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Abstract

This dissertation examines the literature of royal consorts in Stuart England. Critics and historians have devoted considerable attention to the creation of the monarch’s image during this tumultuous period, which witnessed two revolutions and the explosion of print. We know that the Stuart monarchs embraced different forms of visual media – including pageantry, portraiture and print – to disseminate their image within the court and to a broader public. However, the extensive literature about the royal consorts remains under-examined. My thesis makes an original contribution to scholarship by exploring what texts were written about the royal consorts, by whom, and how these writers constructed images of the royal consorts that participated in broader debates over the status of the monarchy.

The dissertation is divided into two main parts. Part 1 comprises six chapters that analyse succession writing, when a new monarch came to the throne and established their iconography for the new reign. I draw on hundreds of texts that were printed about the Stuart consorts at these moments. These writings span a variety of genres, from poems and plays to sermons and political pamphlets. I investigate the literature of each succession in turn, analysing the main themes and motifs that emerged. This approach enables me to uncover a swathe of anonymous and under-utilised literature, but also re-interpret works by more canonical writers such as Aphra Behn. I ask how the royal consorts themselves, their spouses and members of the public could influence the creation of the royal consorts’ images at these moments. Critically, I also compare the conventions that were used to describe the consorts across the century.

Part 2 analyses how writers re-constructed ideals for the royal consorts in Restoration England, as debates about the structure of the monarchy came to be more explicit. Chapter 7 concentrates on images of Henrietta Maria when she returned to England as Queen Mother. Chapter 8 asks how writers adapted former models of representation to praise Catherine, the infertile queen, when it became clear that she would not bear an heir. Finally, Chapter 9 examines the numerous secret histories and romances that were authored about Mary Beatrice’s purported behaviour during her exile in the 1690s. These chapters highlight the continued importance of these women and examines how writers constructed their legacies. As a whole, the literature about the royal consorts reveals a dynamic project as part of which authors engaged with and adapted earlier models of writing. This enabled them to address broader questions about changes in the nature of the Stuart monarchy and political life.
Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the generous support provided by the AHRC for my studentship. I am incredibly lucky to have had the opportunity to work with the Stuart Successions team. Professor Andrew McRae is a patient and thoughtful supervisor, whose support over the whole period and during the last year in particular has been invaluable. Professor Paulina Kewes is an exemplary second supervisor. Her enthusiasm for early modern history, generosity and unmatched vocabulary are both encouraging and inspiring. Working alongside John West and Joseph Hone has also been a pleasure, and my research has benefitted hugely from our conversations and their insights.

Many colleagues and academic advisors have also assisted my research and generously contributed their ideas along the way. Both Susan Doran and Tracey Sowerby read early drafts of this material and provided helpful feedback. Adam Morton and Helen Watanabe O’Kelly invited me to participate in their conference for the excellent Marrying Cultures Project, and I am grateful to them both for offering me the opportunity to publish an essay in the Marrying Cultures edited collection. I was also very fortunate to meet Sara Wolfson on the day of my interview for the Stuart Successions Project. I owe many thanks to Sara, along with Louise Wilkinson and Liz Oakley-Brown, for inviting me to speak at the Queenship & Diplomacy conference and then editing the resulting article for Women’s History Review. I am also very grateful to Professor Mark Knights and Professor Karen Edwards for agreeing to examine this project, and for making the viva a constructive and enjoyable experience.

Working at Exeter University I have had the opportunity to meet and collaborate with many great colleagues and friends. Callan Davies and Nora Williams were excellent co-founders and role shares on the community history project Staging Exeter. I learned a great deal from working with both of them, and owe many thanks to Callan for proof-reading a large part of this dissertation as well as to Nora for her advice and support. I am also indebted to the wonderful Peter Knowles and Isabelle Cosgrave, who put up with sharing an office with me for three years and both commented on a draft of this dissertation at a late stage. Isabel Galleymore and Sharanya Murali have also provided key friendship and trusted counsel. Final and special thanks are due to my family: my incredible sisters, Jenny and Kathryn, and my parents, Carole and David Linnell. They have given me more support and encouragement than I could ever have deserved over the last few years. This project could only be dedicated to them.
A note on the texts

Many of the contemporary writings that I cite in this project include irregular spellings and unusual typography such as random italic type and capitalisation. Quotations in the thesis retain irregular spelling and the use of italic type or capitalisation. If the original quote was in italic type, I have reversed the use of italic in my quotes. I have also modernised the long 's', and silently modified archaic spelling that substituted 'i' for 'j' or 'u' for 'v'. These modifications should not affect the ease with which readers can find texts through online databases such as the ESTC, but are designed to make the quotations easier to read within the context of the thesis.
Contents

Introduction 6

Part One: Literature at moments of succession 19

Chapter One: Queen Anna in 1603 20

Chapter Two: Queen Henrietta Maria in 1625 39

Chapter Three: Queen Catherine in 1662 53

Chapter Four: Queen Mary Beatrice in 1685 69

Chapter Five: Queen Mary II in 1689 82

Chapter Six: Prince George in 1702 96

Part Two: The Royal Family after 1660 112

Chapter Seven: Maternity and Henrietta Maria’s role as Queen Mother 113

Chapter Eight: Fertility and succession in the 1670s 137

Chapter Nine: Royal romance at the court of Saint-Germain 157

Conclusion 170

Appendices 174

Works Cited 210
Introduction

An unprecedented number of writings was produced about the monarchs and their royal consorts during the Stuart century, a creative and turbulent era. The Stuart period started with the accession of King James VI and I in 1603 and closed with his great granddaughter Queen Anne’s accession one hundred years later. The intervening years witnessed a formative time for English politics, during which the constitutional status of the monarchy was transformed and new forms of political communication emerged. In particular, the growth of print changed the opportunities for royal representation. While there have been a number of recent scholarly enquiries into the creation of the monarch’s image in Stuart England, the royal consort’s public image remains under-examined. What sorts of texts were produced about the royal consorts? By whom and to what ends? What codes and conventions were associated with the royal consorts at moments of succession, and how did these change across a period in which the meaning of the monarchy shifted? How can these succession texts provide an entry point to understand the construction of the royal consort’s image more generally?

In what follows, I concentrate on the representation of the five Stuart consorts: Anna, Henrietta Maria, Catherine, Mary Beatrice, and George. I also compare their representations with that of Mary II, who was queen in her own right but to all intents and purposes represented as a royal consort. I combine the perspectives of history and literary studies, making extensive use of online archives to map different kinds of writing about the royal consort. These diverse sources include works we would define as literature in modern terms, including masques, poems and romances. They also encompass non-imaginative writings, which can also be seen as forms of literature, such as sermons and short polemic pamphlets. My aim is to create a history of writings about the royal consort that is alive to both literary conventions – by which I mean the generic templates, images and themes that writers used – and the historical conditions within which these writings were produced. Across this material, I argue, polemicists and panegyrists make repeated efforts to forge a model for writing about the royal consort. It is only by analysing the full spectrum of material that we can understand the function of the royal consort’s image during this period. By doing so, we can learn a great deal about perceptions of the monarchy more widely.

I: The Royal Consorts in Print
Royal consorts were important to royal iconography long before the Stuarts. The consorts had enviable proximity to the monarch, giving them a position of potential influence that could otherwise only be hoped for by close advisors or privileged royal favourites. Their anticipated status as the parent of an heir to the throne also gave them considerable political status in an era of hereditary monarchy. Each of the medieval queen consorts participated in court rituals, such as the monarch’s symbolic entry into London.\(^1\) When Henry VII came to rule after years of internecine strife and bloody civil war, his marriage with Elizabeth of York was a symbol of stability. The couple’s union was arranged to unite warring factions within the aristocracy, and reduce the likelihood of a rebellion against the new Tudor reign. Contemporary writers depicted it as a union of the white and red roses, a motif that continued to be used long after their deaths.

If images of royal marriage were advantageous for Henry VII, they came to be more problematic for his successors. His son Henry VIII’s decision to divorce his first wife, the Spanish Princess Katherine of Aragon, helped to set England on the path of separation from the Church of Rome. Writers capitalised on his second wife Anne Boleyn’s coronation, which was preceded by a large pageant across London. The queen was visibly pregnant when she was crowned, and writers suggested that the new royal consort would herald a new imperial era for the English. Panegyrists praised the “right distinguished” queen, describing her as a “gentle bulwark of the English”.\(^2\) The royal couple’s union therefore enhanced a sense of English national identity that was separate from papal control, although the marriage transpired to be violently short-lived and Anne was executed just three years later. In the later years of Henry VIII’s reign, his quick succession of wives created conflicts at court. The later Tudor marriage negotiations also prompted considerable disquiet. Mary I’s marriage to the Spanish Prince Philip created tensions with her Parliament, who feared that the English nation would be drawn back under foreign control once Philip inherited his father’s seat.\(^3\)

By the time that James VI of Scotland was proclaimed King of England in March 1603, the country had not had a functioning royal family for more than five decades. After years of on-off


courtships and matrimonial negotiations, Elizabeth I came to embrace her iconography as the Virgin Queen by the later years of her reign. While this imagery has proved to be enduring, her subjects lived under considerable uncertainty about the future after it was clear that she would not produce a child to inherit the throne.4 James I knew that his stable marriage with his wife of fourteen years, Queen Anna, made him more attractive to the English populace. He placed Anna and their eldest son Prince Henry square in the public eye. Anna was crowned alongside her husband in June 1603, and both she and Henry took part in the major public pageants that formally celebrated the royal family’s arrival in London.5 The royal consort’s image was therefore part and parcel of royal iconography from the first Stuart reign, as their family helped to set the Stuart monarchs apart from their Tudor predecessors.

The country that James I inherited in 1603 was familiar with visual images of Tudor monarchy, and print had been an important factor in the representation of the most recent Tudor queen consort. Katherine Parr, Henry VIII’s sixth wife, authored several devotional writings that then entered print.6 They were printed in Parr’s name under the auspices of the King’s Printers, conveying her husband’s approval. Indeed Parr’s use of print helped to foster a positive reputation for piety and learning, which built on earlier traditions for representing the medieval queens but also aligned her image with a reformist Protestant tradition. In turn, Parr’s pious image informed Elizabeth I’s representation when she came to be queen. “The cult of Elizabeth in the later sixteenth century,” John N. King writes, “is actually a reincarnation of the iconography of late medieval queens as well as a carefully orchestrated manipulation of the doctrine of royal supremacy”.7

What changed in the Stuart period was a matter of scale. There was an explosion in the number of texts printed in England throughout the seventeenth century, and the variety of formats and genres that were produced. The volume of material tended to spike at moments of crisis, such as the civil wars of the 1640s. But these specific surges were also part of a much bigger incremental trend. As the overall number of printed texts annually increased, illiteracy rates also decreased in both rural areas and urban

4 Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, eds., Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014).
6 Katherine Parr, Prayers or meditacions, wherin the mynde is styrred paciently to suffre all afflictions here, to sette at nought the wayne prosperitie of this worlde, and alway to longe for the everlasting felicitie (London: by Thomas Berthelet, printer to the kinges highnes, 1545); Katherine Parr, The lamentacion of a syner, made by ye most vertuous ladie, Quene Caterin, bewayling the ignorance of her blind life (London: by Edward Whitchurch, 1547). See Jane Mueller, ed., Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2011).
centres. This changing environment opened possibilities for political debate. In *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1962), first translated into English in 1989, Jürgen Habermas contended that the growth of print culture and sites for political communication like coffee houses – in which printed texts were read – helped to create the conditions for a “rational public sphere”. His representation of both early and late Stuart political culture has been hotly contested. But scholars agree that print came to be a regular and accepted forum for political debate. In part as a consequence of this trend, along with other economic and political factors, Mark Knights identifies a growing interest in the concept of public politics in late Stuart Britain.

The growing prominence of print in everyday life transformed the nature of royal representation. Each Stuart ruler advocated methods to police printed texts, through licensing restrictions or the appointment of court officials who could monitor what they deemed to be heretical or seditious texts. While cases of prosecution were fairly rare across the period, printers and publishers could be prosecuted for producing unseemly images of the monarch and royal consort, along with writers such as the unfortunate William Prynne. Yet despite measures such as these, the monarchy’s control over the press was never monolithic. Other bodies, including the Church and the Stationers’ Company, could influence which texts made it into print. Rather than seeking to control the press alone, then, the Stuart monarchs had to adapt. Kevin Sharpe sees this as a pivotal time for the emergence of a “representational monarchy” in England, as successive Stuart monarchs made use of print. Through the publication of their own proclamations, speeches and political writings, and

---


through the patronage of certain poets, pageant writers and even preachers, the monarchs could use print to promote specific ideals or promote particular policies for their reign.

The project of writing about the royal consort encouraged writers to adapt and develop royal iconography. Abby E. Zanger observes that printed literature about the royal consort could uphold the symbols of absolutist rule in seventeenth-century France. At the same time, literature that was published about the queen consort changed the focus of positive texts that would otherwise concentrate on the king. Portraying the queen in print therefore “facilitated the rearrangement and adjustment of culture and its myths”.¹⁵ In seventeenth-century England, writers also showed willingness to experiment with royal iconography and the evolving medium of print. Yet despite the considerable attention that has been devoted to the Stuart monarchs’ images in recent scholarship, there has been surprisingly little effort to explore changing representations of the Stuart consorts in print. Furthermore, the few recent studies that have concentrated on the female consorts tend to focus exclusively on women’s writing, which comprises a small amount of the overall literature that was published.¹⁶ Even Sharpe’s trilogy, which illuminates the Stuart monarchs’ representation, contains little dedicated analysis of the literature that was produced for or about the royal consorts.

The first part of this thesis provides a diachronic analysis of literature that was published about the royal consorts at moments of succession. These moments consistently generated a significant amount of literature, as writers sought to explain the transfer in power and forge an image for the new monarch and his or her spouse. In six chronological chapters I analyse the literature that was published at the successions of 1603, 1625, 1685, 1689 and 1702, along with writings about Charles II’s marriage to Catherine of Braganza in 1662, which was announced less than a year after he was restored to the throne. This means introducing a large amount of material which spans multiple genres, some of which is by familiar writers such as Ben Jonson, John Dryden and Aphra Behn, and some of which is by little-known writers of the likes of William Vaughan and Edmund Arwaker. Each individual chapter seeks to identify the core templates that emerged for writing about the royal consorts at each succession, introducing a range of generic material before explaining how specific images or themes evolved within certain texts. All of the sources that I discuss are then listed in an appendix, in the hope that a

A comprehensive table of literature about the royal consorts will provide future opportunities for comparative work.

This material can enrich our understanding of the royal consort’s self-fashioning. Like their spouses, who used these moments of transition to broadcast their ambitions for the new reign, so too could the royal consorts use the moment of succession to shape a distinctive image for themselves. Each of the consorts patronised or supported artistic projects that later entered print. Often these projects supplemented their partner’s iconography, but they were also designed to emphasise the consort’s authority and establish his or her status. In the early 1700s, for example, Mary Beatrice used print to respond to her husband’s death and suggest that her son should now inherit his crown. She furnished David Nairne, former Clerk of her Council, and John Caryll, her former secretary and now Secretary of State, with the necessary papers to produce James II’s complete Life. The nuns of Chaillot, whom Mary patronised, also published a “lettre circulaire” which purported to represent James’ final days and his family’s plight. This literature was designed to eulogise the former monarch, and insist on the legitimacy of the former royal consort and her son. People in England were accordingly suspicious of texts printed “by the consent of the Late Queen”.

While some of the texts that were published at moments of succession can be traced to the royal consort’s patronage, most of the material that I study in Part 1 was produced as part of a wider network of politicians, writers and publishers. I chart here the variety of tropes that were used to describe the royal consort, suggesting that these were an integral part of royal representation and that writers knowingly deployed them at the time. A pattern emerges at each of the successions, which explains how the conventions for individual consorts started to become prominent. At each Stuart succession, the monarchs and their advisors used their spouse’s image in certain ways and promoted – through public pageants, the coronation ceremony, speeches or declarations – specific images of the union. In 1625, for example, the architects of Charles I’s marriage promoted Henrietta Maria’s arrival by suggesting that it would initiate a new phase of Anglo-French military co-operation. These templates proved to be

---

17 Mary Beatrice certified James II’s Pious sentiments, which were made into a 174 page quarto document by David Nairne in Jan 1702. These papers were used by Father Sanders for his ‘Short Relation of the Life and Death of James the Second’, which was published as Abridgé de la vie de Jacques II (1703) in France. James’ fourteen papers of devotion were then published as The pious sentiments of the late King James II of blessed memory (1704) in London. See Edward Corp, in the introduction to Geoffrey Scott, “The court as a centre of Catholicism,” in A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689–1718, ed. Edward Corp (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 235.
19 Anon, A funeral oration upon the late King James (London: by A. Baldwin, 1702).
influential, as speeches delivered to the king and queen appeared elsewhere in print and writers deliberately recycled these conventions. This does not mean that the process of the royal consort’s representation was top-down, but rather sheds light on a dialogue about court culture and the monarchy that extended well beyond the walls of Whitehall.20

What story emerges from a comparison of the literature that was published about the Stuart consorts? During this transformative period, royal marriage came to be increasingly important to the monarch’s iconography. James I used the metaphor of marriage to explain the contract between a monarch and his subjects in his political writings. A monarch’s authority, James argued, was similar to the husband’s authority in the household: grounded on obedience and consent.21 In addition, Anna’s presence at prominent public events highlighted her importance and helped to enhance his royal image. While James also showcased his young children, Anna’s role at the Jacobean court was understood to be vital. When Charles acceded to the throne after his father’s unexpected death in 1625, royal marriage was even more important than it had been for his father. Charles’ recent marriage with Henrietta Maria had not yet been consummated. In lieu of royal heirs, writers placed primary emphasis on the king’s new wife. This provided positive opportunities for Charles, who could present himself as a future progenitor for the realm. Yet the literature about Henrietta Maria also reveals considerable anxiety for contemporary writers, as they sought to adapt earlier models of writing about the Protestant royal family to accommodate a Catholic queen.

Royal marriage continued to be an important aspect of the monarchy’s public image in the late Stuart period, even as traditional models of patriarchal kingship were contested and brought into conflict with other theoretical ideas. Indeed, in 1685, 1689 and 1702, perceptions of the marriages of James II and Mary Beatrice, William III and Mary II and Anne and George were integral to succession literature. The literature that was published about these later royal consorts would come to be more divided and more politically specific than the succession texts about their predecessors. Whereas comparisons between the earlier Stuart consorts were oblique, at these later successions writers were much more likely to compare and contrast the royal consorts explicitly. They also developed specific

motifs for individual royal consorts, such as queenly beauty for Mary Beatrice. These images spread widely through their repetition in print, and helped to build positive images of the new reign through implicit contrasts with Stuart heritage and earlier literary conventions. The royal consort’s image thus came to be increasingly important, as it was connected with nuanced debates about the nature of the royal image and who had the power to represent it.

The increasingly specific and divided comparisons of the royal consorts do not necessarily reveal a new story about change – we already know that the culture of royal representation was transformed in an era of partisan politics and print. But it can give us a fresh perspective on how writers came to terms with fundamental changes in the body politic. Similar forms for representing the royal consort, such as panegyric, endured. Yet these genres also evolved, while the conditions for creating them and the concerns within the texts shifted. In the first years of the Stuart century, for example, panegyric was the dominant genre for writing about the royal consort. This genre, which condensed expectations of the new reign into an idealising image of monarchy and power, peaked in 1685, when a large number of panegyrics were published to praise James II and Mary Beatrice. However, panegyric was overtaken by a trend in historical writing and political biographies in the following years. By the end of the century, George was represented in more histories and biographies than poems. As the Stuart century wore on, then, writers seem to have been increasingly interested in looking back to the preceding reigns and reflecting on the achievements or limitations of royal representation. Indeed, as we shall see, the language that was used to describe the later Stuart consorts was increasingly influenced by their predecessors’ legacies.

The first part of this thesis shows that the royal consort’s image was a vital part of the Stuart dynasty’s image, and integral to perceptions of Stuart power. The second part of this thesis investigates the nature of dynastic imagery in the second half of the Stuart period. Laura Lunger Knoppers identifies “the powerful but destabilizing effects of a newly domestized image of the royal family in a period of crisis and revolution”.22 But while the royal family was an important part of the court’s identity before the civil wars, similar dynastic ideals were not deployed at Oliver Cromwell’s republican court. Cromwell’s wife, Elizabeth, the non-royal consort, had been an important presence in political life but her image was never assimilated into Cromwellian propaganda to the same extent as earlier royal

consorts. Charles II’s succession should therefore have offered an opportunity to recuperate dynastic language as the king and his advisors recreated the language of monarchy after 1660. Yet following the execution of a monarch, and in light of the libertine culture of Charles II’s court, scholars such as Belinda Peters Roberts argue that earlier models of dynastic representation lost their political utility.

Part 2 offers three chapter-length case studies. Chapter 7 examines how writers forged a language for Henrietta Maria as Queen Mother, building on the memory of her marriage and exile. Chapter 8 considers how writers reworked images of queenly fertility when it became clear that Catherine would not bear an heir to the throne. Finally, Chapter 9 asks how writers recreated ideals of royal romance, once Mary Beatrice went into exile. These are just three examples of ways in which writers reworked the conventions for representing the royal consorts, and the analysis is therefore far from exhaustive. More work could be done on the representation of other royal women or aristocratic figures associated with the royal family, including Anna Duchess of Monmouth, wife to Charles II’s most prominent illegitimate son. But these three chapters in Part 2 show how writers created an image of post-Restoration Stuart monarchy that was profoundly influenced by the legacy of the earlier Stuart consorts, and considers the challenges they faced.

II: The Stuart consorts in history

How have historians and literary scholars approached the literature that was published about royal consorts in the past, and what does this project contribute to their work? The Stuart royal consorts occupied an unusual and intriguing position at the heart of the body politic for a number of reasons. During a period in which the monarch’s position as Head of the English Church was a point of national pride, the fact that all of the Stuart consorts embraced a different faith provided a spectacle of difference. The Stuart consorts all came from countries with political systems and ideas of rule that were different to their partners, and their movement between nations symbolised cultural exchange. Yet two main themes, religion and gender, have dominated the ways in which we read printed literature about the consorts. In what follows, I examine how these themes came to be prominent in scholarly work on the royal consorts and unpick some common myths.

In 1694, the economist and historian Roger Coke looked back on Charles II’s marriage and the influence of the king’s mother, Henrietta Maria. Coming up with a remarkable conspiracy theory, Coke speculated that the Queen Mother came back to England “seemingly to treat with her Son for a Marriage between the Monsieur of France, and her fair Daughter Henrietta Maria, the King’s beloved Sister.” However, he added that for Henrietta Maria “the Marriage of the King with the Infanta of Portugal was no less designed” as well. Coke explained his insalubrious evidence:

As the Designs of the Queen’s coming over were dark, so I acknowledg I have not seen any of the Treaties or Transactions concerning them, but must take Measures by what followed, and so far as I had Light from what went before; yet in all of them it seems evident to me, that the Queen shewed herself to be more affectionate to her Daughter than Son, and to be more a Daughter of France, than Queen of England.\textsuperscript{25} This passage draws on a store of anti-Catholic stereotypes, blending themes of deceit and corruption. The fact that Coke could concede that he had no evidence suggests that he did not need any - his readers would already be convinced. In this account of Stuart history, one Catholic queen consort could be aligned with another to form a reliable, negative, narrative about the early Stuart reigns.

Coke wrote his history at the start of an influential tradition, which has fundamentally affected the Stuart consorts’ legacies. His work was published in the wake of the 1689 political settlement, which stipulated that all future Stuart monarchs would have to be Protestant. Numerous authors published texts to celebrate the 1689 succession, depicting William III’s and Mary II’s arrival as an emancipation for the English nation and a triumph against popish powers. This narrative aligned the English monarchy with the Protestant cause, placing religious identity at the heart of the country’s nationalist rhetoric. It also helped to forge support for William’s looming campaigns against the former King James II and the French King Louis XIV, as England was drawn into a wider war in Europe. In order to craft a negative image of the early Stuart reigns, without necessarily undermining William’s and Mary’s hereditary claim, writers placed great weight on the perceived influence of the earlier Catholic queen consorts. They placed focus on key moments of crisis during the early Stuart reigns, when the royal consorts – and also their spouses – came under heavy criticism.

Through these narratives, a Whig historiographical tradition was born which entranced negative attitudes towards the early Catholic Stuart queens. The weight of historical work on the Stuart

\textsuperscript{25} Roger Coke, \textit{A detection of the court and state of England during the four last reigns and the inter-regnum} (London: for Andrew Bell, 1697), Dd6\textsuperscript{v}. 
consorts’ representation has fallen on the uses of their images at moments of crisis.26 As a consequence, certain assumptions have been made about their unpopularity and the level of hostility towards them. Michael McKeon’s recent study The Secret History of Domesticity (2005), for example, charts what McKeon calls the devolution of absolutism: the decline of the Stuart monarch’s perceived authority across the seventeenth century. McKeon concentrates on representations of the Catholic queens during the civil wars, the popish plot and the warming pan scandal. He concludes that writers could use lurid rumours about the Catholic queens, and in particular their sexual behaviour, to subvert royal privilege and in turn undermine the monarch.27 Historical accounts such as these provide ample evidence for how the queen’s image could be used to deconstruct ideals of sovereignty. Yet they do less to explain how the queen’s image came to be so important, and was used in positive ways to create ideals for the monarchy in the first place.

Religion was of course a vital issue for many contemporaries, at a time when the Protestant cause in Europe seemed to be under threat from encroaching Catholic superpowers.28 It seemed paradoxical and hypocritical for many of the English people that each of the first Stuart Kings chose to marry a spouse from a different faith.29 However, the Whig tradition has embedded negative images of the early Catholic queens to a much greater extent than was evident at the time. Revisionist historians have worked hard to modify some of the ideological assumptions that underpinned Whig narratives. This was not a specific movement, but rather a moment during which scholars addressed a shared concern with the perceived anachronism of Whig scholarship.30 These historians critically re-examined the nature of ideological conflict in early modern England.31 While some still placed emphasis on the

26 There have been some excellent studies of individual queens’ representation in this regard. See in particular Michelle Anne White, Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); Adam Morton, “Sanctity and Suspicion: Catholicism, Conspiracy and the Representation of Henrietta Maria of France and Catherine of Braganza, Queens of Britain,” in Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics 1550-1750, eds. Helen Watanabe O’Kelly and Adam Morton (forthcoming).

My project builds on these studies by attending to the plurality of images about the Stuart consorts. If we read literature about the Stuart queens through the lens of anti-Catholicism alone, we run the risk of misinterpreting it. Equally, by placing more focus on the Catholic queens than the other Stuart consorts we overlook the innovative strategies that writers also used to depict the Lutheran consorts Anna and George. By keeping in mind the importance of religion, but concentrating on the ways in which the importance and structure of this theme changed for the different consorts, we gain a much more compelling insight to the ways in which the royal consort’s image helped to shape debates about religious toleration more generally.

The second major theme that has influenced the ways in which we read texts about the royal consorts is gender, culminating with the recent emergence of queenship studies as an area of inquiry with its own book series. The parallel rise of court history and feminist historiography in the 1980s led feminist scholars to interrogate the culture of the Stuart courts, in which the monarchs and their spouses had their own households. These feminist historians explored the implications of the fact that the Stuart queen consorts were exempt from the system of coverture that was imposed on all other married women in Stuart England, and had control over substantial resources at court. The queen’s unique status, Clarissa Campbell-Orr and others argued, could invite questions for early modern writers about the dynamic between gender and power. “The theatrical nature of power in the Renaissance and baroque courts of Europe,” Campbell-Orr writes: “could only contribute to the construction of powerful images of manhood and womanhood”. Some excellent studies have been produced by feminist historians, who have provided particularly rich accounts of the Stuart consorts’ patronage. Clare Campbell-Orr, “Introduction” in Queenship in Britain 1660-1815: royal patronage, court culture and dynastic politics, ed. Clarissa Campbell-Orr (Manchester: Manchester Univ Press, 2002), 33-34. See also Clarissa Campbell-Orr, ed., Queenship in Europe 1660-1815: The Role of the Consort (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 2004).
McManus and Karen Britland, among others, show that the royal consort held a vital role in court culture and investigate the implications that this could have for internal court politics.\(^{37}\)

The royal consort’s gender informed the kinds of conventions that could be used to describe them in print, as Sybil Jack’s recent article “In Praise of Queens: The Public Presentation of the Virtuous Consort in Seventeenth-Century Britain” (2007) amply demonstrates. However, the suggestion that the royal consort’s gender defined their public representation also runs some risks. Jack, for example, argues that the royal consorts’ images were the quarry of “male propagandists” across the Stuart period. She identifies a turn towards domesticated images of female power by the end of the Stuart period, which – she argues – were designed to contain concerns about the agency of women more generally.\(^{38}\) This article highlights, rightly, the fact that literature about the royal consorts often prescribed ways in which women – or indeed men – should behave. But it also restricts interesting possibilities and contemporary alternatives. As David Norbrook discusses, teleological narratives about women’s history and the relationship between public and private often reach similar conclusions: “with each period seen as one where women begin with a public role and end up by being banished into domesticity”\(^{39}\).

The swathe of writings uncovered in this project about the royal consorts engaged with a wide range of contemporary debates in Stuart England, including persistent questions about the nature of the monarchy, the structure of the Church, and the legacy of the past. By attending to the themes that occupied writers at moments of succession, and considering the literary conventions that they developed to praise the royal consort, I reassess the creation of the royal consort’s image across the period. This approach accommodates the diverse uses of the royal consort’s image and enables us to reconsider the issues, including gender and faith, which influenced their representation at the time. Addressing the mass of print about the royal consorts sheds light both on the extent of conflict over the uses of their image - and the value that writers placed on portraying the consorts across this period.

---


PART ONE

LITERATURE AT MOMENTS OF SUCCESSION
Chapter One
Queen Anna in 1603

An outpouring of literature was published when James I was proclaimed King of England and he and his family arrived in the country. For the first time in more than five decades, England had a royal consort, or, as Henry Chettle put it, a “royal fruitful lady” whose fertility meant that concern about the future succession was now “farre off”.¹ How did writers forge an image for the new queen, and what was her perceived status at the Jacobean court? What themes came to be associated with her, and what expectations did these create for the future Stuart dynasty? I examine here a range of printed material about the queen, from court entertainments to religious polemic and then the dominant genre of panegyric. I start by exploring the king’s representation of a royal consort’s ideal role through his own political writings, which gained considerable traction at the time. I then explore how writers responded to Anna’s faith and her fertility, making these two themes central aspects of her image.

Most scholarship on Anna’s representation has concentrated on her self-fashioning within the court. Her image became something of a cause célèbre for feminist critics, who rightly pointed out that scholarship on James’ iconography tended to dismiss his wife. Barbara Lewalski contended that Anna’s participation in court masques created a distinct source for female authority that then rivalled James’ power.² This focus has persisted in more recent studies, such as Michael Young’s provocatively titled article “Queen Anna bites back”.³ Indeed, in the weeks after James was proclaimed king, Anna made it clear that she intended to increase her personal authority now that she was Queen of England. She insisted on gaining custody of her eldest son, Prince Henry, who had been placed under the Earl of Mar’s guardianship by James.⁴ Faced with making a decision when the royal family was under scrutiny, James despairingly conceded that she could have custody of Henry, assuring Anna via letter that “God

¹ Henry Chettle, Englandes mourning garment (London: By V.S for Thomas Millington, 1603), B4v.
³ Michael B. Young, “Queen Anna bites back: Protest, effeminacy and manliness at the Jacobean Court,” in Gender, Power and Privilege in Early Modern Europe, eds. Jessica Munns and Penny Richards (Harlow: Pearson Educated Limited, 2003), 108-121.
is my witness I ever preferred you to all my bairnes, much more then to any subjecte”. Writers and readers in England would have to gauge the queen’s role.

While a good amount of work has considered the ways in which Anna’s image could create conflict at court, more work needs to be done on how her image contributed to the sense of consensus on which James I’s rule depended. We know that writers looked back to past exemplars as they forged praise for the new king, comparing James, for example, with the mythological Brutus or praising his Tudor forebears. By contrast, I show here that writers crafted a fresh vocabulary for the new Stuart queen. Anna was welcomed with terms that subtly differentiated her both from the former queen regnant and earlier queen consorts, as writers promoted themes of international union, fertility and Protestantism that were more specific to the incoming Stuart rule.

I: The Consort’s Role

What was the expected political role and influence of a royal consort? English writers who wanted a starting point could turn to the works of the king. James I was a man of many words, writing and publishing political tracts throughout his career. He wrote a fairly comprehensive definition of royal marriage in his advice manual for Prince Henry, the Basilikon doron (1599). Here, James advises Henry how to choose a wife. He discusses the threefold “causes” for getting married: “for stayiing of lust, for procreation of children, & that man should by his wife get a helper like himselfe”. He then introduces the threefold “accessories” that make a king’s marriage advantageous: “beautie, riches, and friendship by alliance”. These attributes should be considered when choosing a bride, James states, provided that they do not conflict with the prior mentioned aims for royal marriage. He therefore warns his son not to marry a rich foreign princess if she observes a different faith: lest “the dissention betwixt your
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8 James I, *Basilikon doron. Or his majesties instructions to his dearest sonne, Henrie the prince* (London: by Richard Field, for John Norton, 1603), G6v.
9 Ibid., G7v.
Preachers and hers, will breed and foster a dissention among your subjects”. James did not abide by this particular advice, of course, when he started negotiations for Henry’s and Charles’ marriages years later. Still, his pragmatic overview of the marriage market represents the royal consort as a commodity, whose fertility and diplomatic contacts bring benefits for her adopted country.

James wrote the *Basilikon doron* with an eye to the English succession, which means that he works throughout the text to show what his kingship would be like and explain his interpretation of a monarch’s power. As such, James discusses the acceptable role of a queen consort once the royal marriage has taken place. He advises Henry to “suffer her never to meddle with the politick governme[nt] of the Commonweale, but hold her at the Oeconomicke rule of the house; & yet all to be subject to your direction”. While this statement appears to limit a queen consort’s influence, James later gives a more open viewpoint of the consort’s political role. Should James die while Henry was still a minor, he advises the Prince to follow Anna’s advice. She should be treated like the biblical queen consort Bathsheba, wife to King David and political advisor to her son Solomon, James states:

> If it fall out that my Wife shall out-live me, as ever ye think to purchase my blessing, honour your Mother, set Beersheba in a throne on your right hand: offend her for nothing much less wrong her: remember her.

According to the biblical text, Bathsheba secures the throne for Solomon during an ancient succession crisis. The aging King David has allowed his eldest son, Adoniah, to set himself up as the next monarch. To make sure that Solomon is proclaimed rather than his elder half-brother, Bathsheba appeals to David in a petition. By drawing on this biblical story, James produces a model for Anna’s authority that relates to queenly intercession: a common theme in representations of medieval English queen consorts. The queen consort is seen to supplement the masculine tradition of Stuart kingship, an important part of the royal representation that also differentiates the Stuart kings from a sole female
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10 Ibid., G8v.
11 Ibid., H1v.
12 Ibid.: H8v.
13 David agrees that “As I sware unto thee by the LORD God of Israel, saying, Assuredly Solomon thy sonne shall reigne after me, and he shall sit upon my throne in my stead; even so wil I certainly doe this day”. 1 Kings: Chapter 1 Verses 15-31. Biblical quotes hereafter taken from the 1611 King James Bible.
monarch. The themes that were expressed in *Basilikon doron* came to be prominent in descriptions of the queen, as contemporary celebrants of the 1603 succession clearly consulted James’ works.¹⁵

The 1603 accession was celebrated with a number of festivals and public entertainments, which were held across several months to avoid a terrible outbreak of the plague in the summer of 1603. Anna’s journey to Windsor became an event in itself. The queen stayed in Scotland for several weeks after her husband, before setting out for England with Prince Henry and her daughter Princess Elizabeth. Female members of the English aristocracy jostled to meet her *en route* in the hope of gaining preferment. The diarist Anne Clifford, a child at the time of writing, remembers racing her aunt: “my mother and I went on our journey to overtake her [the aunt], and killed three horses that day with extreme of heat”.¹⁶ By the time that Anna arrived in Windsor she was accompanied by more than two hundred people. Through its scale and structure, Anna’s journey was similar to an Elizabethan royal progress, which provided a visual display of the monarch’s authority.¹⁷ Her route went through parts of the country that James had not visited on his own journey from Scotland, bringing the Stuart royal image to a broader audience. It thus continued “the vital process of ‘anchoring’ the new dynasty in the realm”.¹⁸

Over the course of her journey, Anna was also hosted by wealthy families who provided her with hospitality and entertainment. Robert Spencer, a wealthy member of the country gentry, commissioned a drama from the celebrated playwright Ben Jonson to entertain Anna at his family seat in Holdenby. ‘The Entertainment at Althorp’ comprises welcome sketches for the queen consort and a set of farewell speeches: the entertainment stretched over three days and was published in the later pamphlet *B. Jon his part* (1604). Throughout, the tone is light. One speaker praises Anna while hoping for her future patronage:

> You are a goddess, and your will be done.
> Yet this our last hope is, that as the sun
> Cheers objects far removed as well as near,

---

¹⁵ For instance, Thomas Bilson, *A sermon preached at Westminster before the king and queenes majesties, at their coronations on Saint James his day, being the 28. Of July. 1603* (London: V.S for Clement Knight, 1603).


So wheresoe'er you shine, you'll sparkle here.\textsuperscript{19}

This passage raises a sense of Anna's importance through a monosyllabic echo of the Lord's Prayer and through the use of solar imagery. The idea that Anna will "shine" on the countryside indicates her possible influence at court and by implication her possible generosity. Similar images were common in succession texts for James, such as Jonson's \textit{B. J. his panegyre} (1604), which claims that James emits "a thousand radiant lights, that stream / To every nook and angle of his realm".\textsuperscript{20} The speech thereby constructs an image of the queen consort's patronage that is compatible with her husband's authority. The speaker hopes that she will take future opportunities to remember the Spencer family. In future years, Jonson would certainly benefit from Anna's good regard: he became one of her chief masque-writers at the Jacobean court.

While the structure of Anna's welcome entertainment might be seen to mirror an Elizabethan progress, its contents subtly differentiated the new queen consort from the former queen regnant. In the opening scene, a character representing a satyr greets Anna and Henry, before proceeding to tease representatives of Queen Mab and some fairies. This pastoral imagery seems comparable with the imagery common on Elizabeth's progresses. However, the speakers use the theme of fertility in order to celebrate Anna and highlight the differences between the two royal women. The fairies sing that Anna brings a "Kingdomes happenesse" and "Doth private Lares blesse" through her fertility. This gestures towards Henry's presence, as he also attended the entertainments. The speakers add: "Long live Oriana / To exceed whom she succeeds, our late Diana".\textsuperscript{21} Connecting "succeed" and "exceed" through assonance, Jonson implies that the new queen consort offers greater assets than the previous queen. The description flatters Anna at Elizabeth's expense.

Once the royal family was established in England, the accession was celebrated with the coronation of July 1603. The king and queen were crowned together, for the first time since Henry VIII's joint coronation with his first wife Katherine of Aragon. Traditional English coronations involved a progress through London, which was followed the next day by the religious service in which the monarch was anointed.\textsuperscript{22} Although James hoped that the 1603 coronation would include both of these


\textsuperscript{21} Ben Jonson, "The Entertainment at Althorp," 405.

\textsuperscript{22} The coronation service was both "an efficacious ritual in which the heir was anointed with holy oil and transformed into the king, and a constitutional and legal act in which the monarch swore a solemn and binding
components, the pageants had to be cancelled due to concerns about the plague.\(^\text{23}\) James even issued a proclamation in advance of the service, urging people to stay away.\(^\text{24}\) Importantly, Anna’s behaviour at the coronation did not adhere to her husband’s expectations of her. She refused to take the Sacrament during the service, which was an important aspect of the English Church rituals. This decision might have been motivated by Anna’s secret conversion to Catholicism – which took place before 1603.\(^\text{25}\) But most importantly, as Clare McManus notes, it emphasized her autonomy from her husband and his new subjects: “Anna’s refusal, whether an act of Catholic or Protestant allegiance, was above all a display of her difference from the English”.\(^\text{26}\)

Perhaps due to the diminished size of the event, few texts were published about the 1603 coronation. The only surviving narrative of the event is Gilbert Dugdale’s pamphlet *The time triumphant* (1604), which was published some months later and crucially does not mention Anna’s refusal of the Sacrament. Printed in traditional blackletter type, Dugdale’s pamphlet describes James’ departure from Scotland and the royal family’s entry to London. While it is unlikely that Dugdale witnessed all these events, his narrator offers the perspective of a spectator:

Anon comes forth Englandes Tryumph, the worth of women, Anna Queene of Englande, and happie wife to our most gratious King, whose father was a King, her brother no lesse he a King, and whose husband fower Kings in one, accompanied with lovely Ladies the onely wed starres of the world, for as beauty and good graces following her deare husband to Coronation, with her seemely hayre downe trailing on her princely bearing shoulders on which was a crownet of Gold. She so mildly saluted her


\(^{26}\) Clare McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court (1590-1619)* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 94.
Subjectes that the women weeping ripe cryed al in one voice, God blesse the Royall Queene, welcome to England long live & continue.27

Like earlier English queen consorts, Anna wears all white with her hair down: a symbol of fertility. Dugdale places emphasis on the gender of her entourage and highlights the positive effect that Anna’s presence had on the crowd. The description incorporates Anna into a tradition of English queenship. Dugdale praises her in colloquial terms that are reminiscent of folklore, celebrating the “pierles Ann” and claiming that “Never was Woman so before, / But faire Queene Katherin and no more.”28 Her portrayal here should be seen as following a prescribed code of representation rather than accurately depicting Anna, showing how some writers adapted familiar templates to praise the new consort.

The entertainments that should have preceded the coronation eventually took place in March 1604, as James prepared to open his first Parliament. Co-authored by Jonson and his fellow playwright Thomas Dekker, the entertainments comprised a series of sketches that took place at seven stations in the city. The stations were constructed at the expense of city guilds, along with Dutch and Italian trade representatives. James, Anna and Henry were greeted by actors playing mythological and classical figures, as well as characters such as Thamesis. The pageants seem to have attracted considerable interest from members of the public. Several accounts of the entertainments were printed afterwards, including a transcript by Jonson, a description by Dekker, and a pamphlet about the arches by the architect Stephen Harrison, who designed them.29 Significantly, these pamphlets appear to have been produced in competition. Thomas Man, who published Dekker’s account, was involved in a dispute with Jonson’s publisher Edward Blount. In May 1604 the Stationers’ Company ordered Blount to sell his remaining 400 copies of B. Jon his part to Man, giving the latter a monopoly.30 The scale of the entertainments on the day that they were delivered, and the interest in printed souvenirs of the event, indicates that the 1604 pageants provided an important opportunity for England’s new royal couple to showcase their images.

27 Gilbert Dugdale, The time triumphant declaring in briefe, the arival of our soveraigne lidege lord, King James into England, his coronation at Westminster: together with his late royal progresse, from the toure of London through the Cittie, to his highnes manor of White Hall (London: R.B, 1604), B1.
28 Ibid., A3.
29 Stephen Harrison, The arch’s of triumph erected in honor of the high and mighty prince. James. the first of that name. King, of England. and the sixt of Scotland at his majesties entrance and passage through his honorable citty & chamber of London. upon the 15th. day of march 1603 (London: John Windet, 1604).
The pageants describe Anna by drawing on classical imagery but also flattering her status as a Danish Princess as well as English queen. At the Fenchurch Arch, Jonson describes Anna being greeted by the purple clad character Genius:

Glory of queens, and glory of your name,
Whose graces do as far outspake your fame
As Fame doth silence, where her trumpet rings
You daughter, sister, wife of several kings;
Besides alliance, and the style of mother,
In which one title you drown all your other [...] But not our zeale to them [her children], or ought beside
This Citty can to you: For whose estate
Shee hopes you will be still good Advocate
To her best Lord.\(^{31}\)

Jonson draws attention to Anna’s influential relatives, in particular her brother King Christian IV, who would visit England a couple of years later to much fanfare. Similarly, Dekker notes that people tried to cater to Anna’s Danish tastes. To “delight the Queene with her owne country Musicke,” Dekker writes, “nine Trumpets, and a Kettle Drum, did very sprightly & actively sound the Danish march”.\(^{32}\) Notably, Genius indicates that Anna’s status as mother of the heir to the English throne increases her importance and trumps her former status.

Another important theme that comes through in Genius’ speech is queenly intercession, which as we have seen James also deployed in Basilikon doron. When the speaker requests that Anna be “still good Advocate” for the city, they depict the queen inheriting a tradition from the earlier English queen consorts. As Paul Strohm notes, medieval queen consorts were seen to be advocates for the City of London and they participated in public petitions.\(^{33}\) Strohm sees queenly intercession as a symbolic model of authority, which compensated for the queen consort’s lack of actual power in an increasingly

\(^{31}\) Ben Jonson, B. Jons: his part of King James his royall and magnificent entertainement through his honorable citte of London (London: V.S for Edward Blount, 1604), B4°.

\(^{32}\) Thomas Dekker, The magnificent entertainment given to King James, Queene Anne his wife, and Henry Frederick the Prince (London: T[homas] C[reed], Humphrey Lownes, Edward Allde and others for Tho. Man, 1604), E2°.

partitioned polycentric court structure. Interestingly, though, Anna seems to have appropriated this imagery as she established an iconography for her new household.

In the months after she arrived in England, Anna patronised a number of artistic projects, including poetry, music and dramatic entertainments. There has been a considerable amount of work on Anna’s patronage of court masques throughout her career in England, as she regularly sponsored and performed in these significant court events. Masque performances were expensive productions that took place before court elite. Once dismissed as slavish royal propaganda, critics and historians now accept the complex political and literary dynamic of the masque genre. Anna’s first masque, The vision of the twelve goddesseees (1604), was authored by the well-known writer Samuel Daniel and performed in January 1604. This masque was an opportunity for the queen to showcase her image, and it was also a consequential diplomatic event. Anna invited the Spanish ambassador, who had recently arrived in London to open negotiations for Anglo-Spanish peace, to attend the masque’s opening performance. The French ambassador, who opposed the peace talks, asked James to retract the Spanish ambassador’s invitation, but the King refused. The Spanish ambassador jubilantly reported to his superior that James told the Frenchman “the Queen’s will was his will, and as she had gone with it this far he wanted it to be performed in the presence of those whom she chose”.

Although scholars have tended to treat Anna’s performance in The vision of the twelve goddesses as a display of personal power, which competes with James’ authority, comparing her performance with other texts from 1604 offers an alternative perspective. In this masque Anna took the dominant role of Pallas, goddess of war. The performance begins with a scene in which Anna descends from a mountain summit accompanied by eleven other court women, all of whom are dressed as goddesses. The women’s parade echoes, as Martin Butler has noted, Anna’s journey to London.
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34 Two musicians associated with the Danish court published texts in 1603, advertising their connection with the new queen’s brother. See John Dowland, Lachrimae, or seaven teares figured in seaven passionate pauans with diuers other pauans, galliards, and almands, set forth for the lute, viols, or violons, in fiue parts (London: John Windet, 1604); Thomas Robinion, The schoole of musicke wherein is taught, the perfect method, of true fingering of the lute, pandora, orpharion, and viol de gamba; with most infallible generall rules, both easie and delightfull (London: Tho. Este, for Simon Waterson, 1603).


the women proceed from the mountain, they offer their gifts to a shrine. The “war-like Pallas” lays down her weapons, and the narrator states that these presents will help to “Make glorious both the sovereign and his state”. This speech draws attention to the prospects of the new reign and suggests that Anna’s performance will help to unlock its potential.

Throughout *The vision of the twelve goddesses*, the speakers play with the relationship between fiction and political reality. Once the goddesses deliver their gifts to the shrine, they prepare to dance with members of the audience:

> While worth with honour make their choice
> For measur’d motions order’d right,
> Now let us likewise give a voice
> Unto the touch of our delight […]
> Where words our glory do not show,
> There like brave actions without fame,
> It seems as plants not set to grow,
> Or as a tomb without a name.  

The chain of similes here suggests that power and the representation of power are integrated. If monarchical power is shaped by its reputation, as this speech suggests, then Anna’s performance is political. Even as the passage praises the queen’s capacity to intervene in contemporary politics, though, the Graces are careful to emphasise that her behaviour is part of a queen consort’s conventional remit. The word “motion” connotes a petition, or request. By emphasizing that this motion is “measur’d”, the graces suggest that the queen’s behaviour is within the appropriate remit of her authority. For Pallas to deliver up her weapons heralds peace, in an act or piece of counsel that is seen to be within the established parameters of Anna’s role. The goddess Iris enters to close the solemnities. She states that the masque was instigated by the “motion of the all-directing Pallas, the glorious patroness of this mighty monarchy”. Iris then suggests that Anna’s performance will please the gods, who will consequently provide the audience with “the real effects of these blessings represented”.  
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40 Ibid., 36.
41 Ibid., 36.
of the twelve goddesses, Anna’s status as intermediary enables her to intervene, and through this action shape a legacy for the future reign.

The women’s actions here are a strident interpretation of queenly intercession compared with the Basilikon doron, or the other pageants that describe Anna as royal consort. Yet Daniel’s masque was itself a succession text, which provided insights into the Jacobean court for readers who were interested in their new monarch. Edward Allde, the printer of Dekker’s entertainment, produced a pirate copy of the masque. Daniel then published a corrected text with a dedication to the Countess of Bedford, who was close to Anna.44 As masque texts were often sold cheaply, for an average 4d, this transcript of Anna’s performance would have been accessible for a good number of readers of the ‘middling sort’.45 It would have given them a glimpse of court life, notably of the queen’s status in a polycentric court environment. It would also have offered a possible insight to the new monarch’s priorities and those of his allies. Rather than challenge the themes that had emerged in succession literature of 1603, The vision of the twelve goddesses capitalises on them to open dialogue about international war and peace.

II: Devotional literature and the queen’s faith

Although we now know that Anna had converted to Catholicism prior to the English succession, few if any members of the public knew this at the time. To all intents and purposes, Anna was a Protestant queen. This was a dynamic period for the Protestant Church, as James’ arrival raised the prospect of religious reform. It was unclear exactly what James’ priorities were as he arrived from Presbyterian Scotland. The son of the Catholic Mary Queen of Scots, James had been raised Protestant but also courted Catholic support when he was hoping to gain the English throne. Various parties competed to gain the new king’s attention and advocate changes to the Church. Puritan-leaning clerics in England hoped that James I might call for simpler church rituals, as they felt that the English Church had become

44 Samuel Daniel, The true discription of a royall masque. Presented at Hampton Court, upon Sunday night, being the eight of January. 1604. And personated by the queenes most excellent majestie, attended by eleven ladies of honour (London: by Edward Allde, 1604); Samuel Daniel, The vision of the 12. goddesses presented in a maske the 8. Of January, at Hampton Court; by the Queenes most excellent Maiestie, and her ladies (London: T[omas] C[reede] for Simon Waterson, 1604).
excessive. Some Catholics in England, meanwhile, hoped that James might reduce Elizabeth’s anti-recusant legislation. In a letter to his friend Dudley Carleton, John Chamberlain notes that “not only Protestants, but Papists, and the very Poets, with their idle pamphlets, promise themselves great part in his favour”. How did perceptions of Anna’s confessional identity shape expectations of the new Stuart reign? In particular, how did literary representation of her religion play out when different religious constituencies were vying to advise James on ecclesiastical policy?

Anna appears in a number of texts that address the issue of religious reform, including philosophical tracts and short petitions. These religious writings cannot be said to contribute to Anna’s representation in the same manner as the court entertainments. The queen consort’s image was usually peripheral to the main agenda of these writings. Moreover, a number of preachers dedicated texts to Anna because the royal households were a source of employment for a number of clerics and divines. In 1603, for example, the cleric Thomas Playfere republished an old sermon and dedicated it to Anna, in the hope that she would recognise his “humble endeavours” after reading the piece. These dedications were often short and in prose, rather than the poetic dedications that again we might find in other kinds of literature at court. Nonetheless, the fact that Anna appears in several of these texts shows that religion was perceived to be a pressing issue at the time, and her image was useful for some writers in the debate. I will identify here some of the ways in which her image was used, by some groups.

Perhaps due to the fact that Anna’s conversion to Catholicism was secret, there was no rush of Catholic writing to celebrate her arrival in England. Only three authors describe Anna in pieces of Catholic polemic, and these comments come in a broader description of the royal family. The anonymous tract A supplication to the kings most excellent majestie (1604), for example, praises “our yong Prince and his brother, the rare vertues of their Queene-mother, our most respected Princesse”. The author hopes for “such store of children from both your bodies, as may to the worlds end most renownedly spread and perpetuate the royall conjunction, name, and family”. By promising allegiance to James’ wife and future heirs, the author insists on his lasting obedience to the Stuarts. By doing so,
he hopes to counter the common claim from Protestants that Catholics could not be loyal to both the Pope and the Protestant monarch. The fact that these authors do not try to exploit Anna’s issue, or claim her as one of their own, confirms that her conversion to Catholicism was private and her personal faith was not perceived to be a point of contention.51

By contrast, a number of Protestant divines and polemicists appealed more specifically for Anna’s assistance. Robert Fletcher, a former court employee, touches on the advantages of Anna’s counsel in the pamphlet *A briefe and familiar epistle shewing his majesties most lawfull, honourable and just title to all his kingdomes* (1603). This piece justifies James I’s succession, on the grounds that he can continue Elizabeth I’s policies and protect England from a European Catholic threat. Fletcher hopes that Anna will support the king’s endeavours: “like Bersheba to give counsell, like Hester to preserve, like Judeth to confound Holophernus, &c. And that their seede and prosperity may be as Josiah”.52 Each of these biblical women is a strong exemplar. According to the biblical text, Bathsheba’s political advice enabled her son, Solomon, to retain his throne despite a coup; Esther convinced her husband to protect the minority Jewish community and encouraged the destruction of their persecutors; Judith intoxicated an enemy general, Holofernes, before decapitating him to prevent an invasion. These examples remind the reader of a period when religious communities were under threat and imply that the Protestant community in England is similarly threatened. Fletcher hopes that Anna will help to “redeeme us from Roome [sic] and Romish Religion” by setting a good example at court.53

The writer Andrew Willet used the 1603 succession as an opportunity to comment on what he saw to be the increasingly popish tendencies of the established church. An ordained clergyman, Willet had previously authored a history of controversies between Catholics and reformists entitled *Synopsis papismi* (1592). He presented James with a copy of this history when the King arrived. While Willet was associated with the established church, he increasingly believed in the early 1600s that the bishops should listen to Puritan criticisms of certain aspects of church ritual and alter their practice.
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51 On later awareness of Anna’s conversion within Danish court circles, see Suzanne Trill, “A feminist critic in the archives: reading Anna Walker’s a sweete savor for woman (c. 1606),” *Women’s Writing* 9 no. 2 (2002): 199-214. One speculative exception from 1603-4 is Ralph Buckland’s Catholic psalmody *Seaven sparkes of the enkindled soule* (1604), where the name Anna appears in an illustration above the psalm “the Blessed State of a Catholick”. Buckland mentions Elizabeth I and Mary I in a similar way, making explicit parallels with these earlier queens. Without further information on Buckland, however, it is unclear whether he would have been aware about the rumours regarding Anna’s faith. See Ralph Buckland, *Seaven sparkes of the enkindled soule* [1604-5], 73.
52 Robert Fletcher, *A brieve and familiar epistle shewing his majesties most lawfull, honourable and just title to all his kingdomes* (London: John Harrison, 1603), B3v.
53 Ibid., B3v.
accordingly. Soon after Anna’s arrival, Willet authored the lengthy exposition *Ecclesia triumphans* (1603), which celebrates the succession and meditates on the psalms. Willet dedicated the tract to Anna, asking her to consider the case of reformists within the Church. He compares her with Anne Boleyn, whose marriage had set the English Reformation in motion and who was by this point seen to be a symbol of Protestant reform. Bolyen was concomitantly blamed for the Reformation by the Catholic press. The Catholic writer William Warford, for example, criticises “the inordinate affection which King Henrie the eyght tooke to Anne Bollen, mother to the late Queene Elisabeth (beheaded afterward for her justes desretes by the sayde kinge her husband)”. Willet hopes that Anna will “continueth the Christian name” of Boleyn, and “revive the honourable fame” of England’s former queen consort. He states that Anna will revive the spirit of the early Reformation period: “this land may long have fruition of like golden and happie daies, which God in his mercie graunt”. For Willet to appeal to Anna in this text supplements his earlier appeals to James. His attempts to gain notice from the court appear to have been successful – he later became chaplain in ordinary to Henry and often preached before the court.

Through these texts, various religious parties tried to use the queen consort’s image to advocate their preferred strategies for church reform. The fact that Anna is often marginal in these texts, or that writers dedicated works to her only after also dedicating works to the king, suggests that Anna was not perceived to have a particularly strong influence on her husband’s religious policies. She would play no part in the Hampton Court Conference or in the compilation of the King James Bible that bore her husband’s name. At the same time, these texts show that Anna’s status as a Protestant was an important component of her representation. These representations of the queen might not have changed expectations about James’ government, but they set a precedent for representations of the future royal consorts, whose religion was publically different from that of their spouses or predecessors.

III: The queen in panegyric
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54 I am grateful to Tracey Sowerby for reading extracts of this chapter, and for her helpful insights to Anne Boleyn’s legacy in England.
55 William Warford, *A briefe instruction. By way of dialogue, concerninge the principall poynetes of Christian religio[n], gathered out of the holy scriptures, lathers, and counceels* (Louaine [i.e. Seville?]: By Laurence Kellam [i.e. F. Perez?], 1604), I2v.
56 Andrew Willet, *Ecclesia triumphans: that is, the joy of the English church for the happie coronation of the most vertuous and pious prince, James by the grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defendour of the faith, &c* (London: John Legat for Simon Waterson, 1603), I4v.
The seventeenth century was a defining era for royal panegyric. James was known to be a poet and translator of poetry – the *Basilikon doron* was fronted by one of his own verses. As a consequence, English poets hoped that James would be likely to sponsor their works at court. The first Stuart succession proved to be a creative and dynamic time, as authors such as Michael Drayton and Jonson turned their hands to the panegyric form. Yet in what remains the leading full-length study of Stuart panegyric, James Garrison contends that the uses of the royal consort’s image are somewhat staid in panegyric. “Because the queen is perceived as a national asset,” Garrison writes: “she has no private or romantic dimension”. Garrison is right to suggest that Anna’s image was seen to be a national icon, but the 1603 succession changed what a national icon should represent. James’ arrival united the English and Scottish crowns, and he hoped that he would be able to bring the two countries closer together politically as well. The prospect of Anglo-Scottish union was hotly contested. How could poets transform Anna into a national icon as debates about the nature of English identity took hold? What was Anna seen to bring to the nation, and what were the perceived consequences?

Like Anne Clifford, who rushed to meet Anna in person, rival poets at the English court hurried to praise her in print. Both John Davies and Hugh Holland dedicated longer projects to Anna with prefatory verses. Davies’ poem ‘To the sacred Queene of Englands most excellent Majestie’ is included in the preface of his verse history *Microcosmos, the discovery of the little world, with the government thereof* (1603). Here, Davies compares Anna’s “blest and gracious” womb to that of the Virgin Mary, which provided “our Soules preservative” through the birth of Jesus Christ. If Mary is “in Heaven Crowned”, Davies writes to Anna, “sith thou bring’st our Corpes conservative, / We must crown thee in Earth”. Comparing the queen consort with the Virgin Mary draws from a traditional model of royal representation – resembling, for example, the pageants that celebrated Anne Boleyn’s coronation in 1533. Anna’s provision of Stuart heirs is thereby linked with the English body politic, which her fertility helps to secure.
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60 Hunt, *The drama of coronation*, 62.  
61 John Davies, *Microcosmos, the discovery of the little world, with the government thereof* (Oxford: Jospeh Barnes, 1603), A2v.
The theme of queenly fertility is also important for images of English nationhood in Holland’s poem ‘To the Bright Queene Anne’, which fronts the verse romance *Pancharis* (1603). First started during the reign of Elizabeth, *Pancharis* concentrates on the life of James I’s ancestor Catherine of Valois. It focuses on the aftermath of the death of Catherine’s first husband King Henry V and the action takes place before her marriage to Owen Tudor. It must have seemed fitting for Holland to publish the piece after James I’s accession – he dedicated the piece to James, Anna and Henry with separate poems. Holland euphemistically describes Henry’s conception, praising Anna:

Thou in whose Zodiak of white armes enchained  
Our Sunne so oft hath shined,  
In whose wombe was confined  
What in this Isle scornes to be long contained.

To represent Anna’s arms encircling the sun, and her womb confining her child, builds a spatial language in which her body is both productive and protective. Anna’s image is in turn synthesized with the English nation: as Henry moves beyond her body, he will also “scorne” to stay in the British Isles. This tactic suggests an expanding vision for the monarchy, in which Anna’s heir will achieve new international gains. “Live thou and he, and maist thou see him rather / Copartner then Successor to his Father”, Holland writes.62 Both Davies and Holland therefore concentrate on Anna’s fertility, using her motherhood as a symbol of England’s future prospects.

The anonymous author of the collection *Northerne poems congratulating the kings majesties most happy and peaceable entrance* (1604) creates a more malleable image of nationhood. This piece was published several months after the succession and dedicated to the Earl of Sheffield. The author styles himself as a representative of the north of England. His text comprises a series of poems, several of which describe the queen. Like Davies and Holland, the author concentrates on Anna’s fertility. He suggests that Anna’s arrival with James offers a more positive future for the nation than would have been possible under Elizabeth. “Our Princesse barren from this Worlde is gone, / (No Marvaile) for she liv’d a Virgins life”, the speaker states: “A happier change we could never have none, / Then King with issue store by lawfull wife”.63 At the same time, Anna’s fertility provides a model of cultural exchange as well as a positive symbol for the English nation. The author celebrates that “Our Noble Queene in
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63 Anon, *Northerne poems congratulating the kings majesties most happy and peaceable entrance to the crowne of England* (London: John Windet for Edmund Weaver, 1604), B4v.
Cimbria land was borne / That she to Cambria might bring forth a son.” These lines use an ancient term for Denmark, Cimbria, and pair it with a common name for Wales, Cambria. Anna, who has moved from Denmark to Scotland and now provides a Prince of Wales, here becomes an apt symbol for James’ leadership across the British Isles.64 “Let Cimbria joy which her birth doth adorne,” the author writes: “Let Wales reyoyce to whome this grace is wonne”.65 The queen’s relationships with people in Denmark help to forge and cement alliances between different parties. Her capacity to pass between Denmark and Scotland, or England and Wales, provides a positive model of cultural exchange. This might lessen the perceived risks of the union project for its opponents.

For the Scottish poet Alexander Craige, who authored The poetical essayes of Alexander Craige Scotobritane (1604), the queen consort’s image provides a means to ruminate on British nationhood in more ambivalent ways. It would be wrong to suggest that this collection opposes the Union project outright.66 Craige followed the royal family to London in 1603, where The poetical essayes circulated at court under the aegis of his friend and Anna’s future Secretary, Robert Ayton. Craige was allocated a royal pension in 1604, which suggests that the poems might have been well received.67 Indeed, Craige dedicated a second collection of poems to Anna two years later, in which he thanks her for supporting his work.68 It is possible, then, that Anna specifically saw and approved these pieces. Yet Craige’s use of the queen consort’s image reworks some of the patterns in the poems that were discussed earlier, providing a distinct interpretation of the Union project that is focused on the ramifications for Scotland.

In the sonnet ‘The Most Vertuous and accomplished Prince ANNA, Queen of Britane, Fraunce and Ireland’, Craige takes the unique decision to ventriloquize the queen consort and makes Anna his primary speaker. ‘The Most Vertuous and accomplished Prince’ is set on Anna’s marriage bed in Scotland:

64 Henry was not invested as Prince of Wales until June 1610. By the time this pamphlet was published, he had been invested Knight of the Garter and given the title Duke of Cornwall.
65 Ibid., B3v.
66 Sarah Dunnigan treats these pieces as ‘problem poems’ that criticise the union project. I share Dunnigan’s sense that Craige is conflicted, but think that as a result the overall content of the collection holds a more complex balancing act than she suggests. Sarah M. Dunnigan, “A New Critical Cartography: pre and post-Union Scottish Renaissance,” in Alba Literaria: A History of Scottish Literature, ed. Marco Fazzini (Italy: Amos. Edizioni, 2005), esp. 112.
67 David Laing, introduction to The Poetical Works of Alexander Craig of Rose-Craig, 1604-1631 (Glasgow: Robert Anderson for the Hunterian Club, 1873), 3.
Where habit was, dwells sad Privation now,
And I am made an Orphane from delight:
To want the sweete fruition of thy sight,
In balefull bed my body when I bow,
Yea neither can I tell, nor can ye trow,
How blacke alace and noysome is each night. 69

Rather than praise Anna’s fertility and status as a mother, Craige depicts her as an “Orphane” and thereby aligns the queen with the Scottish nation, which has lost its patriarch. Although James I is still implicitly praised as the sun, the speaker’s focus on the “blacke” and “noysome” night illuminates the problems for those that James I has left behind. The optimistic descriptions of Anna’s fertile body in other succession texts are reversed in Craige’s verse.

Craige’s poem meditates on the consequences of the accession for James I’s Scottish subjects. The affective nature of the sonnet form creates a sense of the emotional dimensions of the succession, which is heightened by the despair that Craige’s queen consort expresses at the departure of her husband. Anna’s words in this verse mediate fears about the impact of the succession upon James I’s subjects in Scotland, who were being left by their patriarch as the queen consort is here left by her husband. 70 By deploying some of the conventions for representing the queen consort in a different context, Craige is able to consider the implications of ‘marrying’ the king’s countries for the subjects James was leaving behind.

IV: Conclusion

The royal consort’s image was a vital part of Stuart iconography at the start of this era. Anna participated in the major events for the 1603 succession, giving writers an opportunity to start testing out themes and images that could be used to describe her. Writers seem to have built on the memory of earlier medieval queen consorts, but also to have adapted to the emphasis on international diplomacy, intercession and fertility that James promoted in his description of the ideal consort in Basilikon Doron.

In turn, Anna appropriated intercession in her performance of 1604. To read Daniel’s masque in light of other succession literature published at this time shows first how strident the representation of Anna’s position is, but also that her intervention could be seen as compatible with her role. This sheds light on the dynamic project of writing about the royal consort at the early Jacobean court, as writers bid for the king’s and queen’s approval.

How were these images of Anna connected with the past, and what templates might they create for future Stuart consorts? As few writers explicitly compared Anna with earlier English queen consorts, there is little sense that writers were trying to create a line of continuity between Anna and her predecessors – even while the occasional author such as Willet hopes that she will inherit Anne Boleyn’s spirit. Instead, writers looked ahead to a distinctly Stuart reign. But the motifs that were used to describe the queen would prove to be important for her successors. In particular, writers assumed that Anna was a Protestant and her faith was an important aspect of her representation. Furthermore, the queen’s proven fertility was vital. Anna had already fulfilled the expected role of the queen consort by providing an heir to the throne, and her maternity was therefore vital to her representation. This also meant that, in some senses, the queen’s image could be perceived to be less important than that of her son. In later years, the absence of royal heirs would mean that the royal consort’s image came to be even more important. And the ideals of Protestantism and fertility, which appealed to writers in 1603, would be used to put subtle pressure on the consorts and their spouse.
Chapter Two

Queen Henrietta Maria in 1625

Henrietta Maria arrived in England in June 1625, soon after her young husband Charles I had been proclaimed King. What expectations surrounded the young King’s marriage, and how did writers depict the new Queen’s role? In particular, how did writers explain the Queen’s Catholicism and what themes or images could be used to praise her compared with Anna? Charles I’s succession was perhaps the smoothest of all the Stuart successions, as it followed his father’s natural death. As he did not yet have children and heirs, the image of his marriage to Henrietta Maria was even more important for his iconography than his father’s marriage had been in 1603. Kevin Sharpe notes that “Charles’s marriage was as central to his self-presentation as King as was his advertisement of his Stuart Succession”. ¹ But if the new royal marriage was integral to Charles’ iconography, Henrietta Maria’s status also presented problems. The young queen was a Catholic and French Princess, who declined to participate in her husband’s coronation because she refused to acknowledge the authority of a Protestant Archbishop. She sponsored entertainments at court that were modelled on French drama, and undertook provocative pilgrimages to Catholic sites. ²

Approximately forty texts were published about Henrietta Maria in the weeks before her arrival and after she landed. The majority of these works were panegyrics, including individual pieces by court poets and two volumes by the universities. There are also a range of prose writings, such as plague pamphlets in which Henrietta Maria often appears on the sidelines rather than being the main subject of the texts. More writings had been published about Anna in 1603, but this should not be seen as a reflection on the level of interest or enthusiasm about Henrietta Maria as an individual. A smaller number of texts was produced about the 1625 succession than the 1603 succession, perhaps because the hereditary succession was less contentious than James I’s succession or because a terrible outbreak of plague in the summer of 1625 meant that many printing presses in London closed. The limited amount of material makes it difficult to identify clear trends in writings about Henrietta Maria, but I show here how writers start to develop an image for the queen that subtly adapts the images that had been used to describe Anna. I begin by examining literature that was created under the direct influence of the court,

by which I mean court entertainments and speeches, and then consider how these images were fostered in other printed texts. The dominant theme here is war and peace. I then turn to the theme of religion, and show how writers used the queen’s image to subtly counsel the new king.

I: The Royal Marriage, War and Peace

How did the architects of the royal marriage explain the dynamic of the Anglo-French union, and what impact did this have on Henrietta Maria’s representation in print? In a collection that was published posthumously, the poet Abraham Holland suggested that writing panegyric in 1625 felt inappropriate due to the widespread mourning caused by the plague. “Sorrow can speake as well in verse as prose”, Holland wrote, “in this great Yeare of Elegies”.

Despite such concerns, however, royal panegyrist Quin hoped that Charles and Henrietta Maria would “live and love long flourishing, / That many a goodly Bud from them may spring”. Twining images of the French lily and English rose, Quin created a sense of harmony between Charles’ and Henrietta Maria’s nations. His imagery was echoed in the hefty poetry collections that the University of Cambridge and the University of Oxford also published to celebrate the marriage. I analyse here entertainments that were published before Henrietta Maria’s arrival and speeches that were delivered to her after she arrived, which sought to define Anglo-French partnership and by implication the queen’s status.

One of the first writers to celebrate the Anglo-French marriage was perhaps the foremost writer of late Jacobean England, Ben Jonson. Having written entertainments for James and Anna since 1603,
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3 Abraham Holland, Holandi post-huma (Cantabrigiae [i.e. London]: impensis Henrici Holland [i.e. B. Alsop and T. Fawcet], 1626), D3v.
Jonson was commissioned to produce the masque *The fortunate isles* (1625) once the Anglo-French marriage was ratified in December 1624. The masque was performed before James on 9 January 1625. Jonson depicts the union between two islands and promotes themes of peace and harmony under James’ rule. The majority of the material in this masque was not specific to Henrietta Maria or indeed the Anglo-French marriage. In fact, much of the material was originally written for an earlier masque entitled *Neptune’s triumph* (1624), which was designed to celebrate Charles’ return from Spain during his negotiations to marry the Spanish Infanta, of which more will be said below. When Charles’ marriage to Henrietta Maria was announced, Jonson expediently recycled the older material and simply added a new anti-masque.8 The text alludes to Henrietta Maria just briefly, when two characters “sing the present prophecy that goes / Of joining the bright lily and the rose”.9

Although the imagery in *The fortunate isles* is not original for the 1625 marriage, the text was printed in 1625 and was seen to be part of the specific celebrations for the Anglo-French marriage. It is therefore interesting that Jonson places so much emphasis on peace, as he had in *Neptune’s triumph*. When Jonson was writing both incarnations of the entertainment, the English public were concerned about the wars over religion in Europe. In particular, people worried about the fate of James’ daughter Elizabeth, who had married Frederick V Elector Palatine in 1613. Frederick had accepted the throne of Bohemia after being petitioned to do so by members of the Protestant populace, but Catholic forces backed by the Spanish Hapsburgs later challenged him. Frederick lost both the crown of Bohemia and his lands in the Palatinate, and he and his family were forced into exile. Public support for the Palatinate couple was strong in England.10 However, James resisted calls to intervene militarily on their behalf and expressly forbade Frederick, Elizabeth or their family members to come to England.11 Jonson’s 1625 masque concludes, as had his masque in 1624, with an address to James I that calls for calm:

May thy subjects’ hearts be all one flame

Whilst thou dost keep the earth in firm estate,

And ’mongst the winds dost suffer no debate,

But both at sea and land our powers increase,
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With health and all the golden gifts of peace.\textsuperscript{12}

This closing passage uses natural images of the sea, land and earth which depict James as a figure of order in a broader balance. The language also suggests that there is a mutual connection between James’ authority and peace, as the flame of his subjects’ loyalty matches the “golden gifts” of peace. By suggesting the King’s control over the whole earth, Jonson’s speaker promotes James’ desired image as a peace-maker in Europe. Whispers of dissent are at once recognised and contained.

These “golden gifts” are a far cry from the second entertainment about the Anglo-French marriage, Sir John Beaumont’s \textit{The theatre of Apollo} (1624). Commissioned by George Villiers Duke of Buckingham, who increasingly supported military intervention, this entertainment does not seem to have been performed at the time. It is set in Parnassus, where James I is represented as Apollo the sun god and is accompanied on stage by representatives of both Charles and Elizabeth of Bohemia. Beaumont’s speaker looks forward to the Princess’ arrival: “\textit{Shee} must increase our joys, crowne our desires, / And joyne her flames, unto Apolloses fires”.\textsuperscript{13} Karen Britland rightly points out that this image of Henrietta Maria depicts her as a tributary Princess. As such, Britland suggests that the French Princess is incorporated into an English imperial project.\textsuperscript{14} At the same time, the prospect of Henrietta Maria’s arrival creates new opportunities. The flames of love that Henrietta Maria brings are perceived to enhance the Prince and his father, whose dynasty would be secured by a strong marriage between his heir and daughter in-law. The choice of vocabulary also subtly insists on England’s firepower, and by implication military strength.

In \textit{The theatre of Apollo}, the royal marriage is seen to change the power balance on Parnassus and increase the Prince’s authority. The speaker addresses Elizabeth of Bohemia’s representative with a prophetic tone: “Beholde the Raynbowe, mirror of the Sunne / Ritch Scarfe of varied ayre, firme Peace begun”.\textsuperscript{15} The rainbow connotes the covenant between God and Noah after the Flood, in which God promises to protect Noah’s descendants.\textsuperscript{16} As such, the speaker builds a sense of growing activity for Elizabeth of Bohemia’s cause. The “golden gifts” of peace in Jonson’s masque are here somewhat

\textsuperscript{12} Jonson, “The Fortunate Isles,” 714.
\textsuperscript{13} John Beaumont, \textit{The Theater of Apollo}, ed. W. W. Greg (London: F.Etchells and H.Macdonald, 1926), 7. The modern edition uses the American English spelling of “theater”. In-text I have used “theatre” to retain consistency with other in-text spellings.
\textsuperscript{14} Britland, \textit{Drama at the courts}, 28.
\textsuperscript{15} Beaumont, \textit{The Theater}, 8.
\textsuperscript{16} “I doe set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant, betweene me and the earth”. Genesis Chapter 9 Verse 13.
complicated, as peace is promised to the exiled Princess, rather than to the English nation. James I may be god of the sun within this masque device, but his son is also a rising star. The prospect of Henrietta Maria’s arrival therefore provides an opportunity to look ahead, and subtly advocate a change in policy when Charles I becomes king. Unlike Jonson’s masque, *The theatre of Apollo* was not printed at the time. However, the entertainment starts to create a connection between the Anglo-French alliance and a prospective restoration for the Palatinate, which would come to be more explicit in printed texts after Henrietta Maria arrived.

On 13 June 1625, the Recorder of Canterbury John Finch welcomed Henrietta Maria to Canterbury. The queen had recently landed in Dover, and she and Charles were *en route* to London. Finch’s speech was designed to praise the Stuart couple, and also to appeal for new powers for the city of Canterbury. He opened by praising the “glorie and grace now shining upon us from your high majesties”. Suggesting that Henrietta Maria and Charles are equally luminous, Finch indicates their personal compatibility. In addition, he suggests that Anglo-French partnership is promising in the military context. “All things concurre to Enflame the zeale of English hartes that we could hope”, Finch writes: “or our Enemies feare”. He emphasises that England and France, two “Nations military and populous”, can together balance European affairs of state. This representation of Anglo-French partnership helps to produce a positive image of Henrietta Maria’s prospective agency as English queen consort. Finch makes a direct address to Henrietta Maria on behalf of Charles’ sister:

> But if ever, now was the true period of time to summon our ancient affection to a new Leauge; when the Chariotts of Jehu drive so furiously, When our neighbours and allies are so neare danger if not ruine, when (oh that my tongue could not speake it, but gracjiously be pleased in the day of the gladnesse of thy hart o Queene to be put in minde of it) when soe many royall branches of that blessed tree that that [sic] now growes in Paradise live transplanted from theyr owne propper inheritance.

The “blessed tree” is a thinly-veiled allusion not only to persecuted Protestants in Europe but also the Stuart family in exile. By putting the queen consort “in minde” of her new sister-in-law, Finch creates an emotive connection between two female consorts. This strategy flatters Henrietta Maria by praising her authority. Finch counsels the queen to support Elizabeth and perhaps use her influence with Charles to achieve it. Although Finch’s speech was delivered in English, a language in which Henrietta Maria

---

17 Finch’s transcription of the speech is in the British Library, BL Sloane MS 1455, 4-6. All quotes are taken from this copy.
was not fluent, Finch’s efforts appear to have served him well. He was later granted a sizable payment from Henrietta Maria’s jointure and made her attorney general.¹⁸

First delivered to the royal couple, Finch’s speech reached a broader audience when it was circulated in print. A transcript of the speech was published by John Haviland in the pamphlet *A true discourse of all the royal passages, tryumphs and ceremonies, observed at the contract and mariage* (1625), which records the queen consort’s journey from the proxy wedding ceremony to her arrival in London.¹⁹ This text is a prose account written in the first person, which makes it similar to European early modern festival books. Like other festival books, it is hard to determine the exact origins of this pamphlet, but it is likely to have been sanctioned by Charles I or his advisors to share details about Henrietta Maria’s arrival with a domestic and international audience.²⁰ The first half derives from a French text about the proxy wedding ceremony, which was licensed for translation in May 1625 and then printed by Nathaniel Butter: an enterprising publisher of international newsbooks, who had previously collaborated with Haviland to publish a festival book celebrating Charles I’s return from Spain.²¹ Haviland’s 1625 pamphlet repeats Butter’s translation with minor amendments, and then adds a new section that describes Henrietta Maria’s arrival and reception in England. It seems likely that this account of Henrietta Maria’s arrival was sanctioned by the court, given the license for the original pamphlet’s translation and the inclusion of a generally accurate transcript of Finch’s speech.

*A true discourse* places emphasis on public displays of affection for the King and Queen and attends in detail to the pomp that accompanied the royal nuptials. The narrator spends twenty lines, for example, describing the Duke of Chevreuse’s outfit during the proxy ceremony. In addition, the narrator builds a romantic narrative about Henrietta Maria’s and Charles I’s first meeting. The narrator claims that when Henrietta Maria first saw Charles I she bent down to pay respect, then declared her loyalty
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¹⁹ Anon, *A true discourse of all the royal passages, tryumphs and ceremonies, observed at the contract and mariage of the high and mighty Charles, King of Great Britaine, and the most excellentest of ladies, the Lady Henrietta Maria of Burbon, sister to the most Christian King of France* (London: John Haviland for Hanna Barret, 1625).


²¹ Anon, *A relation of the glorious tryumphs and order of the ceremonies, observed in the mariage of the high and mighty Charles King of Great Britaine, and the ladie Henrietta Maria, sister to the most Christian King of France* (London: T.S for Nathaniel Butter, 1625). For the 1623 pamphlet see *Two royall entertainments, lately given to the most illustrious Prince Charles, Prince of Great Britaine, by the high and mighty Philip the fourth King of Spaine, &c.* (London: Printed [by John Haviland] for Nathaniel Butter, 1623).
when he raised her up and “threw herself into his armes”.\footnote{Anon., \textit{A true discourse}, D3'.} The description of Henrietta Maria’s behaviour seems similar to Dugdale’s enthusiasm about Anna’s arrival, prescribing ways for the queen consort to behave as opposed to reflecting her actions. The emphasis on her deference to Charles is important, as it suggests that the new English queen consort is aware of established boundaries for her status and authority. For Finch’s speech to be reproduced in this pamphlet cements the association between the Anglo-French marriage and popular Palatinate restoration that was implied in the court entertainments. The pamphlet therefore pairs traditional conventions for representing royal women with a specific narrative about the advantages of Henrietta Maria’s arrival.

These representations of the Anglo-French marriage helped to shape public ideas about the nature of the relationship between England and France. There was certainly increased public interest in Henrietta Maria’s native country around this time: enterprising publishers produced a spurt of Anglo-French dictionaries.\footnote{French dictionaries had of course been printed before, but the quantity of them produced in this year suggests a link between Henrietta Maria’s arrival and growing interest in French as a second language. See \textit{The French alphabet} (London: by Richard Field, 1625); \textit{The French littelton} (London: by George Miller, to be sold by Richard Thrale, 1625); \textit{The French tutour} (London: [By H. Lownes] for Robert Young, 1625); and \textit{The marrow of the French tongue} (London: By Miles Flesher] for Richard Meighen, 1625).} The Cambridge scholar William Lisle oversaw a new edition of his text \textit{Part of Du Bartas, English and French} (1625), which translated the works of the French Huguenot Guillaume de Salluste Du Bartas into English. Du Bartas was popular in England and had been admired by James I, who translated some of his works.\footnote{See Chloe Wheatley, \textit{Epic, Epitome and the Early Modern Historical Imagination} (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), esp. 71-93.} In \textit{Part of Du Bartas, English and French}, Lisle places Du Bartas’ French text and his own English translation on adjacent pages. He dedicates the new work to Charles with a “pastorall” scene, in which two shepherds prepare for Henrietta Maria’s arrival. The shepherds excitedly discuss giving the new queen consort presents from their orchard, and look forward to welcoming “The French Deluce to Brytaines Rosy bank”.\footnote{William Lisle, \textit{Part of Du Bartas, English and French}, and in his owne kinde of verse, so neare the French Englished, as may teach an English-man French, or a French-man English} (London: By John Haviland, 1625), Ii2'. Praising the royal union, Lisle states that he wishes to show how the French and English languages can also go “hand in hand”.\footnote{Ibid., Ii4'.} His translation, like the festival book discussed above, was published by John Haviland.

The fact that writers associated Henrietta Maria with Elizabeth placed the Anglo-French marriage in a broader European perspective, which ultimately suggested that Charles’ marriage to a
Catholic Princess would assist the pan-European Protestant cause. For the naturalised Frenchman George Marcelline, this theme helps to justify the union between Britain and a Catholic power. Marcelline advertises the relationship between Anglo-French matrimonial alliance and the European conflict on the title page of his lengthy tract *Epithalamium gallo-britannicum* (1625), which was dedicated to Charles and the Duke of Buckingham and circulated before Henrietta Maria arrived. Marcelline states that the marriage presages “the Destruction and Ruine of Antichrist, the establishment of the true Faith, the propagation of the Gospell, the restitution of the Palatinate, the ouerthrowing of the Enemies designes”. Within the text, Marcelline insists that Henrietta Maria will convert to the Protestant faith, and encourages her to follow the example that had been set by Protestant figures such as Charles’ mother and sister. He describes the Anglo-French marriage as the “Epilogue to the dolefull Tragedie, so passionately acted in the bosomes of the Royall King and Queene of Bohemia”. The idea that Henrietta Maria’s actions will help to secure a restoration for the Palatinate here provides an explanatory framework for the marriage, which might have been designed to palliate concern about the arrival of a new Catholic consort.

II: Religion and images of intercession

In 1603, Protestant piety was an important component of Anna’s representation. The new queen was celebrated for her perceived Protestantism, and writers hoped that both she and James might reform the English Church. Queenly intercession was seen as a symbolic model for the queen’s political influence, which could be a useful and positive intervention in political affairs. In 1625, images of queenly intercession were problematized by Henrietta Maria’s faith. The prospect of Anglo-French union was not as alarming for many of Charles’ contemporaries as his earlier attempt to woo the Spanish Infanta, which would have resulted in an alliance with the Catholic Hapsburg dynasty persecuting Elizabeth and other Protestants in Europe. Many people were relieved when in 1623 Charles’ negotiations with Spain collapsed. Nevertheless, people were concerned about the consequences of the English King marrying a Catholic. French and English diplomats clashed over the exact
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27 George Marcelline, *Epithalamium gallo-britannicum: or Great-Britaines, Frances and the most part of Europes unspeakable joy, for the most happy union, and blessed contract of the high and mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Wales, and the lady Henrette Maria* (London: for Thomas Archer, 1625), H3.
accommodations that would be made when Henrietta Maria arrived. The marriage contract stipulated that she could hold services at her royal residence, while Charles privately agreed to reduce penal legislation against English Catholics. In this context, motifs of queenly intercession came to be incorporated with broader debates about Charles’ nascent Kingship.

Catholic and Protestant writers used the theme of intercession in similar ways, though for different ends. Both sides of the confessional divide hoped that one member of the royal couple would convert. Before Henrietta Maria departed for England, French writers used the theme of intercession to encourage her to convert Charles to Catholicism. Her mother, Marie de Medici, presented Henrietta Maria with a letter that urged the new queen to behave like a second Esther and secure relief for English Catholics. Additionally, a series of farewell entertainments that were performed for Henrietta Maria compared her with French queen consorts who had converted their husband’s subjects in the past.

Catholic writers in England, too, hoped that the Anglo-French marriage was a positive development. The controversialist John Fisher hoped that Charles’ choice of bride showed secret sympathy with the Catholic faith. Addressing Charles, Fisher suggests that Henrietta Maria’s “rare Excellency” will revive “the sweet Memory of your Right Glorious Grand-mother”, Mary Queen of Scots.

In this context, the Catholic writer Thomas Hawkins produced a new English translation of Nicolas Caussin’s devotional text *The holy court* (1626) to celebrate the marriage. First published in Paris, *The holy court* was dedicated by Caussin to Louis XIII, but Hawkins dedicates the English translation to Henrietta Maria. This piece is divided into five books, the first three of which address theology and the final two of which present narrative histories about pious and sinful courts. The fourth book centres on the history of Mariam, first wife to King Herod, whose story was familiar to English readers thanks to versions of the tale such as Elizabeth Cary’s play *The tragedie of Mariam* (1613), printed late in James’ reign. Mariam, who remained steadfast in her faith despite marrying a heretic King, could be seen as a religious icon. Hawkins states that Henrietta Maria will find characters to
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32 John Fisher, *The answere unto the nine points of controversy* ([Saint-Omer : English College Press], Permissu Superiorum, 1625), *4r*.
emulate in this story, and hopes that she will in turn steer her new subjects towards the Catholic faith – or provide “Matter to imitate” for the English populace.34

By contrast, Protestant writers in England worried about the consequences of a Catholic consort having the monarch’s ear. Sir Robert Phelips expressed concern about the marriage contract in Parliament. “There are visible articles and invisible”, he warned other members of the House of Commons: “those we may see, but these will be kept secret from us”.35 Phelips’ comment was made as part of a broader complaint about the vote of supply. But fears about Henrietta Maria’s influence and her intentions were also widespread. The Justice of the Peace Walter Yonge, who was based in Devon, wrote in his diary that Henrietta Maria had established a Catholic chapel at her royal residence. He noted that “since the Queen came into England the priests do swarm very much in London”, and speculated that this would spread to his own locality as well.36 These two statements were expressed in very different contexts, suggesting the spread of concern about Henrietta Maria for Protestant writers.

In light of these concerns about the Catholic queen, Protestant writers called on her to convert. For the first time at a Stuart succession, in 1625 another woman describes the incoming queen consort. Eleanor Davies’ reference to Henrietta Maria in the prophecy *A warning to the dragon and all his angels* (1625) is, however, curt. Davies mentions the new queen in a quick prayer, but spends the rest of the text making her view of the (feminized) Catholic Church clear: “I hate and despise your Images, Feast dayes, Processions, solemn assemblies, saith the Lord”.37 Most Protestant devotional writing was subtler than Davies’ prophetic pamphlet, but writers were nonetheless explicit about the problems caused by the new queen’s faith. The anonymous Protestant author of *Sacrae heptades, or seaven problems concerning antichrist* (1625), for instance, lambasts Catholicism as a “Magicall Science”.38 He argues that Henrietta Maria will have to convert once she comes to England, and suggests that she should be reminded about her father’s assassination at the hands of Catholic plotters: “his blood is yet too fresh upon their fingers to be hidden from her Majesties eyes”.39

37 Eleanor Davies, *A warning to the dragon and all his angels* ([London: B. Alsop], 1625): Dv1.
38 G.S, *Sacrae heptades, or seaven problems concerning antichrist*, ([Amsterdam:] Printed [by the successors of Giles Thorp], 1625), a2r.
39 Ibid., O02r.
Preachers seem to have bided their time before praising the new queen. Early modern sermons were vehicles for religious instruction and also political commentary, often incorporating current material or responding to recent events. Henrietta Maria’s arrival is discussed in only two printed sermons from this time: both of which had been delivered before she arrived. On one hand, this slim number seems consistent with Anna’s representation in 1603 – Anna was also mentioned in just two. Yet it is more surprising when one considers that sermons occupy a higher percentage of the corpus overall in 1625. Daniel Price’s *A heartie prayer, in a needfull time of trouble* (1625) is useful to tease out some of the issues. Price was a royal chaplain and had been made Dean of Hereford shortly before the accession. His sermon *A heartie prayer* was delivered when James was understood to be sick in March 1625, and was then published in June 1625 after Henrietta Maria arrived. In the preface to the printed text, Price states that he published the sermon to coincide with “this time of our just cause of joy, wherein the Lillies and Roses, the Olive and Vine, are conjoynd”. Price seems to have thought that the sermon contained themes that would be especially useful for Charles as he prepared to greet his new bride.

Price’s sermon starts to build an interesting comparison between Henrietta Maria and her predecessor Anna. The tone is anti-Catholic, which is not surprising for a seventeenth-century sermon, but might seem somewhat incongruous with the dedication to Henrietta Maria. Price worries that “the Land mourneth for the apish Popish Idolatry of many who call upon, not onely imaginary saints, but upon Statues, and pictures, and medalls, and Idolls, creeping to Crosses”. Speaking to Charles I right before he takes the throne, Price hopes that the Prince will reform these tendencies when he becomes King and prevent the threat of idolatry. Price remembers Anna’s behaviour at the Jacobean court. He describes her as:

a Queene not superstitious, not factious, not tyrannous; but religious to her God, and most gracious to all the Subjects of this Land, and her well deserving servants: Not a Lionesse hunting for the prey as Jezabel, or a Tyger greedy of the spoile as Athalia; but
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40 See also John Williams, *Great Britains Salomon. A sermon preached at the magnificent funerall, of the most high and mighty king, James, the late King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c*, (London: John Bill, 1625), G1v. This is a brief reference, made before Henrietta Maria arrived.
42 Ibid., B3v.
Peter McCullough argues that Price’s description of Anna here shows that contemporaries were aware of the former queen’s private Catholicism. To state that the former queen consort was “not superstitious”, McCullough states, presupposes a claim that she was. This might be true, but the sermon’s emphasis on what Anna was not importantly provides an example of queenship for Henrietta Maria. If Anna was “Not a Lionesse hunting for the prey as Jezabel” but “gracious” to her husband’s subjects, Price suggests that the new Catholic consort should also behave in such a way. This could be by abandoning Catholicism, or at least by ensuring that her Catholicism remains private. Though this sermon was delivered long before Henrietta Maria’s arrival, the circumstances of its publication invite comparison between the two “gracious” queens that Price describes. Henrietta Maria, the “Royall Person, and Gracious Queene” that Price praises in the preface, should treat this earlier “sweetly tempered & Royall Lady” as a model. One issue that prevents literary continuity between representations of the first and second Stuart queen consorts, this sermon suggests, is their different faiths.

Tellingly, Price’s sermon utilises the traditional theme of queenly intercession but also adapts this imagery. Price offers advice to Charles I by drawing on the biblical words of Mordecai, the uncle to Esther. Price tells the Prince that “a great and weighty Charge, is ready to fall upon your Princely shoulders […] as Mordecai spake, who knoweth whether you are come to the Kingdome for such a time as this is?” Explicitly, Price’s use of Mordecai’s words suggests that Charles will be able to enact moral reform when he is King. At the same time, in the biblical text Mordecai offers this advice to Esther, before she goes to petition her husband Ahaseurus to save the Jewish people from genocide. By likening himself to Esther’s uncle, Price also implicitly aligns the young King with the biblical queen consort to whom Mordecai delivers his advice. This strategy positions Charles in the established position of a petitioner, which was earlier associated with the queen consort. Price therefore reminds the King of his responsibilities as a custodian of the English people, in terms of their physical and spiritual well-being. When published in June, his sermon might have been seen as a subtle comment to Charles about his
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46 Ibid., E4r.
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perceived duty to petition his wife. Price situates Charles in the position of a queen consort who was about to petition her husband to change his treatment of the Jewish people, and might thereby encourage the new King to petition his wife to change her faith.

The theme of intercession is also reimagined in William Crashaw’s pamphlet *Londons lamentation for her sinnes* (1625), which was printed several months after the accession and reflects on the causes of the plague outbreak. Plague pamphlets were an emergent genre of writing, and a group of similar works were published in 1625. Printed in quarto or octavo, these pamphlets often combine verse with prose, and they question the causes and effects of the plague for different social parties. They are particularly interested in themes of social justice. A Church of England controversialist and father to the future poet and Catholic convert, Richard, Crashaw suggests that the plague was sent by God to punish the English nation. He criticises: "The publicke sinnes of our State, in letting our Lawes bee laid a sleepe against Idolatrie & Superstition, whereby much Popish impietie hath not only beene practised in private, but so publickly professed". In particular, Crashaw is caustic about court entertainments, such as those for Henrietta Maria’s arrival. "When other Churches were fasting and praying," Crashaw laments: “we alas were masking, feasting and playing”.

While Crashaw’s pamphlet points a finger of blame at the court, he also tries to envisage possible ways forward for the King and queen. In a prayer on behalf of the nation, Crashaw hopes that Charles will pray to God for his people’s recovery and for Henrietta Maria’s conversion to Protestantism, which would in turn help the nation’s spiritual security. Crashaw describes the “serious supplications which wee are sure his Majestie daily powres out before thee [God], for her [Henrietta Maria’s] happie and speedie Conversion”. Like Crashaw, who petitions the Lord in a prayer, Charles is here situated as a petitioner before his wife. This image credits Henrietta Maria with considerable authority, and accordingly places some pressure on Charles. Crashaw’s quiet insistence, on what he “is sure” the King does, provides counsel for the monarch and also offers a platform for future criticism if Charles fails to convert his wife. Price’s sermon and Crashaw’s pamphlet show two ways in which writers considered the utility of intercession in 1625, and weighed its possible implications. Rather than repeating earlier ways and means of representing the queen consort, writers considered the implication of specific images
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and ideas within a different political context. The convention of queenly intercession here enables writers to work through the possibilities of Henrietta Maria’s role, and start articulating concerns about the dynamic of Charles’ authority as Head of the English Church.

III: Conclusion

It is important not to overstate the level of public concern about Henrietta Maria’s religion in 1625. While Crashaw appeals for moral reform and places blame on the court, the writers of other plague pamphlets took a very different approach. The anonymous author of *The run-awayes answer, to a booke called, A rodde for runne-awayes* (1625), for example, remembers that before the outbreak “a new King was proclaymed, a James was lost but a Charles was found: a Queene was to come from France, and that Queene arrived in England”. Henrietta Maria’s arrival is here seen to be a happy interlude, before the plague broke. Similarly, the narrator of *The weeping lady* (1625) remembers wistfully: “What musicke made they, when the pride and prime / Of all her Sex (MARIA) in our Land / Made her most wisht Arrivall”. Many people seem to have been genuinely enthusiastic about the new queen’s arrival, and to have enjoyed the kind of pomp and ceremony that was promoted in Butter’s and Haviland’s festival books.

Nonetheless, the texts that greeted Henrietta Maria subtly reorient the images in earlier succession texts about Anna, and thereby also question the fictions that surrounded Charles I’s sovereignty. Beaumont’s masque and Finch’s speech associate the Anglo-French marriage with ambitions for the new reign, and international military intervention. These texts build on some predictable themes for queen consorts, including female fertility, but adapt these images for the context of 1625. Other writers appropriate earlier images of queenly intercession to address the possible consequences of this union. Henrietta Maria is not often directly compared to Anna, but the memory of the former queen consort could enable writers to explore the parameters of her role. There is not, then, a sense of succession between the queen consorts at this moment. There is, rather, a renegotiation of literary images that were associated with the queen consort to reflect on the acceptable co-ordinates of Henrietta Maria’s role as a Catholic queen consort in Stuart England.

52 Anon, *The run-awayes [sic] answer to a booke called, A rodde for runne-awayes* ([London: A. Mathewes], 1625), Br1.
Chapter Three

Queen Catherine in 1662

This chapter analyses how writers responded to Charles II’s marriage to the Portuguese Princess Catherine of Braganza, which was announced less than two weeks after his coronation in 1661. What issues surrounded Charles’s marriage to another foreign Catholic princess, and what were the political implications of this union? How, after years of republican rule, did writers forge an image for the royal consort that could be suited to Restoration monarchy? People were still acclimatising to the return of the monarchy when Catherine arrived in London. The Act of Oblivion placed blame for Charles I’s execution on a small band of reprobates and encouraged people, at least in theory, to forget the past. But many writers and readers were still occupied by the memory of the civil wars and republican government. There were also serious questions about Charles II’s priorities as his new policies took shape. For the writer John Boys, Catherine’s arrival provided an opportunity to look ahead to the future of the Stuart monarchy. “Let the Succession of the Stuarts sayl”, he wrote when the marriage was announced.¹

More than sixty texts were published about Catherine between the announcement of the marriage in May 1661 and her arrival in May 1662, and this spurt of literature was accompanied with a surge of other visual items such as love lockets and commemorative mugs. Many of the writers who greeted Catherine had also welcomed Charles to the country less than two years before, and they represented her arrival as the great culmination of England’s change in circumstance. In some ways, the literature that was published about Catherine is similar to the literature that was published about her predecessors. Panegyric was, once again, the dominant mode. However, more of the texts that were written about Catherine seem to have been printed cheaply for a commercial audience following news about the royal court. I argue here, drawing on a range of printed material from parliamentary speeches announcing the marriage to newsbook reports and poems, that the queen’s representation can be distinguished from her predecessors. I show that Charles and his advisors at once fostered enthusiasm for the marriage and exploited that enthusiasm through the use of print. Three main motifs, fertility, trade and royal restoration, also came to be associated with the queen. These helped writers to move away from earlier representations of royal consorts and build a positive image of the restored monarch.

¹ John Boys, A panegyrick to his sacred majesty upon the conclusion of the auspicious marriage between the two crowns of England and Portugal (London: for Henry Brome), B4v.
They formed an iconography that negotiated the uncertainties of Charles’s early reign, including the political implications of his decision to take Catherine as his wife.

I: Religion

As Chapters 1 and 2 have shown, religion was a defining influence on the early Stuart queens’ representation. Writers were concerned about Henrietta Maria’s Catholicism in 1625, and reframed traditional themes of queenly intercession to express concerns about her influence on Charles. It might have been expected that similar fears would emerge when Charles II married a Catholic as well. The new King had spent more than ten years on the continent, relying upon the aid of Catholic creditors and his unpopular mother. Like the controversial Anglo-French marriage contract, the Anglo-Portuguese marriage agreement provided for Catherine’s right to hold services at a royal chapel. Surprisingly, however, Catherine’s faith attracted little comment. In a speech announcing the marriage to the Houses of Parliament the Lord Chancellor Edward Hyde, future Earl of Clarendon, acknowledged that it would have been preferable for Charles to marry a Protestant. He insisted, though, that the King and “my Lords of the Council are sollicitous enough for the advancement of the Protestant Religion, upon which the welfare of this Kingdom depends”. No Catholic devotional works were addressed to Catherine upon her marriage, and no Protestant authors suggested that she should convert.

While Catherine’s personal faith was not the subject of attack in 1662, her image was incorporated into contemporary debates about the structure of the English Church. Her marriage coincided with parliamentary debates about the Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers, controversial legislation that was designed to exclude dissenters and enforce conformity. The Act of Uniformity stated that all ministers had to swear an Oath of Allegiance to Charles and preach according to a standard Book of Common Prayer. As it was well known that some Protestant denominations, such as Quakerism, did not agree with swearing oaths, the Act was understood to be a purge of some Protestant sects. It started a new period of legislation, which resulted in the expulsion of a large number of the English clergy: a “persecution of Protestants by Protestants without parallel in seventeenth-century Europe”.

2 See Chapter 7 below.
3 Charles II and Edward Hyde, His majesties most gracious speech to the Lords & Commons, together with the Lord Chancellour’s, at the opening of the Parliament, on the 8th day of May, 1661 (London: John Bill and Christopher Barker, 1661), E2.
Charles and his advisors took advantage of Catherine's arrival in order to encourage a sense of popular goodwill towards the monarch. The major public event to celebrate the 1662 wedding was Catherine’s formal entry into London, which was observed on 23 August 1662 with a large barge pageant on the River Thames. The event was co-ordinated to take place the day before the deadline for ministers to swear the Oath of Allegiance, and therefore provided something of a distraction from the controversial changes. Charles took this opportunity to issue a Royal Proclamation:

We do willingly lay hold of this time and occasion of publick Joy for the first coming of Our dear Consort the QUEEN to Our Royal Palace at Westminster, to Declare this Our Royal Pleasure unto you, That you cause all such of the said persons [Quakers] in Our Gaols for London and Middlesex, who have not been Indicted for refusing the Oath of Allegiance, nor shall appear to you to have been Ringleaders or Preachers at their Assemblies, to be enlarged.

The King seems to offer an olive branch of goodwill to religious dissenters in this Proclamation, inspired by public support for Catherine. Notably, though, Charles is careful to distinguish between dangerous “Ringleaders” and people willing to swear the Oath. The King thus represents himself as a moderate, but nevertheless sets firm limits for his mercy.

When Catherine proceeded up the River Thames she was entertained with a series of dramatic pageants authored by the dramatist John Tatham, who had already written a number of City pageants in the late 1650s and a couple of earlier texts celebrating Charles’s accession. A licensed transcript of the entertainments was published in the pamphlet *Aqua triumphalis* (1662), which Tatham dedicated to the Lord Mayor. The pageants comprise panegyric speeches and dramatic sketches. In the third entertainment, a representative of Thetis, goddess of the seas and the rivers, arrives in a chariot drawn by two dolphins. Thetis celebrates Catherine’s arrival, but suggests that the nympha preparing for the queen consort’s landing were surprised by a “sudden sound”:

(As though th’imprison’d Winds had broke the Ground)

[It] Surpriz’d our Joyes, we guest not what it meant,

Till seconded by the Upper Element.

At which the Voyce of Syrens became loud,
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6 Charles II, *Right trusty and well beloved, and trusty and well beloved* (London: James Flesher, 1662).
Though soft before; the humbl’d Waves grow proud
To caper into some seditious trick,
And Prey upon the Body Politick.  

A storm in the natural elements here becomes synonymous with a possible political risk to Charles II. Thetis’ description of the unruly winds and waves is connected with the sirens, whose seductive voices were said to have lured Odysseus. Although Thetis does not explicitly yoke these elements to religious dissent, there is a concern with order that seems pertinent in light of the performance date. Significantly, Thetis closes with a prayer that Charles II and Catherine will “out-live the Malice of Your Foes, / While they, subjected to Your Justice, Cloze”. Thetis’ prayer implicitly justifies firm action against those who dissent from Charles’s commands, all of whom are depicted as troublemakers. The entertainments thus supplement the focus on loyalty that is present in Charles’s Proclamation.

Given that a prayer for Catherine was included in the Book of Common Prayer that English ministers would soon have to adhere to, the motif of praying seems to have taken on fresh resonance. This influenced the common trope of praying for the queen’s fertility. For the poet Lancelot Reynolds, nephew of the Bishop of Norwich, praying for Catherine’s health provided a chance to encourage unity within the Church. Reynolds published a number of poems in the early 1660s, many of which were dedicated to members of the Church who supported moderate Presbyterianism. “I do wish, and pray, for Grand King Charls’s Queen,” Reynolds writes in *A panegyric on her most excellent majestie, Katherine Queen of England, Scotland, France and Ireland* (1662): “As much as Tongue can speak, and heart think on: / Ile wish and pray, for great King Charls’s Son”. As in 1603, when Catholic writers prayed for James and Anna to showcase their loyalty, Reynolds prays for Catherine in order to show his commitment not only to Charles but the Stuart monarchy more generally. A cluster of Anglican writers was less accommodating than Reynolds. In the sermon *Sionis reductio, & exultatio* (1662), Robert Le
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Grosse celebrates Catherine’s arrival and compares dissenters with republicans. It is, he states, “lawful to wish them hang’d”.\(^{12}\)

How did emphasis on loyalty to the monarchy and church affect poetic motifs for the Catholic queen? In the months after Charles’ marriage was announced, the Magdalen College scholar John Drope authored the panegyric *An hymenaean essay* (1662). A relative of the antiquarian Anthony Wood by marriage, and his drinking companion, Drope had been ejected from the University in the 1650s but was reinstated upon the Restoration. He gave personal copies of *An hymenaean essay* to friends such as Wood.\(^{13}\) The poem is structured as a dialogue between Hymen, god of marriage, and Venus, goddess of love. At the beginning, Hymen attempts to convince Venus that Charles II should get married. Venus tells Hymen that she is nervous about letting Catherine come to England, in case her arrival gives “misprising Presbyters alarm”.\(^{14}\) Implicit in this statement is a concern about Catherine’s Catholicism, which might raise tension in an already fragile environment. Hymen responds by concentrating not on the queen consort’s faith, but on her imagined opponents. He promises that Charles II will deal with non-conformists, who “Obstruct Church-paths, and cross the King’s high way”. Then, Hymen states: “when husht is all their Noise; / Shall Charls ly quiet with his happy Choise.”\(^{15}\)

In light of the emphasis on loyalty in Drope’s poem, it is again significant that *An hymenean essay* concludes with a prayer for the new queen consort. The poem concludes when Drope’s speaker awakes and it transpires that the conversation between Hymen and Venus, preparing for Catherine’s arrival, has been but a dream. The speaker prays for the incoming queen consort:

That (if not peerless) she may be no other
Then was, for Wife and Queen, his pious Mother.
May shee have what’s the Queens; he what’s the Kings;
Enjoy all Honours, but of Sufferings.
Whilst we are blest by both: And every Summer
Enlarge our Wellcomes to a Royall Comer.\(^{16}\)


\(^{14}\) John Drope, *An hymenaean essay, or an epithalamy, upon the royall match of his most excellent majesty Charles the Second, with the most illustrious Katharine, infanta of Portugall* (1662), A3v.

\(^{15}\) Ibid.: B1v.

\(^{16}\) Ibid.: B2v.
This rare comparison between Catherine and her predecessor goes some way towards rehabilitating Henrietta Maria’s image, as Drope suggests that she would be a positive model for Catherine and praises her “pious” ways. At the same time, it seems instructive that Drope does not try to create continuity between these women, but rather hopes that people will have learned from the ways in which Henrietta Maria was treated in the past. By suggesting that Henrietta Maria had been persecuted with “Sufferings”, a common theme in poems about the Queen Mother, Drope’s speaker opens a parallel between republicans who criticised the early Stuarts and religious dissenters. Like Le Grosse, Drope’s speaker implies that Protestant non-conformists pose a greater threat to national security than the Catholic queen consort. The poem celebrates the royal marriage, but by doing so seeks to emphasise Charles’s dominance as the head of one – indivisible – English Church.

II: International alliance and trade

What were the perceptions of the Anglo-Portuguese alliance, and how did writers explain Charles’ choice of bride? The marriage was not “an excellent one by any reckoning”. Portugal was vulnerable in the early 1660s, as Catherine’s father, King John IV of Portugal, had died in 1656. His death meant that Portugal was being ruled by Catherine’s mother on behalf of her brother, the physically and mentally incapacitated King Alfonso IV. Taking advantage of this perceived weakness, Spanish forces were renewing aggression against their former territory Portugal, which had gained independence in 1640. The Spanish ambassador in England, Baron de Batteville, warned English politicians that an Anglo-Portuguese alliance would involve England in imminent war and damage trade. Portuguese negotiators, on the other hand, promised Charles II an alluring dowry of £300,000 and offered to cede key global trading ports such as Bombay and Tangiers. The Braganza Match therefore committed Charles to provide Portugal with military assistance in the event of a Spanish invasion that was already
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underway – but it also provided unique advantages for English trade. I examine here how the architects of the Braganza Match used print to steer public opinion, and analyse the use of their preferred motifs across popular print.

The Portuguese negotiated hard for Charles’s hand, and by extension the prospect of military support and more security. Catherine’s betrothal was celebrated with a week of celebrations in Lisbon, which started with a Te Deum at the Royal Chapel and also included three days of bullfights and fireworks. These events were followed by more elaborate pageants before Catherine’s departure in 1662. The English ambassador to Portugal, Edward Montagu, Earl of Sandwich, made a formal entry to Lisbon on 13 March, two weeks after he had arrived to start collecting Catherine’s dowry. On 23 April, St George’s Day, Catherine processed through Lisbon to the English ships. This was a symbolic occasion, as St George was the patron saint of both England and Portugal. When Catherine embarked on the English fleet there was an elaborate fireworks display over the waters. As Lorraine Madway shows, these Portuguese entertainments combined secular and sacred festivities. The court’s celebrations “reinforced the importance of the Anglo-Portuguese alliance”, as well as “the wealth and effort it was prepared to expend” to achieve it. Through these depictions, writers were able to bolster Portugal’s imperial pride when they were also threatened by Spain.

Responses to the betrothal in England were more ambivalent. Announcing his marriage in Parliament, Charles II made an unusual apology. “If I should never marry till I could make such a Choice, against which there could be no foresight of any inconvenience that may issue,” Charles stated: “you would live to see Me an old Batchelor, which I think you do not desire to do”. After the king’s speech, Hyde explained the marriage negotiations in more depth. Hyde assured the members of Parliament that the Privy Council approved Charles’s decision, and had “no minde to encourage the King to a War, we have had War enough”. He stated that Charles had also been worried about the prospect of military conflict, but that the Privy Council convinced him to go ahead. They reminded him, Hyde claimed, “how heart-breaking a thing it would be to his people to lose the possession of so great a
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trade”.24 Through these speeches Charles and Hyde framed the marriage as a collective decision, which was made for the greater economic good of the English public. Soon after the speeches were delivered, the King’s Printers John Bill and Christopher Barker published copies. The Speaker of the House of Commons’ formal reply was also separately published.25 The fact that Hyde played down the risk of war, of course, suggests that it was seen to be a worrying threat.

The weekly newsbooks were quick to pick up on the themes in Hyde’s speech. It is worth touching on the history of this mode of writing, as unlicensed newsbooks had proliferated during the civil wars.26 Once the Protectorate was established, it permitted the publication of a weekly domestic newsbook that gave readers a screened update of political affairs. Although domestic newsbooks had been banned under the early Stuarts, Charles II agreed that two weekly newsbooks could circulate in the 1660s. These newsbooks were effectively organs of the government, including stories about domestic events and international affairs.27 The newsbook Mercurius Publicus reports on 16 May 1661 that the English public were “the most happy People in the world, to have a Queen chosen by the mature advice of His Majesty, and his Whole Council, unanimously desired by both Houses of Parliament”.28 This description mirrors Hyde’s description of Charles’s marriage as a collective decision. Through printed sources such as these, Charles and his advisors sought to represent the marriage as beneficial.

Contemporary historians also had their eyes on the themes that the King was using. James Howell, the long-standing Stuart publicist and future Historiographer Royal, produced A brief account of the royal matches or matrimonial alliances (1662) when he was bidding to be Catherine’s language tutor.29 This pamphlet provides a table of all English royal weddings, from King Ethelwop to Charles II. As there is no precedent for a marriage between an English monarch and Portuguese princess, Howell compares Catherine with Philippa, daughter of John of Gaunt, who married King John I of Portugal in 1376. “By the former Alliance it may be said that Portugal married with England”, Howell writes: “by this England hath married with Portugal. And as the former was the fortunatest Alliance that Portugal

24 Ibid, F1r.
28 Mercurius Publicus 20 (16 May-23 May, 1661): Rr3r.
ever made by their own confession to this day; so might this prove to *England*.

Other historians also deployed the comparison between Catherine and Philippa at this moment, although Philippa had not been mentioned at the previous successions and would not be compared with other queen consorts in years to come. By comparing Catherine with Philippa and giving the Anglo-Portuguese alliance a pre-history, Howell seeks to make the union more attractive. His effort registers some awareness that the Braganza dynasty was vulnerable – and attempts to compensate.

In the months after the marriage was announced, five further histories of Portugal were published. These texts seem to have been designed to capitalise on public interest in Catherine’s native country, but the historians are also at pains to explain the nature of the 1640 Portuguese revolution, and with it the context of Portuguese and Spanish antipathy. Raphe Whitfeld, a law student, drew on Portuguese succession law to prove that the Braganza dynasty had a greater claim to the Portuguese throne than their Spanish antagonists. The popular historian John Dauncey also wrote a full account of the 1640 revolution. Dauncey published several histories in the early 1660s, which were dedicated to different court figures and seem to have been commercial projects. Here, he criticises Spanish claims that the revolution was a rebellion. Only “ignorance or self-will would make [John IV] deficient, terming a noble Redemption of a Nations Liberty, black and ignominious Rebellion”, Dauncey writes. He states that the 1640 Revolution “doth so aptly quadrate with our’s a[t] the blessed return of our Gracious Soveraign King Charles”. Dauncey’s terminology associates the rebellion that brought Catherine’s father to power with the Restoration that brought Charles II to power, and thereby creates a more palatable narrative for the looming war with Spain.

If these writers followed Hyde by compensating for Portugal’s military weaknesses, other writers followed him by emphasising the economic advantages to this union. Catherine’s dowry provided needed capital for the English economy, when Charles was more than £50,000 in debt. He
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30 James Howell, *A brief account of the royal matches or matrimonial alliances vvhich the kings of England have made from time to time since the year 800 to this present 1662* (London: by J.G. for H. Brome, 1662): A4v.
33 See for example John Dauncey, *The history of the thrice illustrious princess Henrietta Maria de Bourbon, Queen of England* (London by E.C. for Philip Chetwind, 1660).
started spending it through a system of ‘tallies’ before she had even landed.35 James Heath discusses Catherine’s dowry in The glories and magnificent triumphs of the blessed restitution of his sacred majesty K. Charles II (1660). “That which is the most eminently great, and gives the matchlesse Honour to this Marriage”, Heath writes: “is the great accession that is made to the Crown of England in point of Trade and Commerce, besides the Treasure and Territory we possesse as this Ladies Portion”. He continues to explain that jurisdiction over Tangiers, “the chiefest place of Importance”, would permit merchants to set levies on incoming ships, as the King of Denmark could place levies on the Levant.36 Little wonder that the Venetian ambassador claimed that Charles was bought, for “the gold of Portugal has had such power at this Court”. 37

This emphasis on trade moved away from the themes and images that had been associated with the earlier Stuart queens, creating a new kind of vocabulary for Catherine. Preparing to welcome Catherine to England, the French Huguenot emigré and long-standing supporter of Charles II, Pierre de Cardonnel, produced a volume entitled Complementum fortunatarum insularum (1662). De Cardonnel presented this illustrated text to Catherine upon her landing.38 In the poem ‘Hymenaei Praeludium’, a sea nymph named Galatea imagines foreign ports vying for Charles’s favour. She states that ports such as Tangier will be made envious by Charles II’s possession of other ports as well: “Africa of th’Asiatick soyl / Grown rival by Your Princely smiles, / Will strive to send You richer spoyl, / And sweeter Spices than the Eastern Isles”.39 Indian trading ports such as Bombay, meanwhile, are seen to solicit Charles’s protection from the aggression of Dutch merchants. “Goa and Calecut His Cross shall bear,” the speaker states, “And the Dutch Lions claw no longer fear”.40

Similar images proliferate across popular culture. Whereas Anna and Henrietta Maria were both compared with biblical queen consorts such as Esther, writers instead compared Catherine with

35 Details of these transactions can be found in the Calendar of State Papers. I am grateful to Andrew Barclay, for our discussions of Catherine’s treasurer and the tally system.
36 James Heath, The glories and magnificent triumphs of the blessed restitution of his sacred majesty K. Charles II. from his arrival in Holland 1659/60 till this present (London: printed and to be sold by N.G. R.H. and O.T., 1662), R7v.
40 Ibid., B2r.
the Queen of Sheba: the rich visitor of King Solomon, who came bearing wealth and spices in her train. Both of the ballads that were published about Catherine’s arrival focus on the straitened circumstances at Charles’s court. Now that the queen was on her way, celebrates the author of the ballad *The cavaliers comfort, or long lookt for will come at last* (1662): “Cavaliers may all be paid”. Like all ballads, this piece was designed to be sung and circulated orally. The fact that these texts celebrate Catherine’s wealth suggests that the theme was well established. Charles’s advisors successfully used the queen’s arrival to promote England’s intended role as a trading empire. This was achieved through a focus on Catherine’s dowry. Such representations equate the new queen with specific resources, and suggest that she too is a resource the English will appropriate.

III: Restoration and the English nation

We have seen that the 1662 marriage was a divisive foreign policy decision, which was justified on the grounds of future trade. How could poets turn the mercantile facts of this marriage into a positive romantic myth? As had been the case for both the earlier Stuart successions, the most common genre for representing the new queen in 1662 was panegyric. The University of Oxford and University of Cambridge each produced a volume of poems, which contained 121 and 76 poems respectively. In addition, twenty-two new panegyrics were published to celebrate Catherine’s engagement and later arrival, some of which went through multiple editions. These poems range in format from single sheets to lengthy folios, but are remarkably consistent in theme and imagery. Poets consulted each other’s works and newsbook reports when writing their texts. I suggest here that writers returned to the theme

41 Henry Bold, *Anniversary to the kings most excellent majesty, Charles the II. on his birth-&-restauration-day, May 29, having resolv’d to marry with the infanta of Portugall, May the 8th, 1661* (London: Henry Brome, 1661); John Bodington, *The mystical Solomons coronation and espousals* (London: for William Grantham, 1662).

42 Anon, *The cavaliers comfort, or long lookt for will come at last* (London: William Gilbertson, 1661/2). See also Anon, *Here is some comfort for Poor Cavaleeres* (London: for Francis Grove, 1661).


45 Samuel Holland appears to have been familiar with the broadside *An exact and true relation of the landing of her majestie at Portsmouth* (1662), for example, when he compiled *The phenix her arrival & welcome to England* (1662). His piece borders on what we would now consider plagiarism, taking the majority of lines from the earlier work and occasionally changing their order or adding new paragraphs. See *An exact and true relation
of restoration to describe Catherine, and thereby used the royal marriage as a symbol of harmony in the uncertain years of Charles’ early reign.

More than half of the panegyrist who celebrated Catherine’s arrival had also written poems to celebrate the Restoration, in which the association between the 1660 succession and the theme of restoration had come to be entrenched. For writers to return to this imagery in 1662 helped to create a sense of closure. One J. L celebrates that “Confusion, with Grey Winter’s Snow dissolv’d” now that Catherine has arrived. He states that “A happy May, great Neptune now must bring / A glorious tribute to the Oceans King”.46 The new queen’s arrival, which fortuitously took place in spring, is seen to initiate a new period of rebirth for the country. Like his father and grandfather, Charles is compared with Neptune, the “Oceans King”. This imagery creates a sense of the King’s authority, both through his dynastic lineage and perhaps also through his growing influence over the seas with England’s new trading ports.

The former news-writer turned royal panegyrist, John Crouch, uses the theme of restoration to address international politics in his lengthy poem Flowers strowed by the muses (1662).47 Crouch dedicated the poem to the Marquis of Dorchester, a member of Charles’s Privy Council, although it seems unlikely that Dorchester actually sponsored the work. Throughout Flowers strowed by the muses, Crouch attempts to process the language put forward by the court. Andrew McRae has recently argued that the genre of Stuart panegyric was sensitive to debates about political agency. McRae suggests that “poets take an opportunity to reflect not only upon the arrival of their new monarch(s), but upon the nature of their own art, and in turn the dimensions of political speech”.48 This project can also be seen in Flowers strowed by the muses. “Dull Ignorance” might be surprised by Charles’s choice of bride, Crouch writes: “But Kings sit in a higher Orbe, and so / Discover Stars, not seen by us below”.49 Over the course of Flowers strowed by the muses Crouch works hard to transform the Anglo-Portuguese alliance into a positive romanticised story that will support Charles’s Kingship.

_of the landing of her majestie at Portsmouth, after many high tempests, and a long distresse at sea (London: printed for C. Wildebergh and John Ruddiari, 1662).


49 John Crouch, Flowers strowed by the muses, against the coming of the most illustrious infanta of Portugal Catharina Queen of England (London: printed for Francis Kirkman and Henry Marsh, 1662), A3a.
Throughout his works of this period, and indeed *Flowers strowed by the muses*, Crouch’s tone is often pugnacious, but he represents Charles’s decision to marry Catherine as a benevolent gesture by the English king. Crouch’s speaker warns Spain:

Conclude how little *England* is afraid,
Whose King has wooed a *persecuted* Maid:
A Phænix destin’d for the *Eagles* prey,
But by the care of Providence snatch’d away:
He, whom Heaven rescued with so strong a hand

*Owed* Protection to some tottering Land.\(^{50}\)

Catherine’s personal image is here inter-changeable with the “tottering Land” from whence she came. The passage suggests that Charles will be able to achieve a providential delivery for Portugal, which enhances his own imagined strength rather than that of the Portuguese, who remain vulnerable at the close. This representation of the courtship depicts Portugal and its Princess as the grateful recipients of aid. By suggesting that Charles has successfully overcome his problems, with providential aid, and can now impart help to others also provides a sense of security within the English polity. The English nation is seen to be stronger than the more vulnerable Portuguese, providing a comforting image of the nation’s security and prestige compared with European neighbours.

The most sophisticated use of the restoration imagery comes in Katherine Philips’ poem *To the Queens majesty on her happy arrival* (1662). Philips was principally a manuscript poet who avoided print publication.\(^{51}\) She seems to have written *To the Queens majesty* from her base in Wales, in the hope that her friend Charles Cotterell, Charles’s Master of Ceremonies, would present it to Catherine in person. But despite Philips’ probable intentions, this panegyric entered print. As discussed by Elizabeth Hageman, Henry Herringman published a copy without Philips’ assent.\(^{52}\) Timothy Garthwait published a further printed edition of the same poem, not identified by Hageman, which survives in the Bodleian

\(^{50}\) Ibid., B3′.


Garthwait’s edition does not contain the typographical errors in Herringman’s piece, and is closer to the edition of *To the queens majesty* that was later published under Philips’ name in her collected poems of 1664.54

Unlike Crouch’s poem, Philips’ speaker addresses Catherine directly. The panegyric opens with a description of Catherine’s arrival, which had been delayed by bad weather until the spring. “Now that the Winds & Sea so kind are grown”, Philips’ speaker states: “your glad Subjects with impatience throng / To see a Blessing they have begg’d so long”. This opening motif uses seasonal metaphors of a new spring that were common to the epithalamium genre, but also implies the growth of calm and stability after Charles’s return. Catherine’s arrival is represented as almost a second Restoration:

Hail Royal Beauty! Virgin bright and great,
Who do our hopes secure, and joys compleat.
We cannot reckon what to You we owe,
Who make Him happy who makes us be so;
We did enjoy but half our King before,
You us our Prince, and Him his peace restore.55

The collective address to Catherine bespeaks a sense of gratitude to the queen, rather than Portuguese gratitude to the English as in Crouch’s panegyric. Zeugma emphasises the personal dimension of the royal couple’s relationship, along with Charles’s connection to the populace. Catherine therefore becomes an integral part of the nation. Not only does the queen’s arrival reflect on England’s stability, but her landing helps to achieve it.

If the royal marriage is a model for harmony in the domestic political setting, the personal peace that Charles gains from his marriage provides a skilful contrast with the implicit threat of international conflict. In the second half of the poem Philips’ speaker turns to the prospect of war. “Never was Spain so generously defi’d”, the speaker notes:

Where they design’d a Prey, He courts a Bride.
Hence they may guess what will his Anger prove,
When He appear’d so brave in making Love;
And be more wise then to provoke his Arms,

---

53 To the queens majesty, on her happy arrival. By a lady (London: Timothy Garthwait, 1662).
55 All citations are from Garthwait’s version of the poem, a broadside.
Who can submit to nothing but your Charms.

These balanced couplets pair active verbs with nouns that were associated with romance. The risk of one party being “def’d” is offset by the arrival of a new “Bride”, while the violence of “Arms” is palliated by Catherine’s “Charms”. Even as the Anglo-Portuguese partnership creates a sense of uncertainty, Philips imagines a harmony between Charles and Catherine that can act as a stabilising force. In the closing lines, Philips’ speaker looks forward to the birth of future heirs and thereby uses a conventional conceit of praising a queen consort’s prospective fertility. Her speaker hopes that Catherine and Charles II will produce “Such Hero’s” that “even they [the Spanish] / Without regret or blushes shall obey”. To conclude this poem with a predictable topos provides a sense of security to the piece: Philips’ poem follows a pre-established pattern, in which the royal marriage creates a sense of harmony and security.

IV: Conclusion

As the Anglo-Portuguese marriage occurred in close proximity to the Restoration, literature about the new consort enabled people to reflect on Charles II’s choices soon after he had taken the throne. The union was a significant foreign policy decision, which increased England’s trade potential but also risked international conflict. Charles and his advisors used print to promote specific images of the marriage that centred on wealth and trade. They also sought to exploit public optimism about Catherine’s arrival to distract people from concerns about new legislation that would discriminate against Protestant non-conformists. Unlike in 1625, the queen consort’s faith was not an integral aspect of her representation. There is little mention in these texts of Catherine’s Catholicism, and traditional themes such as queenly intercession are absent.

The legacy of the earlier Stuart consorts informed Catherine’s representation, as writers moved away from themes and images that had been associated with them in the past. The only explicit comparison between Catherine and Henrietta Maria, by John Drope, gives a short and sanitised description of the former queen. Instead, Catherine was described with new historical and biblical allusions, as well as metaphors that emphasised her wealth. Panegyrist also crafted romantic fictions that depicted the Restoration as a new starting point. In Philips’ skilful panegyric, the theme of restoration helps to offset the risks of international conflict caused by the Anglo-Portuguese alliance. It also helps to forge a cohesive narrative about Charles’ power. As a whole, the corpus shows that the queen’s representation continued to be an important aspect of royal iconography. But writers after 1660
relied on a much narrower set of images to describe the queen, all of which were connected with ideas and ideals for Charles’ early reign. There is less of a sense of trying to script a role for the queen at this moment, then. Writers forged her image as part of a broader project, and the demands of representing the restored king.
Chapter Four

Queen Mary Beatrice in 1685

When Mary Beatrice was crowned alongside her husband on St George’s Day 1685, the new royal consort observed the same faith as her husband for the first time in the Stuart period. However, to the alarm of many of her new subjects, both the new king and queen were Catholic. What themes and images could be used to promote the Catholic queen, at a time when people were uncertain about the politics of a Catholic king? How did Mary Beatrice’s representation build on or depart from the representation of earlier Catholic queen consorts, or for that matter Anna? Kevin Sharpe notes that images of James’ marriage helped to provide a sense of stability in the months after the accession: “as in the reign of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, the apparently happy royal marriage lent support to a representation of the larger marriage between the king and realm”.¹ But as in 1625, when Henrietta Maria’s arrival prompted people to ask difficult questions about the future of Charles I’s reign, Mary Beatrice’s presence raised concerns about the future of the Stuart dynasty and the nature of loyalty to the monarch.

A large amount of literature was published to celebrate the new reign. From libertine playwrights such as Aphra Behn to clerics like Edmund Arwaker, a variety of writers put their pens to paper in support of the regime. For his part, James vowed to protect the rights and liberties of the English Church. Nevertheless, many people were suspicious of the Catholic monarch and anti-Catholic sentiment had been growing in the years before Charles’ death, culminating with attempts in Parliament to exclude James from the throne, discussed in more detail below. The diarist Roger Morrice thought that James’ rule continued to be divisive. “Above one halfe of the Nobility made excuses for one reason or another and were absent” from the 1685 coronation, Morrice wrote in his entry book, highlighting also the scarcity of women in Mary Beatrice’s train.² I begin by examining the representation of Mary Beatrice in the major public event for the reign, the 1685 coronation, through which James and his advisors set out effectively a template for writing about the queen. I then analyse two main motifs that evolved in print, queenly fertility and beauty, suggesting that writers developed the latter theme especially in response to wide concerns about the queen consort’s fertility and the prospect of future Catholic heirs.

I: The 1685 Coronation

The first major public event of the new reign was the coronation of 23 April 1685, St George’s Day.3 Whereas Mary Beatrice’s predecessors had arrived in close proximity to their husbands’ accession, she had lived in England for twelve years as Duchess of York.4 In the weeks after the accession, Mary Beatrice seems to have made a positive first impression as queen.5 John Evelyn accompanied other public figures to pay James and Mary Beatrice formal respects after Charles’ death. He wrote in his diary that Mary Beatrice received him “in bed in her apartment”, adding approvingly: “She put forth her hand, seeming to be much afflicted, as I believe she was, having deported herself so decently on all occasions since she came into England, which made her universally beloved.”6 The coronation, a large public event also reported in print, cemented James’ transition from duke to king and Mary Beatrice’s transition from duchess to queen. It was an opportunity to establish some of the key themes of their royal iconography.

The coronation was carefully structured to parallel the earlier Stuart reigns. There were some new innovations in the service, to accommodate the Catholic monarchs. James and Mary Beatrice did not, for example, have to take the Sacrament.7 But there were also deliberate parallels with the services that had come before. The coronation took place on the same day as Charles II’s coronation twenty-five years earlier. This gestured towards James’ patriotism, as it was the day of England’s patron saint, but also reiterated his dynastic heritage. The fact that Mary Beatrice was anointed and crowned alongside James also facilitated this project. Her involvement departed from the precedent that was set by the two earlier successions, when Henrietta Maria refused to participate in the 1626 coronation and Catherine arrived too late to be crowned alongside Charles II. But it harkened back to Anna’s participation in the first Stuart coronation of 1603. Mary Beatrice’s role thereby emphasised again the importance of James’ dynastic heritage, and crucially focused attention on the dynasty that he was still hoping to found. The

---

4 One history of Mary Beatrice’s native country, The history of the house of Esté (London: by J. Macock for Rich, Chiswell, 1681), was advertised again in 1685. But there was not a new edition of this text in 1685, making it likely that the publisher was attempting to shift leftover stock.
7 Sharpe, Rebranding Rule, 253.
anthem that was sung when Mary Beatrice was enthroned, written by Henry Purcell, combines Psalms 45 and 147, concentrates on queenly fertility. It starts with the prayer “In stead of thy Fathers, thou shalt have Children, whom Thou mayst make Princes in all Lands”. As Sandra Jean Sullivan points out, these lines are applicable to Mary Beatrice’s experience as an émigré from Italy who was now expected to bear an heir to the English throne.

The coronation involved a short procession to Westminster Abbey as well as the religious service. These events were then followed the next day by a large fireworks display by the river Thames, which was attended by hundreds of spectators. James and his advisors used print to shape ideas about the ceremony before and after it had taken place. Prior to the event, the queen’s role was discussed in a series of printed texts that were co-ordinated by Henry Howard, the Earl Marshal and Duke of Norfolk, who had responsibility for organising the coronation. In a set of Orders for the coronation, Norfolk instructs people how to behave and attends to the specific regulations for women in Mary Beatrice’s train. The Duke of Norfolk’s order about the habit the ladies are to be in that attend the queen at her coronation (1685) explains that the women accompanying Mary Beatrice should wear the same basic habit, which should then have specific variations for social status. Thus countesses, viscountesses and duchesses wore the same dress, but their trains were of differing lengths and they had varied inches of ermine on their cape. Unlike earlier queen consorts, who were crowned wearing white, Mary Beatrice was to be clothed in gold.

After the event, James sponsored printed accounts of the day. He commissioned an illustrated account from Francis Sandford, the Herald of Lancaster who had previously published a genealogy of Portugal to celebrate Catherine’s arrival. The history of the coronation of the most high, most mighty, and most excellent monarch, James II (1687) turned out to be an expensive folio, which took two years to complete and was published shortly before James’ overthrow. In addition to Sandford’s expansive account, Howard created a broadside description of the coronation that discusses the procession to the Cathedral in brief. The account discusses the events of the day and suggests that all went smoothly: “the

---

8 Francis Sandford, The history of the coronation of the most high, most mighty, and most excellent monarch, James II (The Savoy: by Thomas Newcomb, 1687), Bb1v.
10 R Lowman, An exact narrative and description of the wonderful and stupendious fire-works in honour of their majesties coronations (London: Printed by N. Thompson, 1685).
11 Earl Marshal, Duke of Norfolk, The Duke of Norfolk’s order about the habit the ladies are to be in that attend the queen at her coronation (London: Nathaniel Thompson, 1685).
Solemnity being performed to the great satisfaction of their Majesties, with all imaginable splendour and Expressions of Joy”. Howard again focuses on Mary Beatrice’s attire by describing the “Rich Circle of Gold on her Head”. This piece received a wide circulation in print. The initial broadside was reprinted verbatim in the newsbook The London Gazette. The King’s Printers in Edinburgh then printed another edition in Scotland. These official accounts of the coronation, along with the orders that circulated before it, suggest that the court was carefully monitoring how the event would be represented.

The official accounts of the coronation could be imaginatively recreated. The most interesting reincarnation, A description of the ceremonial proceedings at the coronation (1685), comprises a compressed version of Howard’s prose account, a large illustration of the royal procession, and a short poem entitled ‘The Royal Transit’. The poem describes Mary Beatrice’s journey to the cathedral. Throughout, the speaker attends to the ways in which specific terms or forms of description should be used. The speaker claims that Mary Beatrice unleashes a “Tropick of Hyperbole” when she leaves St. James’s Palace. He imagines classical goddesses watching Mary Beatrice:

Bright Cynthia did the Triumph Bless,
And prais’d her [Mary Beatrice] by Periphrasis:
Exhorting all her neighbour Stars
Not to molest her Reign with Jarrs”.

Both hyperbole and periphrasis are specific literary techniques. The contemporary lexographer Edward Phillips describes periphrasis as “circumlogution, or expressing a thing by many words”. Cynthia’s “periphrasis” creates a positive image for Mary Beatrice by encouraging people to enthuse about her at length. At the same time, this voluminous praise masks a thinly veiled instruction. The term “Jarrs” refers to a harsh or disharmonious sound. In this context, it implies dissent or criticism of the new queen. Cynthia’s request for people “not to molest her Reign with Jarrs”, in non-periphrastic terms, is a simple command for witnesses to obey Mary Beatrice.

12 Earl Marshal, Norfolk, An account of the ceremonial at the coronation of their most excellent majesties, King James II and Queen Mary (London: Thomas Newcomb, 1685), 1.
13 Whitehall, April 23 this day being the festival of St. George, the coronation of their sacred majesties King James the Second and Queen Mary was performed at Westminster in manner following (Edinburgh: by the heir of Andrew Anderson, 1685). See The London Gazette, 2028 (April 23-27).
14 Anon, A description of the ceremonial proceedings at the coronation of their most illustrious, serene, and sacred majesties, King James II and his royal consort Queen Mary (London: George Croom, 1685), 1.
15 Edward Phillips, The new world of words (London: by W.R for Obadiah Blagrave, 1678), Gg3*.
The coronation was therefore an opportunity to establish some main themes in Mary Beatrice’s representation, and to highlight her importance to James’ dynastic representation. But *A description of the ceremonial proceedings at the coronation* evinces a concern with order and loyalty that in turn bespeaks a broader concern about the level of support for James’s regime. Similarly, the four ballads that describe Mary Beatrice balance compliments for the royal couple with criticism of their detractors. “God bless our gracious King and Queen”, states the author of *Brittains triumph*: “and let all Traytors dye”. By writing statements that assert loyalty and challenge the monarch’s opponents, these authors encourage others to do the same. The codes for representing the queen consort are therefore connected with bigger questions about stability in the first months of James’ reign.

II: Queenly Fertility and Piety

The previous chapters have shown that images of the royal consort’s fertility could be used to bolster specific visions of the English nation or English Church. In 1685, motifs of fertility were more problematic. James’ anticipated successors were his two Protestant daughters by his first marriage, Princess Mary and Princess Anne, both of whom were married to Protestant Princes from northern Europe. The Book of Common Prayer praised the whole royal family: “our gracious Queen Mary, Catherine the Queen Dowager, their Royal Highnesses Mary Princess of Orange, and the Princess Anne of Denmark”. A prayer for James was therefore also a prayer for his Protestant heirs. If Mary Beatrice were to bear a son, he would supplant Mary and Anne in the line of succession. People would then face the prospect of a Catholic Stuart dynasty for years to come. How did Catholic and Protestant writers frame the queen’s prospective fertility, and how far could it be seen as a unifying symbol for the nation? I examine here the uses of queenly fertility in a range of devotional writing, from sermons to theological treatises.

In the weeks and months after the 1685 succession, Mary Beatrice appears in far more sermons and devotional tracts than the earlier royal consorts. This surge was in part inspired by her husband’s actions. Although James promised that he would not try to convert his subjects, once he had come to

---

16 *Anon.* *Brittains triumph in the coronation of their most sacred majesties, who were crowned with great splendor in Westminster-Abbey, on the 23d of April, 1685* (London: for John Clarke, William Thackeray [and] Thomas Passinger, [1685]), 1.

17 *Church of England,* *The book of common prayer, and administration of the sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church* (London: by the assigns of John Bill deceased, by Henry Hills and Thomas Newcomb, 1685), B8v.
power he set the King’s Printer, Henry Hills, to work on numerous devotional materials. James authorised the publication of a tract supposedly written by Charles II, in which the former king renounced Protestantism and embraced the Catholic faith.\(^{18}\) The King also encouraged the publication of several Catholic sermons that were initially delivered at court. These sermons were authored by divines who adhered to different branches of the Catholic faith, including John Betham, Doctor of the Sorbonne, and Philip Ellis, a Benedictine priest. Consequently, these texts show some differences in opinion and priorities, but they all seem to share a common intention. Notably, the sermons were advertised alongside other texts that were connected with Catholic devotion, through the use of advertisement lists that were becoming common at this time. Thus the reader of the hagiography *The life of St Ignatius* (1686), the founder of the Society of Jesus, was directed to other Catholic writing and the court sermons.\(^{19}\)

By sponsoring such texts, James seems to have wanted to build a community of Catholic readers. Indeed, the Catholic court sermons use Mary Beatrice’s image to create a model for piety at court. In *A sermon preach’d before the King, on November the 13. 1686* (1686), for example, Ellis represents England as a nursery for Catholicism. He remembers St. Erminburga and Queen Edith: two “Glorious Queens in this Island, who prefer’d the Humility of a Monastique Habit, and obscurity of a Cell to the Pomp and Splendor of a Court”.\(^{20}\) Ellis does not recommend that Mary Beatrice follow the example of these women by renouncing court life. Instead, he urges her to act as a pattern for the court: “tho there are no Court-Saints in Heaven, yet blessed be God, there are many Courtiers”.\(^{21}\) The queen’s image here provides a positive pattern for others to follow. Ellis hopes that she will therefore help people find their way to the true faith.

Going one step further, some Catholic writers use queenly fertility as a symbol of England’s spiritual rebirth. The devotional text *The second nativity of Jesus* (1686), for instance, considers the future of the Stuart dynasty if Mary Beatrice bears an heir. “Further Increase” of the royal family will mean that “the Name of STUART may Rule over the Lyons, Regulate the Leopards, receive the Fragrant


\(^{19}\) The catalogue advertises “Copies of two papers written by the late King Charles II. Together with a paper written by the late Duchess of York. Publish’d by his majesty’s command.” See Dominique Bouhours, *The life of St. Ignatius, founder of the Society of Jesus written in French by the reverend Father Dominick Bouhours of the same society* (London: by Henry Hills, 1686), Cc7v.

\(^{20}\) Philip Ellis, *A sermon preach’d before the King, on November the 13. 1686* (London: by Henry Hills, 1686), D4v.

\(^{21}\) Ibid., E2v.
Scent of the Lillies, and keep the Karp in a Pleasant Tune to the Worlds end”.

This author creates a kind of Catholic idyll, as part of which the Stuart monarchy rules over a harmonious landscape. The choice of the word “Karp”, a now obsolete term for “discourse”, is an interesting play on words. The author creates a positive vision of the nation under the Stuarts, which could even be elevated above Catholic dynasties in Europe. But they also suggest that this positive ideal will depend on monitoring discourse, or keeping karp ‘in check’. This is a positive image of the future under the Stuarts, but it depends on a sense of policing and monitoring the Stuarts’ achievements. As in the accounts of the coronation, there is a concern here with order and what is acceptable to say.

The only Protestant sermon that attends to Mary Beatrice’s image in more than a few lines does not use the image of queenly fertility. Francis Turner’s *A sermon preached before their majesties K. James II and Q. Mary, at their coronation in Westminster-Abby* (1685) was delivered at the coronation and then went through two print editions in London, as well as an edition in Edinburgh. The sermon takes the text of 1 Chronicles XXIV 23, in which Solomon is raised to the throne. Solomon’s accession was achieved after his mother, Queen Bathsheba, reminded David of earlier promises and convinced him to give Solomon the throne. Turner praises Mary Beatrice, like Bathsheba, for her loyalty:

To day we have seen another Spectacle of Magnificent Piety, a Queen, for whom it were too low a comparison, should I compare her to her that was rais’d immediately to a Throne, near that of King Solomon, then, when ’tis said, his mother crown’d him again in the day of his espousals; But a Queen, the most Faithful Companion of her Royal Husband’s Sufferings and hard Travels; the fitter to be now the Consort of all his Triumphs. We have seen *Her* also like *Her* self; that is, like *Humility* it self, which is the Queen of Vertues.

Turner’s praise here relates to Mary Beatrice’s earlier support for James before he became King and her humility during the coronation, when she paid him homage. Her exemplary character is manifest in her loyalty, which provides a model for others to follow. It is the queen’s former experience, rather than her possible fertility, that inspires Turner’s praise.

---

22 John Weldon of Raffin, trans., *The second nativity of Jesus, the accomplishment of the first (viz) the conversion of the soul fram’d by the model of the Word-incarnate* (Antwerp: by T.N. for the author, 1686), A4r.


If Solomon’s mother is a positive model, the same could not be said of Solomon’s wives. To compare James with this biblical king enables Turner to reflect on religion, as Solomon was notorious for marrying foreign wives who were then permitted to worship their own gods. Turner accepts that Solomon lost his way later in his reign. “From making Beauty his Idol,” Turner writes: “he fell even to worship the Pagan Deities”. Turner focuses on the reaction of the people, rather than questioning the King’s deeds. He points out that the people of Israel continued to support Solomon and remained true to their God: “as they might do without any Inconsistence whatsoever”. Here, Turner voices support for the traditional principles of divine-right kingship and hereditary monarchy, which stand true even if the King observes a different faith. His arguments clearly impressed the avid Tory Aphra Behn, who described his sermon as “the best Rhetorick” by “that Ornament of the still Loyal Gown”. But it is significant that Turner plays down the importance of Solomon’s marriages, and does not return to Bathsheba. The sermon concludes with a reminder that James’s reign, like the reign of any mortal king, will be finite. Turner draws his audience’s attention to the royal vault, in which Mary I and Elizabeth I were entombed. “Tho Kings are made as Gods,” Turner states, “they shall die like Men”. Ultimately, Turner promises allegiance to the new King and yet falls short of celebrating the Catholic dynasty that James was hoping to found.

III: Beauty and Royal Panegyric

Whereas Turner was apologetic about Solomon’s attachment to beautiful foreign women, poets praising Mary Beatrice in 1685 embraced precisely this theme. It would be rare to find a queen consort that royal panegyrists did not find beautiful. The theme of queenly beauty was used to describe Anna in 1603, and panegyrists deployed it throughout the 1630s to praise Henrietta Maria. The poet Edmund Waller, for example, claimed that Henrietta Maria roused “extremes of power and beauty” at court. Nevertheless, the theme of queenly beauty is more consistent in representations of Mary Beatrice than any other Stuart queen. Poets privileged the beauty motif as a way to negotiate the problems that were associated
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25 Ibid., C3v.
27 Turner, A sermon, B4v.
with the more established image of queenly fertility. By praising Mary Beatrice’s beauty writers could show their respect for the queen consort and present a positive image of the new reign, whilst also evading the problematic issues presented by her faith.

Mary Beatrice’s beauty had been extolled before she became queen. John Dryden dedicated his opera \textit{The state of innocence} (1677) to Mary Beatrice, then Duchess of York. Dryden states that praise of Mary Beatrice’s lineage can be left to historians, but “I could not without extrem reluctance resign the Theme of Your Beauty to another Hand”.\footnote{John Dryden, “To her Royal Highness the Duchess” in “The state of innocence, and fall of man: an opera” (1677), ed. Vinton A. Dearing, in \textit{The Works of John Dryden Volume 12: Plays} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 81.} Poet laureate since the 1660s, Dryden continued to harp on Mary Beatrice’s beauty after her coronation. Dryden’s opera \textit{Albion and Albanius} (1685) was published soon after the accession. It had been penned in the final months of Charles’s life, and offered an allegory for the Revolution and Exclusion Crisis - so “very obvious”, Dryden stated, “that it will no sooner be read than understood”.\footnote{John Dryden, “Albion and Albanius” (1685), ed. George R. Guffey, in \textit{The Works of John Dryden Volume 15: Plays}, ed. Earl Miner (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 11.} Upon Charles’s death, Dryden tweaked the opera so that it concluded with James II’s accession.

\textit{Albion and Albanius} starts with a scene in which London and the Thames lie chained centre stage, having been defeated by republicans. Two “Imperial Figures” representing James II and Mary Beatrice stand on plinths on either side of the stage. Mary Beatrice is accompanied by the three graces, and a number of cupids lie at her feet “bound, with their Bows and Arrows broken”.\footnote{Ibid., 17.} In this dominant representation of the new queen consort, Mary Beatrice’s beauty enables her to enslave the cupids in the same way that republicans subjugate England’s capital city. But crucially, Mary Beatrice’s alter-ego uses this authority to emancipate the Thames. She points a sceptre centre-stage, “commanding the Graces to take off his fetters”.\footnote{Ibid., 18.} The queen’s beauty is here a national treasure. It is used to assist her husband’s subjects, and implies the importance of a stable monarchy that can benefit the English.

Dryden’s persistence started a trend. As had been the case at each of the earlier Stuart successions, panegyric was the most common mode for representing the queen consort. Both universities published collections to celebrate the accession in which Mary Beatrice is frequently
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mentioned.33 She also appears in twenty-two separate panegyrics and three odes. These poems were generally printed for a commercial audience, as publishers such as Henry Playford capitalised on the succession by co-ordinating elegies for Charles and panegyric for James.34 There are a number of consistent patterns and repeated images across the corpus, with numerous poets focusing on Mary Beatrice’s beauty. John Baber signals his debt to Dryden, describing Mary Beatrice: “Whose Beauty to describe Attempts were always weak, / Nor shall I on that Subject silence break; / Where Laureats have of that Just Description fail’d”.35 The “Ravish’d Muse” of the anonymous poem The description of the coronation of his sacred majesty K. James II. and his illustrious consort Queen Mary (1685) compares seeing Mary Beatrice to seeing “Angels, that above the Blest, / Feels Extasies too high to be esprest”.36

To praise Mary Beatrice’s beauty and suggest that the queen is beyond adequate description is of course a rhetorical device. The tone of these texts serves to elevate Mary Beatrice, to an almost blasphemous extent. Importantly, though, this focus on queenly beauty also enables poets to imagine Mary Beatrice’s positive contribution to the nation. The most sophisticated treatment of the beauty motif comes in Behn’s ode A pindarick poem on the happy coronation of his most sacred majesty James II and his illustrious consort Queen Mary (1685). In this lengthy description of the coronation, Behn adapts the masculine-centred Pindaric tradition to attend to Mary Beatrice’s image in depth.37 The speaker imagines Mary Beatrice being dressed for the coronation by “Nymphs” who “ply all their Female arts / To dress Her for Her victory of Hearts”.38 Particularly, Behn praises the attractive new queen consort as an “inchanting Ravisher”, whose “Angel Eyes, and Voice, so conqu’ring are”.39 For Carol Barash, Behn’s emphasis on Mary Beatrice’s attributes produces a source for female authority that

33 University of Cambridge, Moestissimæ ac lætissimæ Academiæ Cantabrigiensis affectus, decedente Carolo II succedente Jacobo II (Cambridge: ex officina Joan. Hayes, 1685); University of Oxford, Piaetas Universitatis Oxoniensis in obitum augustissimi & desideratissimi regis Caroli Secundi (Oxonii: e Theatro Sheldoniano, 1685).
34 Edmund Arwaker, The second part of The vision, a pindarick ode occasioned by their majesties happy coronation (London: J Playford for Henry Playford, 1685); Aphra Behn, A pindarick poem on the happy coronation of his most sacred majesty James II and his illustrious consort Queen Mary by Mrs. Behn (London: J. Playford for Henry Playford, 1685); W.P. Tears wip’d off, or, the second essay of the Quakers by way of poetry occasioned by the coronation of James and Mary (London: J.P for Henry Playford, 1685).
35 John Baber, A poem upon the coronation of his most sacred majesty King James II (London: R. Everingham, 1685), B1r.
36 Anon, The description of the coronation of his sacred majesty K. James II. and his illustrious consort Queen Mary celebrated on the 23th day of April, 1685 (London: Nathaniel Thompson, 1685), A1r.
37 There is only one earlier instance in which the queen is represented in an ode: Henrietta Maria’s stanza in Abraham Cowley’s Ode, upon the blessed restoration and returne of his sacred majestie, Charls the Second (1660). For a general history of the Pindaric form, see Stella P. Revard, Politics, Poetics, and the Pindaric Ode: 1450-1700 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2009).
38 Behn, A pindarick, C1r.
39 Ibid., B1r.
then rivals James’s patriarchal discourse. In light of the popularity of queenly beauty in other texts that were printed for the succession, though, what seems most significant is that here – as in Dryden’s Albion and Albanius – Mary Beatrice’s beauty assists James. The King is seen to be able to withstand Mary Beatrice’s charms, which are: “Fatal to All but Her Lov’d Monarchs heart, / Who of the same Divine Materials wrought”.

The beauty motif was so ubiquitous as to provide fodder for satire in Tears wip’d off, or, the second essay of the Quakers by way of poetry (1685). This folio piece is on one level a genuine panegyric to James and Mary Beatrice, but it also doubles as a satire on Protestant non-conformity. Playford published the poem and W. P. is purported to be the author, implying the famous Quaker activist, William Penn. Although Penn did support James, he was not responsible for producing the piece and denied his authorship in print. It would be extremely unusual for a Quaker to write a poem, and Penn assured his brethren that he would not be a “Penny-Poet”. Instead, the speaker claims to be a Quaker inspired to deliver excessive praise for the new royal couple. The satire works because the narrator uses common panegyric conventions. It seems instructive, in light of this, that the ‘Quaker’ particularly praises the “Beauty and Honour” that Mary Beatrice brings to James’s court. The motif of queenly beauty had within a few months come to be a stock trope.

What was the utility of focusing to such an extent on Mary Beatrice’s beauty, beyond the obvious purpose of flattering the new queen? The level of emphasis on queenly beauty seems to have moved writers away from some of the tropes that were associated with earlier Stuart queens. In contrast to representations of James, which emphasized his dynastic heritage, writers did not emphasize Mary Beatrice’s similarity with her Catholic predecessors as queen consorts. Similarly, whereas writers

---

41 Behn, A Pindarick, Ct.
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emphasised James’ dynastic lineage, they also separated Mary Beatrice from her predecessors.\textsuperscript{47} She is compared to a striking range of biblical and classical women, but no poets associated her with queen consorts from England’s past. Indeed, writers rejected parallels between Mary Beatrice and her predecessors. In the broadside \textit{A poem on the coronation of James the II} (1685), one Patrick Ker states that “(As ’tis by all Confest) / Our present MARY is of Queens the Best”.\textsuperscript{48} This reference to “our present MARY” contrasts Mary Beatrice with Henrietta Maria, whose name was often anglicised to Mary and whose legacy continued to be divisive.\textsuperscript{49} These authors move away from the earlier queen consorts, and the themes of dynasty that their images had been used to celebrate. Instead, writers focus on Mary Beatrice’s capacity to capture loyalty for the incumbent reign.

IV: Conclusion

Whereas in 1662 writers avoided discussing Catherine’s faith, in 1685 Mary Beatrice’s Catholicism seems to have deeply informed her representation in succession texts. The fact that James, despite his early promises, embarked on a programme of pious propaganda meant that this issue was alive in people’s minds. What had been a long-standing concern now felt more urgent, and this affected the motifs that could be used to describe the queen. On the surface, the literature that was published about Mary Beatrice appears consistent with the representations of her predecessors. In particular, as in 1603, 1625 and 1662, panegyric was the dominant mode. But even as the superlatives that writers used in their panegyrics increased, the kinds of images that they used to praise Mary Beatrice changed in subtle ways. The image of queenly fertility prompted devotional writers to look ahead to a promising Catholic future or to meditate on the risks of the new queen coming to power. While some panegyrists continued to pray that Mary Beatrice would bear a male heir, motifs of queenly fertility came to be far less prominent in 1685 than they had been in previous years.\textsuperscript{50} Panegyrists instead placed focus on queenly beauty, which seems to have been a more acceptable language to praise the queen.

\textsuperscript{47} Ker himself had recently published a series of works about the regicide and Cromwellian regime. See \textit{Flosculum poeticum. Poems divine and humane, panegyrical, satyrical, ironical} (London: for Benjamin Billingsley, 1684).
\textsuperscript{48} Patrick Ker, \textit{A poem on the coronation of James the II- King of Great-Britain, France and Ireland, &c} (London: by George Croom, 1685): 1.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{The life & death of Henrietta Maria de Bourbon, queen to that blessed king & martyr, Charles I. mother to his late glorious majesty of happy memory, K. Charles II. and to our present most gracious soveraign James II. King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, &c} (London: for Dorman Newman, 1685).
\textsuperscript{50} See for example Thomas D’Urfey \textit{An elegy upon the late blessed monarch King Charles II and two panegyrics upon their present sacred majesties, King James and Queen Mary} (London: Jo. Hindmarsh, 1685).
What can these representations tell us about public attitudes towards Mary Beatrice, and what are the implications? It is fair to say that Mary Beatrice’s image did not cause additional damage to James, whose own Catholicism was already alarming for his subjects. As Evelyn’s diary shows, the queen was still well-liked by many members of the English public. Several factors might explain why people placed so much emphasis on Mary Beatrice’s beauty, in addition to the implicit tension about her faith. Unlike Anna, Henrietta Maria and Catherine, for example, Mary Beatrice had lived in England for several years before the succession. She was therefore not bringing new assets or diplomatic contacts that could be incorporated into her representation at this stage. However, James and his advisors made it clear that Mary Beatrice was an integral part of his royal iconography and his ambitions for the future. The queen’s presence therefore invited questions about the future shape of the dynasty, and exacerbated tension over what England would look like under a Catholic Stuart monarchy. Writers consistently came back to questions of loyalty in their representations of the queen, whether in their concern about the best ways in which to represent the Catholic couple or in their images of Mary Beatrice capturing the hearts of her husband’s subjects. This emphasis on loyalty and expediency was vital – and would go on to be vital for Mary Beatrice’s successor when, in 1689, the Catholic queen was supplanted.
Chapter Five

Queen Mary II in 1689

None of the works published about the Revolution of 1688-9 can be said to describe the royal consort. In legal terms, there was no royal consort. On 13 February 1689, the Convention Parliament offered the throne to both William III and Mary II. The new King and Queen had joint sovereignty in name, but monarchical power was invested in William alone. This agreement accommodated the patriarchal idea that a wife should defer to her husband. A large number of pamphlets, public letters and printed dialogues were published about whether Mary could be offered the throne, and on what terms. Lois Schwoerer notes that writers were particularly concerned with gender hierarchy. She concludes that “patriarchalism on the part of many people, including the prince and princess of Orange, as well as political expediency, killed the idea of making Mary queen and William her consort”. At the same time, the joint sovereignty agreement also recognised the fact that Mary had a stronger hereditary claim than William. If either of them were to have children by another partner after the other’s death, the agreement stated that the Queen’s children and Princess Anne’s children would take precedence over William’s. This settlement effectively positioned William as a custodian of the English throne, preserving Mary’s and her sister’s rights.

How did public writers explain Queen Mary’s role in the dramatic events leading to the Revolution, including her father’s overthrow? What literary tactics did they use to make sense of her unique constitutional position, and what points of continuity are there with earlier representations of English queen consorts? The 1689 succession generated an unprecedented amount of printed material: more than all of the earlier successions combined. I am concentrating in this chapter on Mary’s representation, rather than William’s, as her status provided writers with a unique challenge – to which

1 For the argument that Mary II should be offered sole sovereignty, see A seventh collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England (London: Richard Janeway, 1689). For the argument of joint sovereignty, see Reasons for crowning the Prince & Princess of Orange king and queen jointly, and for placing the executive power in the Prince alone [London: 1689]. The case that William III should be sole sovereign is made in the pamphlet Reasons humbly offer’d, for placing His Highness the Prince of Orange singly on the throne during life [London: 1689]. These pamphlets, each authored anonymously, are just three examples of many.


they responded by looking back on earlier portrayals of the queen consorts. Indeed, prior to the accession, Mary had effectively been William’s consort for more than ten years in Holland. She waited to return to England until after her father’s departure, and after the Houses of Parliament had debated the distribution of power. Through the queen’s quiet behaviour in the first months after the invasion, and through the public events that she attended in the months after her arrival, both William and Mary implied that she would be happy to defer to the prince. I argue here that the literature of 1689 shows writers building on, rather than breaking away from, the forms of representation that were associated with the earlier Stuart queens in order to depict Mary. Her queenly iconography was therefore closely connected with that of the earlier royal consorts, and by looking at her representation in this light we can gain fresh perspective on the iconography of the post-Revolution monarchy.

I: Gender and Authority at the 1689 Coronation

The architects of the 1689 Revolution represented William III as a masculine hero, assisted by providence as he attempted to deliver England from popery. On 31 January 1689, as the Convention Parliament debated who should be given the throne, Gilbert Burnet preached a sermon to the House of Commons. Burnet praised the “Prodigies and Miracles of Providence” that attended William’s arrival. He told the House to remember “this great Deliverance, both with relation to that God who has wrought it, and to the happy Instrument by whom he has wrought it”. Once William had been offered the throne, a culture of Williamite panegyric evolved which emphasised masculine themes of military prowess. In effect, William was represented as a Stuart King in post-Revolution England, who could right the wrongs of his predecessors and rehabilitate the Stuart line. But this emphasis on masculine authority obviously did not accommodate Mary’s own sovereign power.

How did people construe the dynamic of the royal marriage? The coronation of 11 April 1689 was the first major public event of the new reign, providing an opportunity to showcase the new regime’s

6 Ibid., D1.
legitimacy and set up the patterns for the royal couple's iconography. The Earl Marshal the Duke of Norfolk circulated papers about the order for the ceremony beforehand.\textsuperscript{8} Cheap licensed accounts of the coronation also circulated after it took place, which meant that the events would have been accessible in print for readers who could not attend to see the coronation take place on the day.\textsuperscript{9} Some key aspects of the 1689 ceremony helped to differentiate William and Mary from James and Mary Beatrice, who had been crowned just four years before. Unlike the Catholic royal couple, William and Mary took the Sacrament together. The author of the licensed account claims that their accession was greeted with “Tokens of the Highest Affections, Loyalty and Satisfaction”.\textsuperscript{10} While the service set William and Mary apart from their predecessors, subtle aspects of the ceremony also distinguished between the royal couple and emphasised William’s precedence. The King was anointed before the queen, and he was crowned before Mary not alongside her.\textsuperscript{11} This order was similar to the structure of the 1685 coronation, when Mary Beatrice was crowned after James. It implied William’s authority over Mary.

Printed accounts of the coronation mirror the subtle emphasis on William rather than Mary. While several poems were published about the coronation, most writers concentrate principally on William and some do not mention Mary at all. In poems that do attend to the queen as well as the king, the language that is used to describe her is quite different. The anonymous author of \textit{A poem on the coronation of King William and Queen Mary} (1689), for example, attends to the queen in some detail. The speaker opens with martial imagery, describing their desire to create a “true English line” which centres on “rugged bravery”.\textsuperscript{12} This part of the poem praises William’s public role as a military hero. After several pages, the author moves beyond this “unequal Theme” and introduces Mary. They depict the queen’s journey to the cathedral, imagining her environs as “some happy Lovers Golden Dream! / Cool Shades, sweet Bowers, and some soft bubbling Stream […] What ever’s sweet, what ever’s soft and fair, / Attend that Canopy – the Queen is there”.\textsuperscript{13} These sibilant descriptions create an idyllic image of countryside retreat, which is specifically associated with the queen.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{8} Earl Marshal, \textit{The form of the proceeding to the coronation of their majesties King William and Queen Mary} (London: Edward Jones, 1689); \textit{Orders to be observed on the day of the royal coronation of King William and Queen Mary} (London: Edward Jones, 1689).
\item \textsuperscript{9} Anon, \textit{An Account of the ceremonial at the coronation of their most excellent majesties King William and Queen Mary} (London: Edward Jones, 1689).
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These countryside images conjure the sense of traditionalism that was common to the pastoral mode. Pastoral writing imagines a depoliticised space, creating an environment in which specific social hierarchies seem to be clearly delineated and social order is harmonious. By using this language to frame Mary’s status, writers imply that she is separate from political decision-making and emphasise William’s importance in contrast. The association between Mary and the pastoral strain can also be seen in works that were performed at court. Nahum Tate, the future poet laureate, depicts rural “swains” in *The prologue [sic] to King William and Queen Mary at a play acted before their majesties at Whitehall* (1689), which was added to a new court performance of Brome’s *The jovial crew* (1652). Here, William is seen to “restore” British hopes: a salient verb. William’s actions are therefore depicted as being undertaken for the communal benefit of the realm. Mary, meanwhile, is praised for her passive “Charms”. The queen is seen to be a dependent of the king, as the pastoral realm in which she resides is secured by him alone: “He only Arms to make our Dangers cease, / His Wars are Glorious, for his End is Peace”.

The images that were associated with Mary in this coronation literature distinguish between the king and queen, emphasising her femininity and placing her in a depoliticised setting. Similar imagery also appears beyond London, spreading as far as the South West. The City of Bath held a public pageant to celebrate the accession: an expedient gesture, given that a large statue celebrating Mary Beatrice’s pregnancy had recently been erected at the Cross Bath. The parade began with one hundred men dressed as martial heroes, who were then followed by a procession of women. According to the printed accounts, one hundred virgins took part, all of whom wore crowns and carried sceptres. These women had small bayonets at their waists: a less strident symbol than the swords that the men carried, but nevertheless a sign of female strength. An “Amazon Dame” then led a troupe of twenty-four women, all of whom carried darts and javelins. Finally, thirty gentlewomen rounded up the march with
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15 Nahum Tate, *The prologue [sic] to King William and Queen Mary at a play acted before their majesties at Whitehall on Friday the 15th of November, 1689* (London: F. Saunders for R. Baldwin, 1689), 1.  
16 Ibid., 2.  
18 The term used in both texts studied here is “bagonet” rather than “bayonet”. The Oxford English Dictionary lists “bagonet” as another way of writing “bayonet”, which was current in the 1690s and can be seen in other texts such as *The London Gazette*. See “bayonet, n.”. OED Online. March 2016. Oxford University Press.  
the motto “Rather than Lose the Day we’ll fight” embossed on their breasts. Although the Bath procession evokes symbols of female power, the printed reports of the event are more cautious about women’s authority.

The Bath parade was reported in a licensed prose account and poem, both of which circulated in London. The poem *The loyalty and glory of the city of Bath* (1689) describes the daggers that were carried by the first group of women and the violent mottoes that were worn by the second group, but then regulates these images by adding conventional descriptions of female innocence in parenthesis. The thirty gentlewomen, for example, are described as being “(All like Fair Blossoms in the Bloom of Love)”. In a similar vein, the author differentiates between the foods that the men and women ate at the banquet after the event: “(Sweet Meats for Ladies, and for Hero’s Wine)”. Crucially, the poem opens and closes with praise for King William. The first lines state that the City of Bath designed the pageant to show “their Prince, their Loyalty and Love”. The final stanza concludes by stating that the people can “Clap for Joy [...] Give Thanks to heaven, and to our Gracious KING”. The images of female power in this poem are, then, addressed to and celebrate a male monarch.

As the coronation provided an opportunity to set up the main patterns in William’s and Mary’s iconography, it is significant that the royal couple chose to emphasise the authority of the male spouse. Through subtle symbols and his own actions on the day, William was able to show his precedence. Mary’s behaviour during the service also accorded with her husband’s authority. Writers responded by developing gendered themes, which celebrated the king’s masculinity and placed Mary in an apolitical pastoral setting. In these representations, the male monarch remained in charge. The responses to the coronation suggest that people used this moment as a testing ground to think through the opportunities for depicting the pair. In William’s and Mary’s early iconography, the queen’s perceived subordination to William helps to magnify his own strength.

II: Queenly Piety and Devotional Writing
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19 Anon, *News from Bath; Being a true and perfect relation of the great and splendid procession, and joyful transactions there* (London: Richard Baldwin, 1689), A1v.
20 See Anon, *The loyalty and glory of the city of Bath being a true and perfect relation of the wonderful ceremony, and transactions, that were lately performed there* (London: A Milbourn, 1689).
21 Ibid., 1.
While a number of factors, including politics and the economy, influenced people’s decision to support the 1688 invasion, William and his advisors justified James’ overthrow by arguing that a Catholic monarch posed great risks to the country. Tony Claydon has shown that “pious propaganda” was important for William’s representation of his kingship, as he sought to depict the new government as reformists who could overcome the corruption and failings of James’ reign.\textsuperscript{22} I analyse here the significance of Mary’s faith in depictions of the queen. More work could be done on Mary’s patronage after the Revolution, in particular her attendance of public plays and her architectural work at sites such as Kensington Palace. I concentrate on one strand of her patronage which was of great import for the queen and prominent in print, her support of sermons and devotional literature. As had been the case for the earlier royal consorts, Mary’s religion was significant for writers. People celebrated the queen’s status as a Protestant, rewriting as they did so the conventions that had been used for the last Catholic queen.

The process of “pious propaganda” started at the court. Like her father before her, Mary encouraged the publication of several sermons that were delivered to her at court. Twenty-eight sermons that were either delivered before Mary or published at her request appear in 1689. Significantly, many of these sermons refer back to the perceived failings of James II and the earlier Stuart reigns. In one text, William Lloyd, the Bishop of Asaph, looks back to the Restoration. He states that the English populace wasted a novel opportunity at this moment. Whereas Charles II’s return offered the Church hope for “a New Life, a Resurrection from the dead”, the people “fell to drinking of Healths”.\textsuperscript{23} Lloyd suggests that these loosened morals extended from taverns to Churches, and that Catholics took advantage of this weaker spiritual state to try and “bring in Popery again”.\textsuperscript{24}

Like the court sermons, devotional writers outside the court represented Mary as a pioneer of religious reform. Several writers compared her with the positive precedent of Elizabeth I. The philosophical tract $\textit{Nosce teipsum}$ (1599) by Sir John Davies, which was first published during Elizabeth’s reign, was republished in 1689 by a certain W. H. The new preface describes Mary as

\textsuperscript{22} Tony Claydon, $\textit{William III and the godly revolution}$ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), esp. 93-100.
\textsuperscript{23} William Lloyd, $\textit{A sermon preached before the Queen at White--Hall, January the 30th}$ (London: for Thomas Jones, 1689), E2\textsuperscript{r}.
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Elizabeth’s “genuine Heir”. The author hopes that she will have a “double Portion of the Princely Zeal and Perfections of this Royal Pattern of Vertue”, and live “like ripe Fruit” to an old age. Other writers look beyond this comparison with Elizabeth, and hope that Mary will give birth to an heir. Three other devotional texts dedicated to Mary express the hope that she will mother a child. The anonymous author of *The lama-sabachthani, or, Cry of the Son of God* (1689) pairs Mary with her sister Anne: “two such Matchless Guardian Angels”. He compares them with the Virgin Mary and Anna, mother to John the Baptist: “Mary and Anna, the Mother of Jesus and Prophetess of our Lord”. By using Marian imagery to describe Queen Mary, the author rewrites conventions that were more recently associated with Mary Beatrice. He appropriates the imagery that surrounded the earlier reign and suggests that only Mary and her offspring can represent the Church of England.

As we have seen, in 1685 the theme of queenly fertility was important for devotional writers, as it gave them an opportunity to celebrate the prospects for the Catholic faith under James. The theme of queenly fertility came to be associated even more with Mary Beatrice in the months leading up to the Revolution, as her successful pregnancy raised Catholic hopes. “After a Prince an Admiral beget”, wrote Dryden, who had lately converted to Catholicism, in *Britannia rediviva* (1688): “The Royal Sov’raign wants an Anchor yet”. In the months after the Revolution, Jacobite writers continued to use the theme of queenly fertility to defend James’s cause. Denis Granville, the Bishop of Durham, vacated his seat and went into exile in 1689. He dedicated *The resigned & resolved Christian* (1689) to “the Queen of England”: Mary Beatrice. Granville states that Mary Beatrice has been “Instrumentall to the Greatest blessing which hath been these many yeares conferred on the Kingdom, in bringing and bearing forth an Heir male for the support of the monarchy”. The queen consort’s dynastic success is here connected with the nation’s future, rather than that of the Church. But Granville’s dedication shows that dynastic motifs were still synonymous with the legitimacy of particular monarchs.

In popular print, writers contrasted Queen Mary with Mary Beatrice by focusing on the women’s faiths. Mary was something of a heroine in popular print. Almost fifty ballads survive from
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1688 and 1689 that describe the new queen: an extraordinarily high number, compared with earlier royal consorts. These ballads frequently contrast Mary with her step-mother. For example, The boast of Great Britain; or, a song in praise of MARY present Queen of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, etc (1689) opens by noting that “WE had a Roman Queen of Late / That plagued these three Nations; / And ruined our Church and State, / By Popish Conjurations”. Likewise, the author of Great Britains earnest desires for the Princess Mary's happy arrival (1689) hopes that Mary will give birth to “an Orange sweet Babe”. This “young Protestant Heir” will then counter “Roman” courts abroad. Although it was by no means certain that Mary would produce an heir, these confident celebrations of her fertility rewrite earlier motifs for Mary Beatrice, and were probably designed to write them off. The broadside The Protestants Ave Mary (1689) mocks Catholic symbolism, hoping that Protestants will receive “Heaven[']s] favour in a SON”. These works take some of the common themes in devotional literature, emphasising the importance of the queen’s religion as part of a broader reflection on the change in power.

III: The queen’s family

How were writers able to explain Mary’s role in a Revolution that saw her father ousted and her younger half-brother stripped of his claim to the throne? Unlike the royal consorts, Mary was raised in England and did not leave the country until she was entering her adulthood. Her arrival in February 1689 was therefore also a return. But people scrutinised Mary’s behaviour in the months after her landing, to try and gauge her thoughts about her father’s fate. Numerous Jacobite satirists compared her with the daughters of King Lear, claiming that she had intentionally betrayed her father and usurped his crown. John Evelyn wrote in his diary that he “expected that both, especially the Princess, would have showed some (seeming) reluctance at least, of assuming her father’s Crown”. Instead, he notes critically, she appeared “smiling and jolly, as to a wedding” and “lay in the same bed and apartment where the late
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queen lay”. I examine here the fictions that panegyrists spun about Mary's role in the Revolution, as they tried to transform her actions into something to celebrate.

For the first time in the Stuart period, in 1689 panegyric was not the most common mode for representing the queen. In 1685, Chapter 4 showed, panegyric was popular. Across a large number of poems, a set of recognisable images came to be associated with Mary Beatrice that placed emphasis on her beauty and suggested that she exceeded all earlier Stuart queens. While few poems were written about Mary at her succession, there is a small and mostly neglected group of panegyrics by some of the leading writers of the day, including Aphra Behn and Thomas Rymer. Several of these writers had authored panegyrics to celebrate the 1685 accession, or even the birth of Prince James. Their new representations reveal concern about the best ways in which to represent Mary’s responsibility for recent events.

In the early months of 1689, the poet and playwright Elkanah Settle struggled to come to terms with the implications of Mary’s arrival. Settle had written a panegyric for the 1685 accession, which he praised as “Britannia’s sacred Nuptial Day”. In 1689, he responded to William’s arrival by penning an ode that he dedicated to the eldest son of the Duke of Hamilton, who was imprisoned for opposing William. Tellingly, the poem concludes by anticipating Mary’s landing. Settle’s speaker adopts the voice of “Three prost’rate Nations”:

Nor You, Illustrious Mary, can Receive
What Heaven Denys, and Justice cannot Give:
Your Virtues are too Eminently Great,
To Rob a Father’s Head to Adorn Your Own;
And that Bright Angels Face, with every Charm repleat,
Needs not th’Addition of a Lawless Crown:
Leave it to Heaven! since you’ve too lately seen

38 See for example Edmund Arwaker, The second part of The vision, a pindarick ode occasioned by their majesties happy coronation (London: J Playford for Henry Playford, 1685); Arwaker, A votive table, consecrated to the Church’s deliverers, the present King and Queen by Edm. Arwaker (London: W Canning, 1689).
The Faith False Britain paid an Injur’d Queen.\textsuperscript{41} Each compliment in this passage is conditional. In order to prove her virtue and beauty, the speaker suggests, Mary has to refuse the crown. The speaker’s protective description of the “Injur’d Queen” also implies that Mary Beatrice has been wrongfully represented. While Settle would go on to write panegyrics for William, Mary, and later Queen Anne, his initial response to the Revolution reveals concern about the consequences of the political settlement.

As Settle’s measured praise of Queen Mary suggests, polemic was inseparable from her poetic representation. Indeed, party positions determine how much space the queen received in texts. The Whig writer Thomas Shadwell, a former member of the ‘Green Ribbon Club’, focuses primarily on William in A congratulatory poem to the most illustrious Queen Mary upon her arrival in England (1689). Despite the fact that this poem is addressed in the title to the queen, Shadwell’s descriptions of her are brief. Indeed, Mary’s key attribute is her association with William. Shadwell celebrates that she “Is home to us with mighty Interest sent: / For we, with Her, have won the Great Nassau, / Whose Sword shall keep the Papal World in awe”.\textsuperscript{42} The poem then concludes with a lengthy passage about William. Those “Who are approv’d so Valiant, Wise, and Just,” Shadwell writes, “Have the best Titles to the highest Trust”. He emphasises in the poem’s final couplet that “Princes more of solid Glory gain / Who are thought fit, than who are born to Reign”.\textsuperscript{43} This statement moves away from the concept of hereditary legitimacy on which Mary’s claim to the throne was based; it is effectively a poetic rendering of the argument that William was fitter to rule than his wife.

Thomas Rymer, who would succeed Shadwell as Historiographer Royal in 1692, attends to Mary’s image in more detail in A poem on the arrival of Queen Mary (1689). Rymer had already written a poem for William by the time Mary arrived, which means that this second poem should be seen as a companion piece.\textsuperscript{44} Whereas Rymer’s first poem focuses on the implications of William’s arrival for European politics, the poem for Mary is more interested in the British context. As a consequence, Rymer has to frame the issue of Mary’s responsibility for her father’s downfall. Throughout, Rymer only uses third-person pronouns such as “She” and “Her” to describe Mary. By not naming the queen explicitly,
Rymer enhances her mystique. Furthermore, Rymer uses classical myths to consider Mary’s achievements. Thus Mary is described as Pyrrha, Deucalion’s Bride in Greek mythology, who repopulates the earth by throwing rocks over her shoulder: “She strikes the Rock, the rudest Rocks Obey, / New Life invades, and animates our Clay”.

Active verbs such as these invite questions about Mary’s involvement in creating the political events before her father’s overthrow. Rymer represents, for example, Mary at the wheel of fortune while William fights on the ground. She “turns the mighty Machine of Affairs, / Strikes Harmony throughout the jangling Spheres”. The queen’s involvement with this machine is linked to her husband’s actions, which are in turn directed by providence: “Providence, through Stratagem and Steel, / Drives on, no Jolt, nor ever cools the Wheel”. The close attention to the mechanics of fortune in this passage creates an awareness of the various factors that enabled the Revolution. To some extent, Rymer’s passage recognises that the Revolution was engineered by man and brought to pass by the new royal couple’s use of resources. The final lines of the poem seem to try and close down the implications of Mary’s agency and direct involvement. The speaker concludes by justifying the queen’s motives: “Her no Ambition moves, nor is she Proud, / Save, in the Glorious Power of doing Good”. While the speaker defends the queen here, the fact that he needs to do so suggests that Rymer was aware of the possible negative interpretations of his poem.

The most complex poem that was printed about Mary’s arrival is Behn’s A congratulatory poem to her sacred majesty Queen Mary, upon her arrival in England (1689). Behn had written poems to celebrate the 1685 accession and the birth of the Prince of Wales in 1688. Following William III’s arrival in England, she was solicited by Burnet to write something praising the revolution. Behn’s response, A pindaric poem to the reverend Doctor Burnet, on the honour he did me of enquiring after me and my muse (1689), both declines Burnet’s suggestion and undermines his propaganda effort by usurping the conventions of Whig panegyric. A few weeks later, Behn wrote a panegyric to celebrate Mary’s landing which appears to renounce her allegiance to James by pledging support to his daughter. Behn’s panegyric to Mary similarly subverts the praise of her arrival by poets such as Shadwell. By rewriting aspects of her 1685 Ode for James and Mary Beatrice, Behn produces a pastiche of succession writing rather than a celebration of the new regime.
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Behn’s poem is somewhat difficult to gauge, because her speakers are intentionally obfuscatory. The structure appears at first to be simple. Whereas Behn’s 1685 Ode was filled with interjections and exclamations, *A Congratulatory Poem* has a regular rhyme scheme and the lines are a consistent length. On the other hand, Behn’s narrative voice shifts between a persona for the author and then the author’s muse. The author opens the poem by stating that her muse has retreated to “the darkest Covert” upon James II’s departure. She enters a safe haven that moves away from the pastoral associations of retreat and perhaps by implication the themes that were common in the coronation literature analysed above. “No Wood-Gods, Fauns, nor Loves did here Intrude,” Behn’s speaker states, “Nor Nests for wanton Birds, the Glade allows.” The opening section thus distances Behn’s muse from other writers who would be more willing to celebrate the regime.

From her vantage, Behn’s speaker watches other poets greet the new queen. These welcomes echo Behn’s representation of Mary Beatrice in the 1685 Ode. For example, as in stanza X of the coronation Ode, in which Mary Beatrice is dressed by river nymphs, now the nymphs come to praise Mary: “River Nymphs their Crystal Courts forsake, / Curl their Blew Locks, and Shelly Trumpets take.” The next stanza follows the pattern of the 1685 Ode in which the queen consort is seen to travel down the Thames:

1685

And now the gilded Barges wait
The coming of Illustrious Fraight;
So Rich a Prize no Vessel blest before

1689

Thames with Harmonious Purlings glides along,
And tells her Ravisht Banks she lately bore
A Prize more great than all her hidden Store

In both these descriptions, there is a subtle play on the representation of an earlier queen consort. Behn’s description of Mary Beatrice as the most “Illustrious Fraight” may link back to the river pageant that marked Catherine’s formal entry in London in 1662, discussed above. But there is an important distinction in 1689. Whereas Behn’s *muse* delivered this praise for Mary Beatrice in 1685, in 1689 the
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muse is seen to observe other people saying the same of Mary and does not participate. Through these echoes of her own past praise, which are repeated at a wary distance, the poet suggests that accolades for the queen have become routine: a repetition of a prior literary model which Behn does not endorse.

The comparison between Mary and Mary Beatrice in this piece is necessarily subtle, but it is likely to have been perceptible for readers familiar with Behn’s 1685 Ode and her recent attitude to succession writing in her poem to Burnet. It is not until line 62 that Behn’s muse first praises the queen: “All Hail Illustrious Daughter of a King, / Shining without, and Glorious all within”. Notably, James II is the central point of this couplet. Behn’s tentative praise for the queen therefore hinges on the memory of the absent monarch, whose memory she does not forget. At the poem’s conclusion, Behn similarly harkens back to earlier representations of the Stuarts. Mary is represented as a Moses-like prophet figure on Mount Sinai:

Stiff-neckt Israel in defiance stood,
Till they beheld the Prophet of their God;
Who from the Mount with dazling brightnes came,
And Eyes all shining with Celestial Flame;
Whose Awful Looks, dispel’d each Rebel Thought,
And to a Just Compliance, the wilde Nations brought.

It is perfectly plausible to read this conclusion as praise for Queen Mary. Certainly, as Behn’s Israelites surrender their “Stiff-neckt” protest, the poem does not critique the new queen. At the same time, these words are again a subtle repetition of Behn’s 1685 Ode, which also finishes with an image of Mount Sinai. In the earlier poem, Mary Beatrice is perceived to represent a deity: the speaker tells other poets that “when Heav’ns brightness ye would make appear, / Behold the QUEEN, and copy it all from Her”. In the panegyric for Mary, conversely, the queen is a secondary representative of a higher power. Behn’s subtle comparisons and contrasts revisit the earlier ideals for Stuart monarchy, and suggest that the new queen falls somewhat short of her predecessors. Behn thereby preserves the legacy of the earlier Stuart queen, while reflecting on Queen Mary’s coming to power.

IV: Conclusion
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The unprecedented amount of material that was published about Mary in 1689 shows how people were using printed images of the queen to come to terms with the Revolution: both its causes, and its effects. The dynamic of the joint sovereignty agreement posed an unusual challenge, as writers had to gauge the balance of power between William and Mary. In early ceremonies for the new reign, which helped to establish their royal iconography, William and Mary placed emphasis on the King’s authority while Mary deferred to him according to the precepts of patriarchal society. Writers responded by representing the queen as part of a depoliticised pastoral realm, in which certain conventions associated with femininity were ascribed to Mary while William was praised as a masculine hero. The queen’s image here helped to emphasise William’s authority, and complemented the perceived military strength of the new reign. In addition, Mary used print to promote images of queenly piety that made Protestantism a central component of her iconography, as it had not been for the earlier queens. Her image was thus used to preserve a sense of order, both for social and religious hierarchies.

While William and Mary claimed that they wanted to correct the failures of the earlier regime, they actually represented their own rule through very similar strategies. The queen’s sponsorship of court sermons and her patronage of devotional writing were similar to the means that James used to represent his kingship. There were also points of continuity between Mary and her predecessor Mary Beatrice. For poets, this similarity created opportunities and also problems. Writers who had recently celebrated James’s and Mary Beatrice’s accession wrote new works that praised Mary’s agency but also sought to downplay it. Aphra Behn exploited the similarities in Mary’s and Mary Beatrice’s representation to suggest that the new queen would not be able legitimately to follow the pattern set by her predecessors. These texts show a process of consolidation, as writers used earlier ways of representing royal consorts to try and make sense of the new queen’s role. In 1689, rather than a revolution, there was a subtle re-evaluation of the literary conventions and symbols that were associated with the queen’s role.
Chapter Six

Prince George in 1702

As the only male royal consort during the Stuart period, Prince George has a unique place in this project. Studies of Anne’s queenly iconography have tended not to focus on her husband of nineteen years in any detail.1 Hannah Smith argues that Anne cultivated a royal image that merged sacral traditions of Stuart kingship with the military tradition of William III’s reign. The queen’s “invalid husband”, Smith argues, was of limited symbolic importance.2 Yet long before Anne came to the throne, George had been an important public figure and member of the royal family. His defection from James in 1688 was perceived to be a turning point. “I am not ignorant of the frequent Mischiefs wrought in the World by factious Pretences of Religion”, George wrote in a public letter to James II that explained his decision, “but were not Religion the most justifiable Cause, it would not be made the most specious Pretence”.3 He was made prince consort, although not crowned, when Anne took the throne.4

How, after a joint sovereignty agreement in which the male and female monarch shared the throne, did writers explain George’s unusual subordination to his wife? And following years of representing female royal consorts, what themes and images could be used to depict the prince? In order to represent George in 1702, writers would need to sensitively adapt earlier images and themes. Besides gender, other factors separated George from the earlier female Stuart consorts. Like each of his predecessors, George was a foreigner and observed a different religion to his wife. But unlike each of his predecessors, it seemed unlikely that his marriage would produce a healthy heir by the time his spouse came to the throne. The royal couple’s only surviving son, William Duke of Gloucester, had died aged eleven just two years before. Some of the traditional tropes that were used to describe the female consorts would therefore not have been appropriate, or even expedient, in 1702. Although a few writers still hoped that George would sire an heir, his fertility was not a major theme. Yet there was also no
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viable precedent for George other than the female royal consorts. It would hardly have been appropriate to compare him with the only other male consort in English history, Philip II, who launched the 1588 Armada 34 years after his marriage to Mary I.\(^5\)

In what follows, I examine a small but diverse range of literature that was printed about the male royal consort, from an ode originally performed at court to a prose biography in a cheap pamphlet. The overall corpus of literature about George might seem to be small. About 60 texts were published upon this accession which mention George in detail. Compared to the amount of literature that was published about Mary in 1689, this number is slim. But as fewer texts were published about the 1702 succession than the 1689 succession in general, the small amount of material is no personal slight on the prince. My analysis of George’s image builds on recent studies of the royal marriage by the art historians David Taylor and Julie Farguson, both of whom argue that Anna and George patronised portraits that promoted the prince’s status as an active political figure.\(^6\) I concentrate on two main themes that emerged in the literature about George, gender and religion, and examine how his representation enabled writers to work through some of the major issues of Anne’s early rule.

I: Gender, Authority and the Male Consort

Chapter 5 showed that in 1689 patriarchal notions underpinned discussions about whether Mary should be given the crown alongside William. In 1702, the fact that Anne was going to be queen while her husband remained prince consort attracted surprisingly little comment. Only one author argued that George should be given the crown in order to honour patriarchal principles. “Consider how Unpresidented a Thing it is in this Kingdom,” this anonymous author writes: “to see the Husband a Subject to his Wife”.\(^7\) He poses the rhetorical question whether it is “contrary to Nature’s Custom” for men to be politically subordinate “if the Woman pleases?”\(^8\) Yet even this pamphlet seems to have
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ulterior motives. It circulated some months after Anne took the throne, and therefore seems designed to stir dissatisfaction with Anne’s leadership, rather than intervene in a current debate about whether George should be crowned. I focus here on the ways that writers explained George’s position in relation to Anne, and I highlight the growing importance of naval imagery as writers praised the prince and differentiated him from his female predecessors.

Although Anne was the first sole English queen since Elizabeth, her succession did not prompt the same sense of anxiety about female rule as the accessions of the Tudor queens. Instead, a number of more facetious texts celebrate the prospect of female rule. The freelance publisher and pamphleteer, John Dunton, capitalised on Anne’s accession by publishing a 110 page celebration of the female sex entitled *Petticoat-government* (1702). Following the genre of proto-feminist debates, which advocated women’s ability to participate in political affairs, Dunton argues that women make the most effective sovereigns. He hopes that “Petticoat-Government may agen flourish in England, and be continued for many Generations”, promoting Anne and her likely successor, the Hanoverian Electress Sophia.⁹ This emphasis on female authority has interesting consequences for the prince. Dunton suggests that women are better suited to rule than kings, as can be seen by their spouse’s treatment. He points out that whereas female consorts are always given the title “queen”, “every Husband of a Queen, has not the Title of a King”.¹⁰ He claims that this shows that female monarchs do not need to enhance their royal image, whereas male rulers have to use their wives’ images to bolster their own prestige. Dunton thereby praises Anne, yet also diminishes her husband’s importance.

The anonymous author of the pamphlet *The prerogative of the breeches* (1702) attacks Dunton’s portrayal of female precedence point by point. The ESTC attributes this text to Daniel Defoe, although P. N. Furbanks and W. R. Owens do not include it in their authoritative list of Defoe’s works.¹¹ The author responds to Dunton’s argument by claiming that Anne’s queenly authority derives not from her feminity, but from her capacity to overcome it. In relation to royal consorts, the author argues that female consorts need the title of queen to improve their “Fund of Majesty”.¹² Male consorts, or the “Royal Masculine”, have authority on account of their gender and therefore do not need the additional benefit of being called a king. The author adds that George’s example shows Anne how to behave: the
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queen’s “Government is mild and compassionate as Her Sex, and yet Awful and Manly as the Spirit of Her Royal Consort”. These pamphlets were designed to capitalise on the succession and their interest in gender is tongue-in-cheek. Still, the authors’ different approaches to George’s role shows the ambiguity that surrounded his political position. By extension, depicting the male consort enabled people to explore the dynamic of Anne’s leadership.

The first opportunity to start building an iconography for George as prince consort came at the 1702 coronation, which took place – like the coronations of Anne’s uncle and father – on 23 April. By staging her coronation on St George’s Day, Anne emphasised the importance of patriotism and her hereditary descent. At the same time, Anne ensured that her image was linked with the earlier English queen Elizabeth as well as the earlier Stuart monarchs. She wore a coronation dress modelled on Elizabeth’s clothing, thereby linking her image with a tradition of independent English queenship. Similarly, this coronation departed from the 1685 and 1689 coronations due to the diminished role of the royal consort. Whereas both Mary Beatrice and Mary were anointed and crowned, George did not participate in the religious ritual of the coronation service and he was not crowned. His role in the service was therefore minor, although he still took part in the formal procession through London and was the first person to pay Anne homage after she was anointed. It is clear that Anne was the star of this royal show. In the coronation sermon, which later went through several printed editions, the Archbishop of York John Sharp praised Anne’s without mentioning her husband at all.

How did writers depict George’s role in this defining event for Anne’s queenship, given the prince’s limited activities in the service itself? The last chapter showed that panegyrist worked hard in 1689 to separate Mary’s image from William’s by creating a pastoral vocabulary for the queen. In 1702, panegyrist set out to rewrite the conventions associated with the Stuart royal consorts once more. George is described in four poems about the coronation, each of which was published by the trade publisher John Nutt. They are similar in theme and imagery, offering a chance to identify features in
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George’s early iconography. The longest description of George concludes the ode *Albion’s glory* (1702). The speaker describes the procession to the Cathedral, depicting George at the rear of the parade:

> And now the Glorious Prince behold,  
> Majestick are his Eyes,  
> How oft he turns them back upon the lovely Prize,  
> On her who wears the Sacred Gold,  
> With Husband’s Kindness and the Lover’s Care,  
> He watches the Illustrious Fair.\(^\text{17}\)

Although in the coronation procession George walked in the middle, this author places him at the back and therefore closer to Anne, who came last. George’s backward glances to Anne echo the classical myth of Orpheus and Eurydice. Anne, in the tradition of such love poetry, is figured as a prize for the Prince. Importantly, though, George’s “glorious” and “Majestick” nature does not quite match the “Sacred” quality of his wife. The queen is described wearing her crown, emphasising her descent and the strength of her leadership. There is also a subtle contrast here between depictions of the male royal consort and earlier depictions of his female counterparts. As in earlier coronation poems for Mary Beatrice and Mary II, the royal consort’s eyes are praised. But whereas the earlier queens were praised for having looks to kill, which in turn inspired support from their spouse’s subjects, the male consort is depicted as a custodian whose “Majestick” qualities go towards supporting Anne.

The opportunities for imagining the prince’s authority seem to have increased after May 1702, when Anne appointed George Lord High Admiral. By the time that he was appointed, George had not seen active service since he was a young man in Denmark – although he was present at the Battle of the Boyne. This placed him in contrast with more active military leaders of the time, such as the influential Duke of Marlborough. Richard Fiddes, future chaplain to Robert Harley, noted that “the only seeming Occasion of complaint” about George was the fact that he did not “go forth with our Fleets”.\(^\text{18}\) When George was appointed Lord High Admiral his tasks included presiding over the British naval council. He issued public commissions and proclamations related to naval matters.\(^\text{19}\) He was also the dedicatee of several projects related to naval affairs, such as the tract *Memoirs of transactions at sea during the*
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war with France (1703) by the Secretary of the Admiralty Josiah Burchett. Whether or not George commissioned these projects, the authors clearly hoped that their dedications would tally with his interests – and make them more likely candidates for his patronage.

George’s appointment as Lord High Admiral was reported on in print and few writers criticised it at the time. The characters of Wit and Beau praise the changes made by the “Female Administration” in the anonymous dialogue Mourning in colours (1702). Wit states that George’s new position is “Unexceptionable”, as his “Personal Bravery and Courage, was early shown” during his years in Denmark. In the pamphlet The history of living men (1702), Dunton also uses the appointment as Lord High Admiral to George’s advantage. The pamphlet was designed to be the first of a series of biographies of public figures, which Dunton starts with a biography of George. He briefly describes George’s upbringing in Denmark, his role in the 1689 Revolution, and his loyal marriage with Anne. Dunton dedicates the whole text to George, stating that “(Tho he is not Crown’d) he hath a Title to all our Hearts”. Whereas George was seen to be ancillary to Anne in The petticoat-government, here he is depicted as integral to the queen’s leadership. Dunton writes that “all things done upon, or beyond the Sea, in any part of the World” are within George’s remit: “the Admiralty being in a manner a separate Kingdom from the rest, Prince George of Denmark (the Lord High Admiral) may be reputed the VICE-ROY thereof”. George is, therefore, represented as an emperor of sorts – with a separate domain to his wife.

Court panegyrists were quick to pick up on the new opportunities for representing George, whose patronage of portraits often focused on military themes. An ode for an entertainment of musick on her majesty’s birth-day (1703) was set to music by the lutenist and singer John Abell to celebrate Anne’s birthday. In this piece, representatives of the classical goddess Pallas, Britain, Victory and
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20 See also Joseph Gander, The glory of her sacred majesty Queen Anne, in the royal navy, and her absolute sovereignty as empress of the sea, asserted and vindicated (London: for the author, 1703).
21 Gilbert Burnet claimed that George was not very good at the role: “the making Prince George our Lord High Admiral, proved in many instances very unhappy to the Nation”. See Gilbert Burnet, Bishop Burnet’s History of His Own Time, Volume 2 (London: for Thomas Ward, 1734), 358.
22 Anon, Mourning in colours. A dialogue between a city wit, and a St. James’s Beau (London: for the author, 1702), C1r.
23 Ibid., C3v.
24 Ibid., C3v.
26 Dunton, The history of living men: or, characters of the royal family, the ministers of state, and the principal natives of the three kingdoms (London: E. Mallett, 1702), F1r.
27 Ibid., G4v.
Triumph celebrate Anne's succession. They praise her hereditary claim to the throne: “May all Loyal Hearts Rejoice, / In Britain’s HEIR and Heaven’s CHOICE”. But the singers also compliment George by considering his role protecting the oceans and preserving the queen. “Long may Glorious ANNA Reign, / And Her CONSORT Guard the Main”, the representative of Britain sings. Whereas in the coronation poem George is seen to be a custodian for his wife, the singers use his position as Lord High Admiral to suggest that he is now also a custodian for the nation. This moves away from earlier depictions of female royal consorts, which suggested that their fertility could be a positive symbol of the nation’s future. But it nevertheless equates the male royal consort with the country’s security and future.

The poet laureate Nahum Tate expands this imagery in Portrait-royal (1703), an ekphrastic poem that responds to a portrait of Anne by John Closterman. In a recent analysis of Portrait-royal, Joseph Hone identifies it as an important political and literary statement about a future High Church revival under Anne. I share Hone’s sense of the importance of regeneration in this piece, but am particularly interested here in how Tate rejuvenates earlier ways of writing about royal consorts. The piece gestures towards a history of literature on royal marriage. Tate refers in a printed footnote to Edmund Waller’s poem To the queen occasioned upon sight of her majesty's picture (1636), citing the earlier poem about Henrietta Maria as a model for his own work. A more recent comparison piece, however, is Tate’s own poem On their majesties pictures, drawn to the life by Mr. Kneller (1692). This piece was authored in response to Godfrey Kneller’s portrait of William and Mary, and it was published in The Gentleman’s Journal, a short-lived publication combining news, poems and contributions from the readers. I suggest here that Portrait-royal adapts Tate’s earlier representation of the joint sovereigns, in order to depict Anne and George.

On their majesties pictures, drawn to the life by Mr. Kneller comprises eighty-two lines and can be divided into two halves. The first half ruminates on the relationship between poetry and painting, as Tate’s speaker modestly praises the painter’s capacity to depict the royal couple. William is described as a Caesar and Augustus, and Tate praises his military achievements such as routing James’s army at

---

28 Thomas Wall, An ode for an entertainment of musick on her majesty's birth-day, and, the success of her majesty's arms by sea and land (London: J. Nutt, 1703), B2.


the Battle of the Boyne. At the same time, Tate emphasizes William’s moderation: the “pious Hero” ensures that violence is “temper’d with the Mercy that restrain’d / His Troops from Slaughter when the Field was gain’d”.32 From this opening description of William, the second half of the poem then turns to Mary:

MARIA’s Soveraign Beauties when my Muse
Attempts to draw, and does her Colours chuse
Of liveliest Words, the Language proves too faint,
The bright Idea’s in my thought to paint.
’Tis Coldness all, all Flatness and Constraint.33

This fairly conventional modesty topos serves to elevate the queen. Tate draws on images of brightness and beauty that are familiar from poems about earlier queen consorts: including Waller’s piece for Henrietta Maria. This structure established Mary’s importance, but also makes her a secondary figure and separates her image from from William. She is a “second equal Wonder”, who follows her husband’s lead even as they share power.

In this earlier poem, Mary is seen to be an important influence within the court and for the nation while William is overseas. Tate’s speaker describes her regency:

How will they (gazing on Her Picture) say,
The FEMALE REGENT look’d when on our Shoar
She heard proud Lewis Naval Thunder roar,
As present to Herself and void of Fear,
As Her All-conquering Hero had been here.34

The uppercase letters typographically highlight Mary II’s authority. The repeated place markers that Tate uses are also important. The speaker draws attention to Mary II’s influence on “our Shoar” and “here”. Mary is thus perceived to be the protectress on British soil, in the face of a European threat. In addition, Tate suggests that Mary will set a precedent for the court in future by regenerating royal patronage. He looks forward to the series of Hampton Court Beauties paintings that Mary had recently commissioned from Kneller: “For after Cinthia, in her Brightness shown, / Her Train of Stars with Ease

32 Tate, “On their majesties pictures,” 3.
33 Ibid., 3.
34 Ibid., 3.
Mary’s artistic patronage enables her to shape the legacy of the joint sovereignty and provides a space for her authority even as William was exercising regal power.

Tate reworks the basic structure of this earlier poem in order to represent Anne and George in *Portrait-royal*. Where the first poem opens with a description of William and then moves to a description of Mary, the second poem describes Anne first and George second. Anne is represented as William’s successor: whereas he is described as Augustus, she is England’s Augusta. George is thereby subtly associated with Mary. Tate praises George’s piety and capacity for artistic patronage, as he had previously praised the queen. “State and Power are, indeed, Venerable Things; yet, at Best, only Transient Royalties”, Tate states in the poem’s dedication to George, “when Religion has the Ascendant at Court, her retinue of useful Arts and Sciences, cannot fail of Encouragement”.

While the structure of *Portrait-royal* starts to equate George with Mary, the images that are used to describe the male royal consort differ. Tate’s speaker prophesies about Britain’s naval prosperity in the final three stanzas of the poem. Here Tate returns to the naval imagery that was common in other texts about the prince:

Last, Let the swelling Sea o'erlook his Bound,

With floating Forts and rowling Castles Crown'd:

Thy Charge, Illustrious GEORGE, Britannia’s Pride.

The sea and its environs are masculinised, in order to be seen as the prince’s province. In a similar manner to Dunton, Tate denotes a specific area for George’s authority. Moreover, as in Gander’s poem, George is patriotically seen to control this area on behalf of “Britannia”. The prince is thus given a clear role in national politics, and in turn inspires a sense of national ambition:

But now All starting from their silent Trance

The Pompous Tow’rs with Stately Motion Dance,

And Western Waves from Far with hurrying Hast Advance,

As with surprising Tidings Charg’d, they strive

Which with the wond’rous News shall first Arrive.

These lines, which repeatedly conclude with active verbs, create a kinetic energy that drives the final part of the poem. Tate proceeds to introduce other military heroes, including the Duke of Ormond and
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37 Ibid., A3v.
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the Earl of Marlborough. The structure establishes a sense that George is inspired by the queen, and in turn inspires other men. Tate’s poem builds on his own earlier literary conventions for representing the Stuart queen but crafts a specific vocabulary for the male consort.

II: Religion and princely intercession

While Anne, like Mary and William, was celebrated as a Protestant monarch, religion continued to be a divisive political issue in the first years of her reign. In November 1702, Parliament voted on the “occasional conformity bill”, which proposed to penalise Protestant dissenters who attended some Anglican services but for the most practised alternative forms of the Protestant faith. The “occasional conformity bill” sought to exclude occasional conformists from office – and, as a consequence, purge a large number of Whigs.39 George was in a difficult position during this debate, as a voting member of the House of Lords but also an occasional conformist himself. People such as Narcissus Luttrell watched George’s actions with interest, as they thought that his decision on the matter would reflect the queen’s opinion. When George voted in favour of passing the bill without any amendments, he tacitly accepted that this was the preferred course of action for Anne.40

Most of the pamphlets in which George appears pertained to the ‘occasional conformity bill’. How did supporters and opponents of the bill use the prince’s image in print? In earlier years, as the above chapters have demonstrated, writers used the prospect of queenly intercession to intervene in religious disputes. When the Catholic Henrietta Maria arrived in 1625, devotional writers reworked the theme of queenly intercession and thereby expressed concerns about her possible influence. By the Restoration period, however, queenly intercession ceased to be associated with the Stuart queens. Perhaps because of Henrietta Maria’s legacy, writers were unlikely to use this theme to describe Catherine and instead downplayed her political agency. Here, I suggest that some writers returned to the theme of the consort’s intercession in 1702, to symbolise – and utilise – George’s possible influence with Anne. Although George ultimately conformed to the policy favoured by Anne’s advisers in Parliament, writers used his image in more complex ways in print.

40 Narcissus Luttrell, A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714, Volume 5 (Oxford: the University Press, 1857), 244.
Prior to the vote on the non-conformity bill, Anne and her advisors used the prince’s image as an endorsement of particular policies. Around the same time that the bill entered the Houses of Parliament, George suffered a major illness. This was his second health scare of the year, as he had suffered a notably bad bout of asthma in August 1702. The queen and her advisors had taken advantage of George’s first illness, travelling to Bath so that George could take the waters. On the journeys Anne and George stopped in Oxford, Cirencester and visited Bristol.41 The queen distributed gifts and conducted ceremonies touching for the King’s Evil, while the couple’s journey was reported in numerous contemporary texts. 42 Anne seems to have treated the visit to Bath as a royal progress, which enabled her to consolidate the images that had been associated with her reign to that point. A poem delivered to Anne at Oxford praises the start of her reign: “So spreading OAKS from lovely WINDSOR born / Shall shelter BRITAIN, which they now adorn”.43 The oak, a national symbol associated with the Stuart reign, is here seen to provide material for people to build English ships and increase England’s imperial strength under Anne. Concerning though George’s poor health must have been for the queen and her advisors, they also made use of the opportunities that it provided for her image.

Later in 1702, as opposition to the non-conformity bill mounted, George experienced a more serious health scare. He was treated by the royal physicians for two weeks and his illness was reported in the news.44 When George recovered, Anne and her advisers suggested that his good health was a sign of God’s favour to the English nation. On 12 November, Anne issued a thanksgiving prayer for “the late happy Recovery of thy Servant his Royal Highness” that hopes that George’s recovery will be “a lasting Blessing to her Majesty and these Kingdoms”.45 On 3 December, a second thanksgiving prayer was issued which coupled celebration for George’s recovery with celebration for England’s recent victories in the European Wars.46 Joseph Trelawny, Bishop of Exeter, delivered a sermon that claimed George’s recovery showed “God has been pleas’d, to make his own Blessings, and our Thanksgivings Entire”.47

41 Poems delivered in Bristol were printed in Phœnix moriendo revixit (Bristol: W.B, 1702).
42 A full account of the journey is given in David Jones, A compleat history of Europe: or, a view of the affairs thereof, civil and military, for the year, 1702 (London: H. Rhodes, J. Nicholson and Andr. Bell, 1703), 307-310.
43 Anon, The queen’s famous progress, or; her majesty’s royal journey to the Bath, and happy return (London: J.W, 1702), 3.
44 Luttrell, A Brief, 232.
45 Church of England, A prayer to be used on Thursday, Novemb. 12. 1702 (London: by Charles Bill, and the executrix of Thomas Newcomb, deceas’d, 1702), 3.
46 Church of England, A prayer to be used on Thursday, Decemb. 3. 1702 (London: by Charles Bill, and the executrix of Thomas Newcomb, deceas’d, 1702).
47 Joseph Trelawny, A sermon preach’d before the queen, and both houses of parliament (London: for Tho. Bennet, and sold by C. Yeo, in Exon, 1702), B5’.
Gratitude, he states, “will most certainly engage God on our side” in future.\textsuperscript{48} Anne requested that Trelawny publish the sermon, which went through at least three editions in print. The Prince’s recovery is depicted here as part of God’s broader blessing, and is implicitly seen to condone even the more controversial policies going through the Houses of Parliament.

Tellingly, writers who supported the ‘occasional conformity bill’ tended to avoid mentioning the prince. The only writer who advocates the change in policy and describes George is Joshua Barnes, whose three-part tract \textit{The good old way: or, three brief discourses} (1703) debates toleration and opens with an allegorical representation of the 1702 coronation. In Barnes’ coronation scene, Anne is named as Gratiana. He suggests that a rogue group of zealots oppose Gratiana’s accession: a “Sort of Men, who talk’d indeed of \textit{Loyalty, Peace and Religion}, as much, or more than any other, altho’ their \textit{Principles and Practice}, and very \textit{Nature ran Counter to all}”.\textsuperscript{49} Barnes’ description extends the long-standing tradition of representing religious dissenters as extremists and suggests that non-conformists are not fully loyal to Anne. Barnes says little of Gratiana’s consort, who remains nameless throughout, although he praises the queen’s love for her husband.\textsuperscript{50} The fact that writers supporting the bill did not mention George indicates that there was some awkwardness about how it might affect his status.

By contrast, opponents of the ‘occasional conformity bill’ were much more likely to refer to George. He is mentioned in six tracts supporting the case for occasional conformity. John Shute Barrington’s pamphlet \textit{The interest of England consider’d} (1702) points out that the proposed legislation would have excluded Prince George from office if introduced earlier. It would have “render’d his Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark incapable of that High Trust which he has executed to the great Honour of the Nation, in the Protection of our Trade, and the signal Victory that we have so lately obtain’d”. Barrington poses the rhetorical question whether this would “not have eclips’d the Glory of her present Majesty’s Government”.\textsuperscript{51} Barrington thus uses the Prince’s status as leverage to dissuade supporters of the bill.

Other non-conformist writers began to revive the association between the royal consort and intercession. Robert Fleming, the Presbyterian minister of the Scots Church in London, expresses the hope that George will influence Anne in the introduction to his pamphlet \textit{The blessedness of those who}...
die in the Lord (1702). Fleming praises William’s and Mary’s tolerationist policies during the last reign. He hopes that Anne will follow a similar example, inspired by her husband: “from the Education of the excellent Prince, that lies in her Bosom, as well as from every thing else, [Anne] sees how necessary Liberty of Conscience is”. Fleming emphasises and applauds the loving relationship between the royal couple, but also highlights the opportunities that this might bring for George to make a difference for his non-conformist brethren.

The Lutheran community in London similarly placed emphasis on George’s possible agency and his capacity to intercede with Anne. In August 1702, the ministers of the Danish Church in Marine Square sent an Address that was then printed in The London Gazette. An increasingly common genre of political writing, the political Address advertised support for the regime but also raised awareness about specific causes. The ministers ask Anne to “continue the Favours and most Gracious Privileges which we have obtained in their late Majesties Reign”. They note that they were “born in the Hereditary Dominions of your Royal Consort, and [are] now happily settled under the benign Influence of Your Majesty’s most Gracious Government”. Going one step further, the Lutheran minister John Edzard dedicated his sermon God save the queen (1702) to George. Edzard offers “the most Hearty Acclamations of Your Lutherans, at the Proclamation and Coronation of Her Most Sacred Majesty” to George. He then appeals for assistance. “Let me beg of Your Clemency the Favour of one Word with Her Majesty”, Edzard writes, “which will be instead of Thousands of others”. Edzard suggests that George’s proximity to Anne could make him a spokesman for Lutherans, and urges him to intercede with the queen.

This led some writers to take quite a different approach to George’s recovery from sickness to Anne and her advisers. The satirical Whig periodical The Observator pairs a discussion of the occasional conformity bill with a discussion of George’s sickness in its issue 14-18 November. The Observator,
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56 John Edzard, God save the queen! The most hearty acclamations of the Lutherans in London. Expressed at the royal proclamation and coronation of her most sacred majesty Queen Anne (London: F Collins for Thomas Bennet, 1702), dedication unpaginated.
which was arranged by John Tutchin, imparted the news through creative dialogues. In this issue, the Observator and a representative of a Country-man ruminate on the partisan motivations that were driving the bill. “We have a great bussle about Offices betwixt Parties”, Country-man notes: “Whigs are to be put out, and Tories are to be kept in, our Officers, they say, must be of one set, must be of a like cut and size in matters of Religion and State”. The Observator is similarly suspicious and questions Tory ethics: “it’s a strange thing that Atheists should trouble their Heads about Hypocrisie in Religion; and that Men who go to no Church at all, should endeavour to keep others from going to a Conventicle”. From this sceptical message, the next few paragraphs report on George’s recovery. Country-man expresses his relief for George’s health, and asks Observator to deliver a celebratory poem. Observator states that he cannot deliver a good poem extempore, before producing a panegyric.

The speaker praises his “unparallel’d Conduct” in military affairs, for example. At the same time, the speaker also places emphasis on the prince’s “Moderate Temper to Mankind”: a loaded focus on moderation, which held connotations of religious toleration. Crucially, the Observator states that “Denmark’s Darling and our Britain’s Love” provides a model for his subjects:

Our hopes are now reviv’d, as in the Bloom
Our Prince is rescu’d from the craving Tomb [...] Like You [George and Anne], may we, your Subjects, all Unite; In Harmony, as well as you, Delight; And England against England never fight.

Referring to the prince using collective pronouns, the speaker emphasises a sense of communal loyalty. This loyalty counters the risk of division within the country, which links to the speakers’ earlier discussions about party politics. Suggesting that England is turning against itself, the author hopes that the nation’s shared celebration of George’s recovery will promote mutual understanding. If the different communities in the English public can unite like George and Anne – whose marriage was based on a principle of accommodation – there might be hopes for the principle of co-existence between religious groups.

As we have seen, writers used the idea of the interceding prince to reflect on contemporary religious politics, as earlier in the century people had reflected on the implications of a Catholic queen consort petitioning the King. At the start of the Jacobean period, intercession invested the queen
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consort with a symbolic model of power that later came to be troubling when writers feared the actual influence of a Catholic queen consort in England. In 1702, the use of this imagery seems to have again been largely symbolic. The non-conformist writers who appealed for George’s intercession were not as bold as the Catholic writers who appealed to Henrietta Maria in 1625. Rather than ask the Prince to modify the queen’s faith altogether, these writers request that he provide an additional voice that is slanted in their favour. The comparative modesty of these later requests might reflect on the perceived utility of petitioning the royal consort in the early eighteenth century. By 1702 Anne’s authority was mediated through Parliament to a greater extent than during the earlier reigns. Notably, while few advocates of the political changes mention George in a positive way, there is also little sense that people were worried about the influence he might have on Anne. The prospect of the royal consort’s intercession therefore held less urgency than in the first part of the century, although this theme was still a useful tool. The idea that George could influence Anne might have provided a symbolic model of authority, which compensated for his lack of political autonomy, as opposed to representing his actual perceived power.

III: Conclusion

In the months after Anne’s accession, writers tried to get a sense of George’s role in the queen’s government and find positive ways to gloss the prince’s unusual circumstance. Both the queen and the prince perceived his image to be important to her iconography, and George seems to have encouraged a form of self-representation that concentrated on naval images after his appointment as Lord High Admiral in May 1702. This theme was certainly embraced by court panegyrists such as Tate, who were able to use naval images to develop earlier representations of Stuart queens. As a consequence, writers were able to explain the balance of the royal marriage and also praise the male royal consort in ways that seemed expedient. This meant building on some of the patterns in earlier representations of the queen consorts but developing a new form of iconography that was particularly suited for a male consort. It suggests the importance of gender for the royal consort’s representation more generally, as writers had to find a way to accommodate the prince within pre-existing templates.

Printed literature about George also throws into relief some of the major changes in representing the royal consorts in the years that came before. While writers adapted previous models of writing about the female queen consorts to describe George, they also returned to a traditional model
for the consort’s authority which had seemed less appealing in 1662, 1685 and indeed 1689. At these successions, the queen consort’s perceived agency and their capacity to intervene in politics was downplayed. This might have been because of concerns about the queen’s Catholicism in 1662 and 1685, but it also seems to have been connected with broader concerns about order and the nature of royal authority in 1689. Crucially, while writers addressed George by raising the theme of intercession, very few called for him to sire a new heir to the throne. The fact that many non-conformists reached out to the Lutheran prince to maintain the status quo, rather than convert members of the public or his wife, suggests a change in tone. The prince, and indeed the royal marriage, was not seen to represent a different future in 1702, as much as provide a symbol of continuity and stability for the present. Traditional models of the consort’s representation might have helped to achieve this objective, as writers drew from the memory and models of the former royal consorts to form a language for the prince.
PART TWO: THE ROYAL FAMILY AFTER 1660
Chapter Seven
Maternity and Henrietta Maria’s role as Queen Mother

The Queen Mother of England, Henrietta Maria, received a mixed reception when she returned to England in autumn 1660 after almost twenty years. The weekly newsbooks reported that Henrietta Maria was welcomed with “great acclamations of joy” by members of the public when she entered London.¹ The diarist Samuel Pepys, on the other hand, gave a different version of events. He missed seeing Henrietta Maria’s entry, but wrote in his diary that there were “very few bonfires in the City, not above three in all London for the Queenes coming; whereby I guess that (as I believed before) her coming doth please but very few”.² Pepys was not himself a hostile observer. His wife Elizabeth was put into a “very joyful condition” eighteen days later, when he secured a joint visit to Henrietta Maria.³ But his assessment of public feeling shows that her legacy continued to be divisive. How did writers explain the return of a queen who had been blamed for so many of Charles I’s failings? What strategies did writers use to represent Henrietta Maria’s status as Stuart matriarch, and to what extent could she be made a positive icon for the Stuart dynasty’s future?

We know that writers trod a careful line when they welcomed Charles II back to England. As was the case for all Stuart successes, but especially 1660, writers were concerned with the most effective ways in which to represent the past. Panegyristists balanced enthusiasm for the future, epitomised by the virile young king, with respect for his father’s memory.⁴ A raft of histories, elegies and panegyrics depicted Charles I as a martyr, whose maltreatment could now be compensated by his son’s success.⁵ Through legislation such as the Act of Oblivion, Charles II and his advisors created a careful narrative about England’s history and promised that people’s behaviour during the Civil Wars

¹ The Parliamentary Intelligencer 45 (29 October – 5 November); The Mercurius Publicus 45 (1 November – 8 November).
³ Ibid., 297.
and Republic could not now be held against them. By putting aside former grudges, at least in theory, the king and his advisors tried to avoid divisive issues and thereby reduce contention about Charles II’s rule. Although we know that these careful uses of history were perceived to be important for Charles II’s iconography, very few scholars have considered how his mother’s return might have invited more difficult questions about Stuart history. For the most part, studies of Restoration literature have consigned Henrietta Maria to a brief paragraph, concentrating on the return of the king without considering the parallel return of the queen.

Contemporary writers did not make the same oversight. In what follows I concentrate on poetry about Henrietta Maria in the early 1660s, analysing the evolution of a mode of writing that had been associated with her earlier career as queen consort. These poems combine different genres, including aspects from journey poems, panegyric and estate poetry. Some were written by leading writers formerly employed by Henrietta Maria, such as Edmund Waller and Abraham Cowley. Others were written by writers who were less high-profile at the time, including John Crouch and Katherine Philips. Compared with the outpouring of poetry that celebrated Charles II’s return, the number of works about Henrietta Maria is slender. Just two panegyrics celebrated her landing in 1660, despite the fact that she appeared at the same time in numerous histories about the earlier Stuart reigns and held pride of place in some newsbook reports about the royal family’s actions. I analyse the issues surrounding her maternal representation in these early panegyrics, and then examine a number of later poems that were printed up to the 1665 completion of her building works at Somerset House. A considerable level of intertextuality between these poems suggests that writers were being careful about how they framed Henrietta Maria’s image. The project of representing Henrietta Maria encouraged
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these poets to reassess earlier motifs for the Stuart dynasty, as they imagined the role of a Queen Mother in Restoration England.

I: The legacy of Caroline culture

What were the common themes in Henrietta Maria’s representation before she entered exile, and how were these images deployed in political debate? The first years of Henrietta Maria’s marriage with Charles I were not smooth, but the king and queen consort became closer in the late 1620s and their first child was born in 1629. Throughout the 1630s and 1640s, the perception of affection between Charles and Henrietta Maria was an important aspect of Caroline culture. From the winter of 1630-1 Charles and Henrietta Maria sponsored and performed in expensive court entertainments for one another almost every Shrovetide and twelfth night. In these masques, Henrietta Maria cultivated neoplatonic themes of love and chastity that represented the royal marriage as an emblem of harmony. In the entertainment Luminalia (1638), for example, the ‘Garden of Britanides’ is depicted as a blessed realm: “the unanimous and magnificent vertues of the King and Queenes Majesties making this happy Island a patterne to all Nations”. In addition to the court masques, Henrietta Maria and Charles patronised court poets such as Edmund Waller, who published a series of poems that celebrated the royal couple by turning their formal courtship into a mythical romance.

If court poets sought to elevate the royal couple above the mortal fray within their texts, these neoplatonic ideals were also always formed in an earthly political context. The two leading analysts of Henrietta Maria’s patronage, Erica Veevers and Karen Britland, show that she promoted neoplatonic imagery as part of her own self-fashioning. This enabled Henrietta Maria to emphasise her loyalty to Charles according to the chaste principles of Neoplatonism, but also advocate specific political approaches. The plot of Luminalia, for example, shows exiled Flamen priests being offered sanctuary in the Garden of Britanides. This setting creates an image of an ideal world, in which persecuted
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Catholics might be protected. Furthermore, Britland points out, *Luminalia* was performed when Henrietta Maria was trying to persuade Charles to offer her mother, Marie de Medicis, sanctuary in England. In light of Henrietta Maria’s desire to see Marie safely housed, Britland postulates that “the association of England with a safe haven [is] a particularly poignant one”. Henrietta Maria seems to have recognised the advantages of using royal romance in her personal iconography, and to have put such imagery to good effect.

In addition to the language of royal romance, maternal imagery for Henrietta Maria blossomed with the growth of hers and Charles’ brood. Henrietta Maria was pregnant several times in the 1630s, and each of her successful births prompted a surge in court panegyric. The University of Oxford and the University of Cambridge published volumes of poetry to celebrate Henrietta Maria’s successful pregnancies. Reading these university anthologies across the decade, Ann Baynes Coiro notes that Henrietta Maria is often depicted as “the romantic heroine to Charles’s hero, the mythical embodiment of the peace Charles came to espouse”. At the same time, Coiro suggests that representations of Henrietta Maria’s future influence over her children came to be more problematic. By the terms of her marriage contract, Henrietta Maria could have a say in her children’s education before they turned fourteen. The queen was known to encourage members of her household to convert to Catholicism, and people feared that she would try to do the same for her children. While the university poets use Marian imagery to compare Henrietta Maria’s maternity with the Virgin Mary, and by implication the birth of her children with the birth of Christ, these images also invited Catholic connotations. Throughout the 1630s, as Henrietta Maria’s family increased, Coiro argues that the poems show increasing “self-consciousness and unease”. These poets probe early tensions about the influence Henrietta Maria might have on her children as well as her spouse.

The queen consort’s perceived influence over Charles also raised serious concerns about his leadership. As disagreements between Charles and Parliament began to escalate, politicians claimed that Henrietta Maria was involved in “popish plots” to corrupt the king. In 1643, these concerns
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culminated when the House of Commons decided to impeach Henrietta Maria for High Treason. Although Henrietta Maria left England at this point, her image still continued to be important in printed debates about Charles’ leadership and the prospect of a settlement. In 1645, for example, Charles’ opponents captured a series of letters that had been exchanged between the king and queen. In these letters, Henrietta Maria offered advice to her husband on dealing with his political opponents, and counselled him to support his loyal Catholic subjects. Parliament decided to publish these letters as proof that Henrietta Maria had undue influence on Charles, and that as a consequence negotiations would not be likely to succeed. “The King’s Counsels are wholly managed by the Queen;” the editors warn the reader: “though she be of the weaker sexe, borne an alien, bred up in a Contrary Religion”.

Significant concerns about Henrietta Maria’s maternal influence continued after Charles I’s execution. From her base in France, Henrietta Maria was an important advocate for Charles II as he campaigned to gain the throne of England. She resided first at the Louvre and later at the Palais Royal, where she was supported by an annual stipend from her sister-in-law, Anne of Austria. The former queen consort’s activities were important for royalist networks, as she provided a hub for emigrés and also sought to gain financial support from international creditors. On the other hand, representation of the Queen Mother in England encouraged negative attitudes towards her son’s prospective restoration. In 1654, for example, Henrietta Maria was heavily criticised when she placed her youngest son, Henry Duke of Gloucester, under the supervision of Catholic priests and attempted to convert him. Henrietta Maria insisted to Charles that her behaviour was consistent with the terms of her original marriage contract. Furious, Charles instructed Henry to leave Paris and publically criticised his mother. The republican newsbooks in England gleefully reported this rift between the Stuart family members, and

16 Michelle A. White, “‘She is the man, And Raignes’: popular representations of Henrietta Maria during the English Civil Wars,” in Queens & Power in Medieval and Early Modern England, eds. Robert Bucholz and Carole Levin (Lincoln: Univ of Nebraska Press, 2009), 205-224.
17 On the publication of this tract see Diane Purkiss, Literature, Gender and Politics during the English Civil War (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 74; Laura Lunger Knoppers, Politicizing Domesticity (Cambridge: CUP, 2011).
18 The Kings cabinet opened: or, certain packets of secret letters & papers, written with the Kings own hand, and taken in his cabinet at Nasby-Field, June 14. 1645 (London: for Robert Bostock, 1645), G2. The success of this publication inspires others, including: The queenes letter to the kings most excellent majesty ([NA]: 1647); The queens majesties message and declaration to the right honourable the peers of England, assembled in Parliament; concerning the kings majesty, and the army (London: for L. White, 1649); and The queens majesties letter to the Parliament of England, concerning her dread sovereign lord the king, and her proposals and desires, touching his royall person (London: L. White, 1649).
suggested that Henrietta Maria’s actions showed the dangers that would come if the Stuart monarchy was brought back in England.\footnote{The information in this paragraph is indebted to Nicole Greenspan, “Public Scandal, Political Controversy and Familial Conflict in the Stuart Courts in Exile: the struggle to convert the Duke of Gloucester in 1654,” \textit{Albion} 35 no. 3 (2003): 398-427.}

In addition to the newsbook reports of Henrietta Maria’s behaviour in France, republican writers in England cultivated negative public memories about the former Caroline court. A number of prose secret histories were published in the early 1650s, each of which claimed to prove the hypocrisy of the early Stuart monarchs by revealing their private dealings.\footnote{Alastair Bellany, \textit{The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660} (Cambridge: CUP, 2002).} Henrietta Maria appears in several secret histories that describe the reign of Charles I.\footnote{Anon, \textit{The life and reigne of King Charls, Or the pseudo-martyr discovered} (London: for W. Reybold, 1651); Arthur Wilson, \textit{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).} In the provocatively titled \textit{The divine catastrophe of the kingly family of the house of stuarts} (1652), for example, Edward Peyton claims that “sin was hatched from an egg to a Dragon, to devour the holiness of life” at Charles I’s court: “insomuch that the Masks and Playes at Whitehal were used only for Incentives to lust”.\footnote{Edward Peyton, \textit{The divine catastrophe of the kingly family of the house of Stuarts: or, A short history of the rise, reign, and ruine thereof} (London: for Giles Calvert, 1652), D8'.} Peyton states that Henrietta Maria had an affair with her companion Henry Jermyn – who was residing with her in France when the text was published – during her marriage. The Queen Mother’s apparently lascivious history undermines her son’s cause, as Peyton casts doubt on Charles’ hereditary claim to the throne. “No issue from thence can either be legitimate or pious, from so ungodly a derivative,” Peyton writes.\footnote{Ibid., K2'.} Henrietta Maria’s perceived activities were therefore important for Charles’ reputation, as they had been for her husband’s leadership.

Henrietta Maria’s legacy came to be most potent in the months leading up to the Restoration, as writers debated whether or not Charles should be offered the throne. While General Monck and the Houses of Parliament deliberated, opponents of Charles’ return took to print. John Milton’s antimonarchical pamphlet \textit{The readie and easie way to establish a free commonwealth} (1659) was published in April 1660, one month before Charles arrived. This is actually a second version of the pamphlet, in which Milton expands his earlier arguments against the monarchy in a last-ditch effort to stop Charles’ return. He suggests that Henrietta Maria will be a model for the restored court. “A king must be ador’d like a Demigod”, Milton grimly warns:
there will be then the *loos imploiments* of court service, which will be then thought honorable. There will be a queen also of no less charge; in most likelihood outlandish and a Papist; besides a queen mother such alreadie; together with both thir courts and numerous train: then a royal issue, and ere long severally thir *sumptuous courts*; to the multiplying of a servile crew.25

Milton identifies three main problems with Henrietta Maria: she is foreign, Catholic and a spendthrift. He weaves these fairly standard criticisms together with emotive language about “loos imploiments” which evokes a sense of court corruption, and might remind readers about Henrietta Maria’s recent representation in secret history texts. Crucially, the Queen Mother will provide a precedent for Charles’ future wife. If Henrietta Maria is the matriarch of the Restoration court, Milton suggests, the Stuart monarchy will be restored unreformed.

Charles II’s supporters, as well as his opponents, were concerned by the return of the queen. Laura Lunger Knoppers analyses the most successful piece of royalist propaganda, Charles I’s purported memoir *Eikon basilike* (1649), in *Politicizing Domesticity from Henrietta Maria to Milton’s Eve* (2011). In this text, Knoppers notes, Henrietta Maria is represented only briefly when Charles I laments the harm that has been done to his wife. The *Eikon basilike* thus “assimilates her [Henrietta Maria] to a dynastic function: her role as loving wife and mother”, and effectively marginalises her image.26 Similarly, royalists who set out to counter the arguments of republican writers in the late 1650s steered clear of the Queen Mother’s image as much as possible. Take the pro-Stuart pamphlet *The army’s declaration* (1660), which responds to earlier claims in a republican pamphlet that Henrietta Maria would try to convert her son.27 The author of *The army’s declaration* does not deny that Henrietta Maria will try to influence her children. Instead, he downplays this risk by speculating that she might not return to England at all. It is “ten to one whether ever the Queen return again,” he states: “though the King be restored to his Right”.28 This tactic deflates the earlier pamphlet’s criticism of Henrietta Maria, yet without an actual defence of the Queen Mother. While writers might be prepared to welcome Charles
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28 Anon, *The army’s declaration: being a true alarum in answer to a false and fiery one made lately by a member of that destable rump and printed for Livewell Chapman. By a member of the army now in London* [1660], B1v.
II, then, Henrietta Maria represented aspects of early Stuart rule that had been unpopular. Her image crystallised tensions about the relationship between the past and the present, and publicists keen to celebrate the Restoration monarchy would have to find a way of writing about her that could navigate her past.

II: The Queen Mother’s journey to England

Once he had returned to England, Charles II made it clear that he wanted to protect his mother’s rights and status.\(^{29}\) He established a parliamentary committee to oversee the return of her jointure properties, many of which had been sequestered by the state and sold off during the Protectorate.\(^{30}\) The committee’s powers were reported in the weekly newsbooks, suggesting that there was some public interest in Henrietta Maria’s position.\(^{31}\) In addition, the Queen Mother had an important role in the international political networks that were being re-established by the early Restoration state. She travelled between France and England several times during these years and was instrumental in the successful marriage negotiations between her youngest daughter Henriette and her nephew the Duke of Orleans. She went to France for their wedding in January 1661, returning to England in July 1662 with her young natural grandchild, the Duke of Monmouth, who was known to be Charles’ natural son. Henrietta Maria’s movement between nations showed that she continued to have a role in diplomatic networks, as well as an important position at the domestic court.

One of the first poems to celebrate Henrietta Maria’s return was written by her former employee, Abraham Cowley, before she landed. As secretary to Henry Jermyn in the 1640s, Cowley acted as a cypher writer for Henrietta Maria and Charles I and later worked as a royalist agent. When he returned to England, though, Cowley was heavily criticised by royalists for publishing a collection of Poems (1656) which seemed to accept the Protectoral government. In the preface to Poems, Cowley

\(^{29}\) Carolyn Harris, Queenship and Revolution in Early Modern Europe: Henrietta Maria and Marie Antoinette (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

\(^{30}\) By August 1660, prior to Henrietta Maria’s arrival, her Attorney-General, Peter Ball, was entering requests to inspect certain houses and collect their rents. See Calendar of Treasury Books, 1660-1667, compiled William A. Shaw (London: for his Majesty’s Stationery Office, by Mackie and Co. Ltd, 1904), 15.

\(^{31}\) Mercurius Publicus 46 (8 November – 15 November 1660); Mercurius Politicus 49 (29 November – 6 December 1660).
encouraged readers to practise the “Art of Oblivion” and recognise the new government’s authority.\textsuperscript{32} This expedient art appropriates the earlier language of royal clemency, which was associated with the Stuart monarchs. Andrew Shifflet notes that it was a bold move: “Cowley made it clear, if it had not been clear already, that the ancient virtue of clemency, so lately unmanageable as a monarchical tool, would survive in some new form more or less independent of kings”.\textsuperscript{33} Cowley was therefore in a difficult position when Charles II was restored. That May, he wrote an \textit{Ode, upon the blessed restoration and returne of his sacred majestie, Charls the Second} (1660), which is designed to praise Charles and perhaps compensate for his earlier comments. In this piece Cowley anticipates the return of the Queen Mother, and starts to move towards a new style of writing about her position.

For an ode “Upon his Majesties Restoration and Return”, Cowley’s piece spends surprisingly little time describing the new king. The poem opens by reflecting upon the nation’s former experience, as the speaker addresses the “peaceful Starrs” that have exerted their “universal gentle Influence” to create England’s newfound security.\textsuperscript{34} Cowley’s speaker dwells on the nation’s felicity before the civil wars:

\begin{quote}
Shall we again (good Heaven!) that \textit{Blessed pair} behold,
Which the abused \textit{People} fondly sold
For the bright \textit{Fruit} of the \textit{forbidden} Tree,
By seeking all like \textit{gods} to be?
Will \textit{Peace} her \textit{Haleyon Nest} venture to build
Upon a \textit{Shore} with \textit{Shipwracks} fill’d?
And trust that Sea, which she can hardly say
Sh’has known these twenty years one calmy day?\textsuperscript{35}
\end{quote}

To describe felicity and innocence as the “Blessed Pair” would remind the reader of Adam and Eve. This implied pre-lapsarian idyll recalls the Caroline court through the speaker’s specific reference to the period “twenty years” earlier, which would be the late 1630s. The speaker also uses images of the

\textsuperscript{32} Abraham Cowley, \textit{Poems: viz. I. Miscellanies. II. The mistress, or, love verses. III. Pindarique odes. And IV. Davideis, or, a sacred poem of the troubles of David} (London: [by Thomas Newcombe] for Humphrey Moseley, 1656), A4’.


\textsuperscript{34} Abraham Cowley, \textit{Ode. Upon the blessed restoration and return of his sacred majestie Charls the Second} (London: for Henry Herringman, 1660), A2’.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., A3’.
“Halcyon Nest”: an emblem of harmony that was common at Henrietta Maria’s and Charles I’s court.36 This language creates a sense of nostalgia for a period that is lost. Crucially, the speaker emphasises the innocence of the past, and suggests that this was disrupted through the actions of “abused people” rather than as a result of the actions of the couple themselves.

If the opening stanzas of Cowley’s poem evoke a sense of nostalgia, the Ode also moves away from the tropes of romance and harmony once associated with Henrietta Maria’s image. The speaker looks forward to the Queen Mother’s return. “Where’s now the Royal Mother, where,” the speaker asks: “To take her mighty share”. The speaker then addresses Henrietta Maria as he imagines her journey:

God has a bright Example made of Thee,
To shew that Woman-kind may be
Above that Sex, which her Superior seems,
In wisely managing the wide Extreams
Of great Affliction, great Felicity.

How well those different Virtues Thee become,

Daughter of Triumphs, Wife of Martyrdom!37

This passage creates what I will term an aesthetic of affliction, in which Henrietta Maria’s suffering is integral to her praise. Cowley adapts traditional praise of Henrietta Maria’s heritage and marriage. Even as the speaker highlights the fact that Henrietta Maria is the daughter and wife of Kings, as had many writers in the past, he subtly draws attention to the fact that those male relatives are deceased. Far from the “extremes of power and beauty” that Caroline poets such as Edmund Waller saw in the queen consort, the speaker praises Henrietta Maria for her capacity to manage the “wide Extreams” of fate.38 Resilience, rather than romance or even reproduction, is here integral to Henrietta Maria’s persona as Queen Mother.

Katherine Philips responds to Cowley’s aesthetic of affliction in her piece To the Queen-mother’s majesty, Jan I. 1660/1 (1661), which was written just a few months later. Carol Barash argues that Philips is particularly interested in the theme of friendship in this poem. She asserts that Philips’

37 Cowley, Ode: c2.
speaker concludes with an “image of friendship as mystical union”. In fact, To the Queen-mother’s majesty culminates with a poignant couplet about maternal grief, and the theme of suffering is vital throughout the poem. Philips wrote it upon Henrietta Maria’s departure to France in January 1661, less than twelve weeks after the death of Henry Duke of Gloucester and just a few days after the death of Henrietta Maria’s eldest daughter Princess Mary. I suggest here that Philips’ poem merges panegyric with elegy and thereby consolidates the importance of suffering in Cowley’s earlier poem, moving away from earlier representations of Henrietta Maria as queen consort. It is possible that Philips was drawing directly on Cowley’s poem. As Elizabeth Scott Bauman shows, Cowley and Philips read one another’s writing at this time, while readers “thought of them [Cowley and Philips] as joint proponents of a similar style and ethos”.

Throughout To the Queen-mother’s majesty, Philips’ speaker addresses Henrietta Maria with direct pronouns that establish intimacy between the speaker and the subject. The tone is penitent, as the speaker offers collective apology for Henrietta Maria’s former troubles. She describes the English nation as diseased, echoing Cowley’s description of the country’s “various complicated Ill” in the 1660 Ode. Henrietta Maria’s suffering is a key motif of the piece. In the poem’s central lines, the speaker describes Henrietta Maria’s experience:

But as our Active, so our Passive, ill
Hath made your share to be the sufferer’s still
“As from our Mischiefs all your troubles grew,
'Tis your sad right to suffer for them too”.

This is a double-edged compliment. As a member of the royal family Henrietta Maria is seen to represent the English populace. But as the people’s representative, she also suffers for their sins. As in Cowley’s ode the theme of affliction is important, and Philips likewise suggests that Henrietta Maria’s perseverance through suffering can help her surpass her own male relatives. “We may reade in story of
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41 Cowley, Ode, A4’.
42 Katherine Philips, “To the Queen-mother’s Majesty, Jan I 1660/1,” in Poems by the incomparable Mrs K.P (London: J.G for Rich. Marriott, 1664), B8’. 
some few / That fought like him,” says Philips’ speaker about Henrietta Maria’s father Henry IV: “none that indur’d like you”.

Unlike most succession texts, which moved from elegiac recollections of Charles I to encomia of Charles II, Philips’ and Cowley’s descriptions of Henrietta Maria retain their elegiac tone. As these poems discuss Henrietta Maria’s journeying, they might be expected to contain a sense of transience and uncertainty. But notably, panegyристs celebrating the Queen Mother’s arrival in England also spend a good deal of time discussing her past. Unlike the outpouring of panegyric for Charles, only two new poems were published to celebrate Henrietta Maria’s landing in 1660. The first of these pieces, George Cartwright’s ‘Upon her Majesties, the Queen Mother Return into England’, concentrates on dynastic security. Cartwright’s poem was appended to his only known publication: an unperformed play entitled The heroick lover, or the infanta of Spain (1661). This play is a tragicomedy which represents a failed rebellion and extolls the divine right of Kings. The panegyric to Henrietta Maria uses similar imagery to praise her. “How much are we engaged to thy womb!” the speaker exclaims: “Thy fruitful womb, that with no little pain, / Hast stock’t our Island, with no little gain”. The speaker apologises, like Cowley and Philips, for Henrietta Maria’s tribulations during the Civil Wars and Protectorate. “I fear to make amends we shall adore / Your Sacred Presence”, he writes. This sense of Henrietta Maria’s “sacred” status echoes the divine right of Kings. It compensates for her former treatment, as well as praising her future role as Queen Mother.

John Crouch’s longer poem, The muses joy (1660), creates a more developed and complicated description of Henrietta Maria’s past. In the Civil Wars Crouch wrote cheap royalist propaganda under the pseudonym ‘The Man in the Moon’, where he ridiculed Parliamentarian wives and represented them as fraudulent counterparts to the exiled queen consort. In the pamphlet A tragi-comedy called New-Market fayre, or, a parliament out-cry of state commodities set to sale (c. 1649), for instance, Crouch depicts Elizabeth Cromwell – or “Mistris Brazen-face” – fighting Lady Fairfax over the crown. The muses joy was dedicated to the Countess of Shrewsbury, who employed Crouch’s brother Gilbert and
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43 Ibid., B7v.
44 In addition, one poem attributed to S Crown was dedicated to Henrietta Maria. See S. Crown, XXXth of January. Or, an anniversary (London: by Nathaniel Butter, 1650. But not permitted to be publick till now, 1660).
45 George Cartwright, The heroick-lover, or, the infanta of Spain by George Cartwright (London: R.W for John Symmes, 1661), F8v.
46 John Crouch, A tragi-comedy called New-Market fayre, or, a parliament out-cry of state commodities set to sale written by the man in the moon and now reprinted at the request of some young gentlemen to act in Christmas Holy-dayes ([London]: by E. Crowch, 1661), A3v.
was close to Henrietta Maria. It is likely that Crouch hoped the Countess would show the poem to Henrietta Maria, but his poem is also designed for a broader readership. The *muses joy* was published in two editions, before being reprinted again in Crouch’s collected works *Census poeticus* (1663). In this piece, Crouch caters for a potentially diverse audience – and he accordingly crafts an image of Henrietta Maria that balances different concerns.

The Queen Mother’s return to England is represented here, as in Cowley’s poem, as a symbol of the Stuart dynasty’s security. The speaker describes Henrietta Maria’s journey from France to England to open the poem, building on the biblical book of Exodus in which Moses and the Israelites cross the Red Sea:

> The Waves wrought not this wonder, there hath stood
> Twixt Her and us a wider Sea of Blood:
> Which once dry’d up, the Queen might freely pass,
> Her ship mov’d on a Pavement, smooth as glass:
> While waters sensible (like those we please)
> Smile to transport the Queen of th’ Narrow Seas!

The “Sea of Blood” relates to the colour of the Red Sea and evokes the violence that England experienced during the Civil Wars. Henrietta Maria’s arrival is seen to be part of a providential design, in which England and the Queen Mother are delivered from their former straits. The speaker emphasises, as had Cowley and Philips, Henrietta Maria’s suffering in the past. “Is this that Queen whom a Rebellious Crew / Sent Bullets after for a kind Adieu?”; the speaker rhetorically asks: “Is this that living Martyr so hard prest”. Crucially, by describing Henrietta Maria as “Queen of th’Narrow Seas” in the above passage,
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48 The folio publication is *The muses joy for the recovery of that weeping vine Henretta [sic]-Maria, the most illustrious Queen-Mother, and her royall branches* (London: 1660). The quarto publication, which truncates the dedication, is *The muses joy for the recovery of that weeping vine, Henretta [sic] Maria, the most illustrious Queen-Mother, and her royal branches* (London: for Tho. Batterton, 1661). See also *Census poeticus. The poets tribute paid in eight loyal poems* (London: for the author, by H[enry]. Brugis, 1663).
49 Lines 11-16. I am quoting a new modern edition of *The muses joy*, edited by John West, which will be included in the forthcoming Stuart Successions Anthology.
50 For two contemporary examples in which the “sea of blood” is used to refer to England’s political violence, see Edmund Calamy’s *An indictment against England because of her selfe-murdering divisions: together with an exhortation to an England-preserving unity and concord* (London: by I. L. for Christopher Meredith, 1645), A4v; William Laud, *The Arch-bishop of Canterburie his speech, or, His funeral sermon preached by himself on the scaffold on Tower-hill on Friday the tenth of January, 1645, upon Hebr[0ov] 12, 1, 2* (London: Printed with license and entred according to order, [1645]), A2v.
Crouch draws attention to her possible role as an intermediary between England and France. This strategy avoids the Francophobia that is expressed in some of Crouch’s other poems from the same period, seeking to develop a positive image of Henrietta Maria.\(^\text{52}\)

Although this opening passage celebrates the Queen Mother’s prospective role, the central passages are more ambiguous about Henrietta Maria’s influence over her children. The speaker praises her possible effect on women at court by using pastoral language. The speaker instructs all Henrietta Maria’s “Loyal Shepherdesses” to “Spring out with your Diana, O break forth, / And shew the blest world, not your height, but worth.”\(^\text{53}\) The speaker also draws on dynastic imagery:

Welcome great Princess, by good Prov’dence sent  
Home to us, from your Native Banishment!  
Delight to see your Royal Branches twine  
Their Arms about you, their Maternal Vine;  
(That fruitful Vine, whose goodness made it smart;  
That Lives, and yet so long has bled at heart!)\(^\text{54}\)

The language of a “Maternal” and “fruitful Vine” celebrates Henrietta Maria for performing her dynastic duty, and suggests that she can now reap its rewards. As at the beginning of the poem, Crouch stresses the role of providence and thereby implies that Henrietta Maria’s return heralds a positive change for the nation. At the same time, the concept that Henrietta Maria was exiled to and from a native country is oxymoronic. The Queen Mother’s divided national allegiances strike a discordant note, in a poem that otherwise celebrates unity and renewal. Again, the speaker emphasises Henrietta Maria’s former maltreatment by emotively stating that she “bled at heart”.

The fact that Crouch reminds the reader about Henrietta Maria’s past as much as he praises her role at the Restoration court does not seem to be a coincidence. Robert Wilcher has shown that poems for Henrietta Maria came to pair sentimental descriptions of the royal couple with satire of the republican rebels from the 1640s onwards.\(^\text{55}\) This coupling was a defensive mechanism, which moved away from criticisms of the royal couple’s marriage and instead turned the focus onto their opponents. When Crouch places focus on Henrietta Maria’s past in *The muses joy*, he similarly tries to overwrite

\(^{52}\) In one piece Crouch encourages Charles II to “Advance / Victorious Ensigns through the Heart of France”. See *Potērion glykypikron, Londos bitter-sweet-cup of tears, for her late visitation: and joy for the Kings return* (London: by E. Crowch, 1666), 8.  
\(^{54}\) Ibid., 75-80.  
concerns about her possible influence on Charles and the other Stuart family members. The final forty lines of The muses joy comprise a satiric account of Cromwell’s death and the fall of the republic. These passages adopt a colloquial tone which draws on proverbial wisdom and vernacular witticisms. Consequently, the panegyric to celebrate Henrietta Maria concludes with a couplet about the regicides’ fall: “let Rebellion, sunck as low as Hell, / For ever There, in its own Region dwell!”. While Crouch’s poem does not utilise the same ‘aesthetic of affliction’ that can be seen in Cowley’s ode and Philips’ journey poem, his piece similarly depends on the memory of Henrietta Maria’s ill-treatment to underpin celebrations of her new role.

III: The Queen Mother’s court at Somerset House

How did people write about Henrietta Maria when it became clear that she intended to reside in England? Could a new form of writing about the Queen Mother develop, which welcomed more conclusively her role as Stuart matriarch? One of the signs that Henrietta Maria wanted to spend substantial time in England was her decision to renovate her former principal residence, Somerset House. Situated on the banks of the Thames and adjacent to the Strand, Somerset House was a symbolically important urban estate. It included a number of nearby tenements, a small garden, and an operational Catholic chapel. During the 1630s and 1640s, Somerset House was a focal point for hostility to Henrietta Maria and was defaced by mobs. Like a number of royal properties, in the 1650s it was appropriated by the state: Oliver Cromwell’s body was displayed there in 1658. Despite the fact that Somerset House was used in the 1650s, parts of the property fell into disrepair and there were holes in the roof by the time that Henrietta Maria returned. The Queen Mother started rebuilding works which amounted to the substantial cost of £23,501. The project included adapting the great staircase and enlarging the queen’s presence chamber, both of which were used for social occasions such as the Queen’s Circle, over which Henrietta Maria presided.56

Henrietta Maria’s rebuilding works were a symbol of the Stuart monarchy’s power in England. Modern theorists of place and space demonstrate that architectural structures can perpetuate specific social and political concepts. To Michel de Certeau, for instance, the “immense texturology” of

skyscrapers in New York testifies to the logic of capital production. Early modern contemporaries also connected property with power. In A parallel of architecture (1664), John Evelyn celebrates the Restoration rebuilding projects. Dedicating the text to Charles, Evelyn states that the royal building works have an important function: “Walled and well built Cities chased Barbarity, introduced Civility, gave Laws to Republiques”. For the Queen Mother to rebuild Somerset House thereby provides “a Structure becoming her Royal grandeur, and the due veneration of all Your Majesties Subjects for the honour She has done both this Your native City and the whole Nation”. For Henrietta Maria to rebuild the property therefore reflects the Queen Mother’s status, but also affirms the respect that Evelyn believes she is due from the English populace. The House re-inscribes Henrietta Maria’s status on the landscape and within the political imagination.

On 2 November 1664, Henry Herringman entered two poems about Henrietta Maria’s building works in the Stationers’ Register: Waller’s Upon her majesties new buildings at Somerset-House (1665) and Cowley’s On the queen’s repairing Somerset House (1665). It is unclear whether Cowley and Waller were commissioned to write these poems. As both were known to Henrietta Maria’s circle, and their poetry was well regarded in general, it is possible that they were requested to produce the poems, which were then printed to publicise the finished building project. Certainly, Cowley was in communication with Henry Jermyn around this time, as Jermyn and the Duke of Buckingham helped him to secure a grant of land. The only existing analysis of the Somerset House poems, published by Charles Larson more than thirty years ago, proposes that they move from early Stuart poetics towards an Augustan mode. Cowley and Waller had “certain misgivings concerning the religious persuasions of the Queen Mother”, Larson writes, but they were willing to overlook this for their “pleasure that a taste for fine architecture has once again been restored to England”. Like Larson, I am interested in the
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58 John Evelyn, trans., A parallel of architecture both ancient and moderne, by Roland Freart S. de Chambray (London: by Thomas Roycroft for John Place, 1664), a4r.
59 Ibid., a3r.
60 A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers, Volume 2, 1655-1675, ed. G.E.Briscoe, transcribed H.R.Plommer (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1967), 349. I quote modern editions of both poems, but see Abraham Cowley, The speech of her majesty the Queen Mother’s palace, upon the reparation and enlargement of it, by her majesty (London: for Henry Herringman, 1665); Edmund Waller, Upon her majesties new buildings at Somerset-House (London: for Henry Herringman, 1665).
process of adaptation, but I am more specifically interested here in literary conventions for representing Henrietta Maria. Whether or not these pieces were sponsored by the same people, it is fair to assume that they were intended to be read together. As such the poems offer a poetic statement about the Queen Mother’s role.

By writing poems about Somerset House, Waller and Cowley participate in the contemporary genre of estate poetry. Traditionally committed to issues of order and hierarchy in a local context, early Stuart estate writing used a rural model for social cohesion. Focused as they were on individual estates, these poems depicted a bounded sense of communal relations, but participated in a complex project of “the landed reassessing the ethics and aesthetics of rural property”. Towards the mid-seventeenth century, the tone and focus of estate writing shifted. Two parallel impulses start to emerge. First, estate poems increasingly used specific aspects of the countryside garden to provide a microcosm for political and national concerns. Second, the emergence of prospect poems such as John Denham’s *Cooper’s Hill* (1642) introduced a wider survey of the landscape than an enclosed focus on particular estates. Such prospect poems, Andrew McRae suggests, permitted new ways of assessing the relationship between place and space, property and ideas of nationhood.

To write about an urban royal palace in the early 1660s posed a number of particular challenges. England’s capital city was the former centre of parliamentarian opposition and had a bad historic relationship with Charles I. The presence of the Houses of Parliament, the prominence of elected political officers such as the Lord Mayor, and the city’s status as a commercial hub, provided numerous centres of authority beyond the royal court. In the poem *On St James’s Park, as lately improved by his majesty* (1661), Waller deals with this potential problem by making Charles II’s developments at St James’ Palace synonymous with broader political regeneration. The park’s porous entry and exit points become an asset. The waters in Charles’ canal, which were channelled from the nearby river, are seen to pay allegiance: “The sea, that always served his empire, now / Pays tribute to our Prince’s pleasure too”. The king’s actions in the park are outward facing. “What nation shall have peace, where war be
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made, / Determined is, in this oraculous shade;", the speaker comments: “The world, from India to the frozen north, / Concerned in what this solitude brings forth”.67

The shorter of the two Somerset House poems, Waller’s Upon Her Majesties new buildings at Somerset-House comprises forty-four lines. The speaker directly addresses Henrietta Maria in the opening passage:

Great Queen! that does our island bless
With princes, and with palaces:
Treated so ill, chased from your throne,
Returning, you adorn the Town;
And, with a brave revenge do show
Their glory went, and came, with you.68

The focus on Henrietta Maria’s dynastic status echoes Waller’s earlier poem To the Queen Mother of France, upon her landing (c. 1638), which he wrote for Henrietta Maria’s mother, Marie de Medici, when she came to England. Waller’s earlier piece described Marie from a European perspective, depicting her as the mother of children at several different royal courts.69 By contrast, this description of Henrietta Maria concentrates on more local markers of place. The speaker situates the Queen Mother in an English landscape, while her story is part of the nation’s history.

The memory of England’s past is important for Waller’s poem, even as the speaker suggests that Henrietta Maria is now overcoming it. The opening four stanzas each repeat a transition from the past to the present. Waller writes that Henrietta Maria is:

Constant to England in your love,
As birds are to their wonted grove;
Though by rude hands their nests are spoiled,
There, the next spring, again they build.70

This passage seems to raise a distant memory of the romance of the Caroline marriage, and perhaps the “halcyon nest” associated with Henrietta Maria’s earlier court, as discussed above. To Larson, the intimate simile of nesting birds is incongruous with more general descriptions of Henrietta Maria’s

67 Ibid., lines 79-82 page 191.
69 Edmund Waller, “To the Queen-Mother of France, Upon her Landing,” ed. G. Thorn Drury, in The Poems of Edmund Waller, Volume 1, lines 1-2 page 35.
70 Waller, “Upon her Majesties,” lines 11-14 page 198.
experience in the surrounding stanzas. He suggests that this dissonance creates a sense of separation between the reader and Henrietta Maria: “One is never quite certain, then, of the exact distance that Waller as narrator wishes to maintain from his subject”. To compare this passage to the similar language in Cowley’s Ode, though, makes Waller’s representation of Henrietta Maria seem more positive. The seasonal regeneration promised by the nesting birds is part of a national process, rather than one couple’s experience. The word “build” concludes the paragraph with a purposeful sense of direction, which produces a positive impetus for Henrietta Maria’s role.

The second half of the poem moves away from the 1660 poems’ preoccupation with Henrietta Maria’s history to develop a set of conventions for her role in the present. Here, Waller recycles tropes that are familiar from early Stuart estate writing: modesty and hospitality. Like Jonson’s Penshurst, Somerset House is defined by contrast with other, ostentatious estates: “Let foreign Princes vainly boast / Of vaster fabrics, to which they / Contribute nothing but the pay”. Although the scale of this comparison is international, Henrietta Maria is specifically situated in the London community. The speaker praises her capacity to manage resources, identifying her rare combination of “Frugality, and bounty”: “From a confined, well-managed store, / You both employ, and feed, the poor”. The Queen Mother is here seen to contribute to the local economy as a landowner, but also as a generous patron who helps other people in the city as well, in this case the poor. This strategy builds on the idealistic images of social harmony in early Stuart country house poems. Waller thus situates the Queen Mother as an important part of the London community, and more generally the nation.

If the opening sections of Upon Her Majesties new buildings at Somerset-House situate Henrietta Maria in the cityscape, the concluding lines attempt to assert her authority over it. The final section introduces the speaker, who ascends the great staircase. Rather than describe internal aspects of the building, the speaker looks out at the landscape:

That the fair view her window yields,
The Town, the river, and the fields,
Entering, beneath us we descry,
And wonder how we came so high.

---

74 Ibi.: lines 23; 25-6, page 197
She needs no weary steps ascend;
All seems before her feet to bend:
And here, as she was born, she lies;
High, without taking pains to rise.\(^{75}\)

Three different landscapes – the city of London, the Thames, and the countryside – are united in this topographical list. This approach moves beyond a bounded sense of property, or focus on Somerset House. As the horizon obligingly bows to Henrietta Maria, the whole nation is depicted as her estate. By conflating three different environments, Waller represents Henrietta Maria as a stable and authoritative presence.

Cowley’s poem *On the queen’s repairing Somerset House* is longer and more complex than Waller’s poem, but develops a similar set of themes. The poem is narrated by a persona for Somerset House, which describes its dilapidation throughout the civil wars and 1650s. This is an unusual, though not unprecedented, choice of a non-human narrator: contemporary writers such as Margaret Cavendish also used this tactic to convey the emotional trauma caused by the civil wars.\(^{76}\) Somerset House laments its emptiness before Henrietta Maria’s arrival: “Nothing remained t’adorn this princely place / Which covetous hands could take, or rude deface”.\(^{77}\) As in Waller’s poem, the speaker then changes the tone to describe Henrietta Maria’s return. Verbs connected with sight and display proliferate, creating a sense of confidence and ambition. “See”, the House states: “how my face is changed, and what I am / Since my true mistress and now foundress, came”.\(^{78}\) The turn from past to present in *On the queen’s repairing Somerset House* mirrors Waller’s focus on transformation in *Upon her majesties new buildings at Somerset-House*, and confirms the importance of the memory of Henrietta Maria’s affliction in positive representations of the Queen Mother.

Where Waller briefly describes Henrietta Maria’s personal authority over the landscape, Cowley works harder to explain Somerset House’s position in the city. The House creates a selective map of London, which particularly emphasises the proximity between Somerset House and the Protestant Churches of St Paul’s Cathedral and Westminster Abbey. The House describes these religious centres

---

\(^{75}\) Ibid., lines 37-44 page 199.

\(^{76}\) See for instance Margaret Cavendish, “A Dialogue between a Bountifull Knight, and a Castle Ruin’d in War,” in *Poems, and fancies: written by the Right Honourable, the Lady Margaret Countesse of Newcastle* (London: by T. R[ycroft], for J. Martin, and J. Allestrye at the Bell in Saint Pauls Church Yard 1653).


\(^{78}\) Ibid., lines 17-18, page 339.
as “my neighbours and my guards”, suggesting indeed that Henrietta Maria’s residence depends upon
the Church for support.\textsuperscript{79} This strategy is intriguing, given the historic opposition to Henrietta Maria’s
Chapel in Somerset House, and the fact that the Queen Mother’s Catholic services at her royal residence
were still a point of contention. By July 1662, the services at Henrietta Maria’s Chapel were frequented
by so many members of the public that a worried Charles banned anyone except her servants and foreign
ambassadors from attending.\textsuperscript{80} One Edmund Bagshaw was not appeased. He warned that Henrietta
Maria’s “cabal carried on the Government at Somerset House, and that popery was coming in”.\textsuperscript{81}
Cowley’s speaker omits the religious activities within Somerset House’s walls, perhaps using the
influence of other power structures – such as the Church – to mitigate the risks of Henrietta Maria’s
influence.

In this poem celebrating Henrietta Maria’s residence, Cowley reflects on the dynamic of royal
authority in Restoration London more generally. The speaker suggests that the King’s command over
the River Thames shows his command over the English populace more generally. Notably, the poet
draws attention to the Thames by echoing John Denham’s description of the river in his earlier poem

\textit{Cooper’s Hill} (1642):

\begin{tabular}{l}
\begin{flushleft}
John Denham \textit{Cooper’s Hill}: \textsuperscript{82}  \\
When a calm River rais’d with sudden rains,
Or Snows dissolv’d, oreflows th’adjoyning Plains,
The Husbandmen with high-rais’d banks rescue
Their greedy hopes, and this he can endure,
But if with Bays or Dams they strive to force
His Channel to a new, or narrow, course;
No longer then within his banks he dwells,
First to a Torrent, then a Deluge swells
Stronger, and fiercer, by restraint he roars,
And knows no bound, but makes his power his
shores.
\end{flushleft}
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\begin{flushright}
Abraham Cowley \textit{On the Queen’s}: \textsuperscript{83}  \\
And here my Thames, though it more gentle be
Than any flood, so strengthened by the sea,
Finding by art his natural forces broke,
And bearing, captive-like, the arched yoke,
Does roar, and foam, and rage at the disgrace,
But recomposes straight and calms his face;
Is into reverence and submission strook,
As soon as from afar he does but look
Tow’rds the White Palace where that King does
reign
Who lays his laws and bridges o’er the main.
\end{flushright}
\end{tabular}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., line 60 page 340.
\textsuperscript{80} Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles II. 1661-1662, Preserved in the State Paper
Department of her Majesty’s Public Record Office, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (Liechtenstein: Krays Reprint
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 531.
\textsuperscript{82} John Denham, “Cooper’s Hill,” ed. Theodore Howard Banks Jr, in The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham
(New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1928), lines 349-358 page 89.
\textsuperscript{83} Cowley, “On the Queen’s,” lines 69-78 page 341.
\end{footnotes}
Denham’s poem was produced during debates about Charles I’s authority and ruminates on the nature of royal authority by referring to methods of water control. As McRae states: “the river is monarchical authority: and such essentially natural forces, Denham suggests, will violently resist efforts to prevent or redirect their courses”. By contrast, the natural forces of Cowley’s river are synonymous with public opinion. Although Charles II is not shown to work in the same manner as Denham’s husbandmen – that is, by physical labour – there is nevertheless a sense that the monarchy must cultivate allegiance. The “art” of London Bridge’s “archéd yoke”, like Cowley’s “art of Oblivion”, implies an element of persuasion. Royal power is no longer synonymous with the waters, but somehow dependent on maintaining their support. The city, Cowley’s speaker suggests, is “troublesomely great”.

In the final paragraphs, Cowley’s speaker encourages the tame waves to take a message to other nations about the security of the restored Stuarts. He returns here to Henrietta Maria’s image:

From hence his kingdom’s happy now at last
(Happy, if wise by their misfortunes past),
From hence may omens take of that success
Which both their future wars and peace shall bless:
The peaceful mother on mild Thames does build,
With her son’s fabrics the rough sea is filled.

These final paragraphs seem to answer the question in Cowley’s 1660 Ode: “Will Peace her Halcyon Nest venture to build / Upon a Shore with Shipwracks fill’d?”. Through the repeated focus on time, “From hence”, the speaker depicts the Somerset House project as a new starting point. The final lines suggest that Charles II has command not only over the land but the waters, as the House describes the sea being filled with “fabrics”. This open phrasing could describe the buildings that Charles II was reconstructing close to the river, which Waller also calls “fabrics” in his poem to Henrietta Maria. But it could also relate to Charles II’s growing navy, and implies skilled workmanship. The “peaceful mother” here provides a sense of continuity with the past - but the fact that the House relies on the waves to convey its message registers a transition in the representation of royal power. The waters, which have been made synonymous with public opinion, might be subject to the King – but they are nonetheless integral to the representation and reception of Stuart authority.

---

84 Andrew McRae, Literature and Domestic Travel, 64.
86 Ibid., lines 103-8 page 341.
IV: Conclusion

The poems analysed in this chapter demonstrate that Henrietta Maria’s image was intrinsic to questions about the nature of Stuart monarchy after 1660. Her legacy in England seems to have exposed concerns about the dynamic of royal authority, and by extension her son’s kingship. The Queen Mother’s representation was more varied than most scholars have allowed, or at least considered. Cowley’s and Philips’ journey poems in 1660, and Cowley’s and Waller’s estate poems of 1665, might be seen as poetic conversations which lay out and test appropriate themes for the Queen Mother’s representation. There are some common patterns, as writers move away from the pastoral and neoplatonic images that were associated with Henrietta Maria when she was queen consort. Early poems about Henrietta Maria’s return reveal a process of conciliation, in which poets avoid the themes of Caroline culture that had been problematized in republican attacks. While Cowley looks back with nostalgia to the era in which this vocabulary was plausible, he crafts an aesthetic of affliction which praises Henrietta Maria by reminding readers about her suffering during the Civil Wars. Rather than make the Queen Mother a positive symbol of the future in Restoration England, or celebrating her prospective influence as a Stuart matriarch, Cowley, Philips and Crouch suggest that readers need to celebrate the Queen Mother to compensate for the past.

If Henrietta Maria’s return created concerns about the direction of Charles II’s kingship, the project of writing about the Queen Mother also enabled writers to reconsider the culture of royal representation. As poets praised Henrietta Maria’s landing, they implicitly recognised that it might not be expedient or indeed plausible to return to earlier ideals of Stuart monarchy. Cowley’s poem about the rebuilding works at Somerset House seeks to make Henrietta Maria a model of continuity and traditionalism, but also opens important questions about the agency of the people around her estate and the reader as well. His speaker places Henrietta Maria’s residence in a broader web of authority, in which the Church tempers the autonomy of her Catholic chapel. The intertextuality of these writings suggests that writers purposefully engaged with the project of representing Henrietta Maria. To do so meant reshaping the legacy of the past, and building a new way of writing about the restored king. The Queen Mother’s representation therefore teases out some of the problems for representing Charles II’s reign, offering a fresh perspective on the challenges that faced panegyrists at the start of the Restoration era.
Chapter Eight
Fertility and Succession in the 1670s

This chapter examines the representation of royal women’s fertility in the 1670s: a decade in which the succession became a vital and divisive political issue. At the time of Charles II’s marriage back in 1662, writers had been optimistic about dynastic prospects. “Every Summer”, the poet John Drope urged Queen Catherine: “Enlarge our Wellcomes to a Royal Comer”.¹ Soon, however, the early optimism about the royal couple’s fertility was in doubt. Charles II’s marriage did not produce the anticipated heirs. Moreover, his sexual promiscuity undermined the notions of legitimacy and illegitimacy that gave dynastic imagery weight.² The Restoration court was still understood to be a centre and model of the realm’s morality, but the libertine court also subverted the principles of honour and virtue that it was supposed to inculcate.³ In a growing culture of court satire, writers travestied the king’s sexual behaviour and thereby challenged traditional rhetoric about the monarch’s divine and dynastic right.⁴

How could writers represent the queen consort, when it became increasingly likely that she would not bear an heir to the throne? What was the perceived status of the York household, and how was it represented in an increasingly divided context? From the early 1670s, people started to be concerned about the English succession.⁵ This anxiety was precipitated by a number of factors, including concern about Charles II’s leadership and the conversion of his brother and heir, James Duke of York, to Catholicism.⁶ The House of Commons made numerous efforts to limit James’ power, such as a bill to stop a Catholic member of the royal family influencing the education of future royal heirs.⁷ Historians have long been fascinated by the succession crisis that took hold from 1678, in the wake of a

¹ John Drope, An hymenaean essay, or an epithalamy, upon the royll match of his most excellent majesty Charles the Second, with the most illustrious Katharine, infanta of Portugall (1662), B³.
² Muddying a distinction between the legitimate and illegitimate, people argued that James Duke of Monmouth, Charles II’s natural son, should be given the throne after him. I do not concentrate in detail on Monmouth or indeed his family in this chapter, but see Wolfram Schmidgen, “The Last Royal Bastard and the Multitude,” Journal of British Studies 47 no. 1 (2008): 53-76.
³ Matthew Jenkinson, Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II, 1660-1685 (Woodbridge: the Boydell Press, 2010), 236.
⁵ In an era of dynastic roulette, succession was often an underlying concern but this became more explicit in the later 1670s. See John Morrill, “Uneasy Lies the Head that wears a Crown”: Dynastic Crises in Tudor and Stuart Britain 1504-1716 (Reading: The University of Reading, 2005).
⁷ Andrew Marvell printed a copy of this bill in An account of the growth of popery and arbitrary government in England (Amsterdam: 1677). Marvell actually opposed the bill, on the grounds that it would give bishops too much power.
conspiracy theory in which it was claimed that Catholics tried to assassinate the king. I investigate here how the images of fertility that were once associated with Charles’ queen evolved in court culture from 1670 to the marriage of Princess Mary with Prince William in November 1677, as the tone of political debates about the succession in the Commons increased in fervour.

The culture of the Carolean court was diverse, shaped by a cacophony of voices writing in different forms. I concentrate here on two main modes of writing, court panegyric and court satire, which had the contradictory aims of praise and critique. While these modes might appear to be radically opposed, both shared a common interest in the relationship between the ideal and the real. Moreover, both panegyric and satire emanated from the Restoration court and were often written by the same authors. For example, the up-and-coming poet John Oldham tried his hands at both in the same draft book. I show here that both panegyrists and satirists reworked traditional images of fertility, and that by tracing these we can see writers gauging broader political changes. I concentrate first on images of Catherine, as writers tried to adapt the dynastic literary conventions that were traditionally associated with the queen consort’s role. I then turn to images of the York household in entertainments that were attended by the royal family members, and court poems. As writers celebrated the marriage of James and Mary Beatrice, traditional images of queenly fertility are diversified. Through their ambiguous adaptations of such imagery, writers start to articulate concerns about the succession.

I: Images of a childless queen

In June 1667, Samuel Pepys heard that a crowd of “rude people” had posted a libel on the Earl of Clarendon’s house. Written at the time of Edward Hyde’s fall from power, this libel criticises him on three main grounds. First, the libeller highlights Hyde’s involvement in the recent sale of Dunkirk to

---

8 These events, traditionally described as the Exclusion Crisis, were motivated by the prospect of future succession but inspired by deep-seated concerns about religion, security, and Charles II’s leadership. On the nature of this crisis, and what to call it, see Jonathan Scott, Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-1683 (Cambridge: CUP, 1991), 21; Mark Knights, Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81 (Cambridge: CUP, 1994), 3-29.

9 For several perspectives on the implications of the succession crisis on party politics, see the various articles in Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies 25 no. 4 (1993).

the French.\textsuperscript{11} Second, he notes that Hyde had been an advocate of Charles II’s acquisition of Tangiers, which was now perceived to be unprofitable.\textsuperscript{12} Finally, the libeller suggests that Hyde had engineered Charles II’s marriage to Catherine, in the hope that the offspring of his daughter Anne, Duchess of York, would eventually inherit the crown: “Three sights to be seen”, the speaker states: “Dunkirke, Tanger, and a barren Queen.”\textsuperscript{13} The most important theme here is of course Hyde’s greed, but it is significant that the anonymous author assumed that Catherine would not be able to conceive an heir to the throne. Tellingly, Pepys expressed no surprise at this assumption when he recorded the incident in his diary.

Aged twenty-nine when the satire about Hyde’s fall circulated, in theory Catherine could still produce an heir to the throne. In fact, the queen was not barren and had already conceived a child.\textsuperscript{14} Two years later, in May 1669, Charles informed his sister Henriette Anne in a letter that Catherine had become pregnant. “My wife has been a little indisposed some few days,” Charles reported: “and there is hope that it will prove a disease not displeasing to me”. He apologised to Henriette Anne for being “so forward in saying thus much without more certainty”, but claimed that he wanted to inform her before the rumours reached Paris.\textsuperscript{15} The queen’s pregnancies therefore seem to have been known in diplomatic circles well beyond the English court. But while Catherine could conceive, she never carried a child to full term. A month after writing the May letter to Henriette, Charles updated her with less fortunate news: “My wife, after all our hopes, has miscarried again, without any visible accident. The physicians are divided whether it were a false conception or a good one”.\textsuperscript{16} After this miscarriage in June 1669, it seems to have been accepted that Catherine would not bear an heir to the throne.

Catherine’s struggle to conceive contrasted noticeably with Charles’ more fertile mistresses. The King had sired several natural children by the time of his marriage, including his eldest son James Duke of Monmouth, who was born in April 1649. Charles’ principal mistress in the 1660s was Barbara Palmer, Countess of Castlemaine. He acknowledged two of Palmer’s daughters, Anne (b. Feb 1661) and Charlotte (b. Sept 1664), and two of her sons, Charles (b. June 1662) and George (b. Dec 1665). Charles also took

\textsuperscript{11} James Howell, \textit{A discourse of Dunkirk, with some reflexes upon the late surrender therof, \&c} (London: by J[ames]. C[ottrell]. for Samuel Speed, 1664).
\textsuperscript{16} Charles II to Henriette Marie, 7 June 1668, in \textit{The Letters, Speeches and Declarations of King Charles II}, ed. Arthur Bryant, 239.
an active interest in the upbringing of his natural children, providing Palmer with the financial resources and access to the monarch that could then enable her to establish a faction at the Carolean court. Without an heir, Catherine did not have the same level of dynastic credit or political access that was enjoyed by Charles’ mistresses. Nancy Klein Maguire even contends that Charles’ later mistress, Louise de Kérouaille, Duchess of Portsmouth, effectively took the role of queen consort for the second decade of Charles’ reign.\textsuperscript{17}

Despite the competition that Catherine faced from Charles’ mistresses, she was an important diplomatic and cultural figure throughout her time in England. This can be seen through surviving evidence about the queen’s patronage and her role in major court events. Compared with the amount of scholarship on Anna’s and Henrietta Maria’s patronage, there has been very little scholarship on Catherine’s. Edward Corp’s recent study of her musical patronage therefore makes an important contribution. Corp shows that Catherine supported Italian musicians from the early 1670s, in order to offset the French tastes that were encouraged by Charles’ incumbent mistress. He suggests that “she succeeded in identifying herself with the music that they offered”, and thereby helped to transform the cultural outlook of Charles’ court: “whereas musical taste in London during the 1660s had been mainly French, by the 1670s it had become for the most part Italian”.\textsuperscript{18}

In addition to her musical patronage, Catherine sponsored a number of court ballets. Attended by the king and members of the political elite, these ballets were significant court events that were similar to the early Stuart court masques.\textsuperscript{19} Early in 1671, for example, the Great Hall at Whitehall was modified to accommodate a larger stage and music area for the “Queen’s Ballet”.\textsuperscript{20} Lady Mary Bertie, who attended the performance, wrote to her friend Katherine Noel that it was “so hard to get room that wee were forced to goe by four a clocke, though it did not begin till nine or ten”.\textsuperscript{21} The scale of these performances indicates Catherine’s capacity to command an audience. However, as full transcripts of


\textsuperscript{19} Peter Holman, \textit{Four and Twenty Fiddlers: The Violin at the English Court 1540-1690} (Oxford: OUP, 1993), 360-366.

\textsuperscript{20} Eleanore Boswell, \textit{The Restoration Court Stage (1660-1702)} (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1966), 47.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 139.
these performances do not survive, it is difficult to know what specific images were used therein to
describe the queen – or how Catherine might have performed her own interpretation of queenship on
stage.

While it was unclear for several years whether or not Catherine would be able to give birth to
an heir, royal panegyrist seem to have negotiated questions about her health from very early in her
career. In October 1663, Catherine came down with a life-threatening illness which was widely reported
in the press. Rumours about the cause of the queen consort’s illness included a fever and miscarriage.
The newsbook *The Intelligencer* described the deterioration of Catherine’s health on 18 October. When
Catherine recovered, the newsbook reported on 7 November that “The Progress of Her Majesties
Recovery, has been Clear and Comfortable of Late”.22 Several poems were printed about the queen
consort’s recovery, including Edmund Waller’s *To the queen, upon her majesties birth-day* (1663).23
These early recovery poems were of course printed long before people were sure that Catherine would
not be able to produce an heir. But they show writers working through concerns about the queen
consort’s body, and finding ways in which to represent her other than traditional motifs of fertility.

It is worth looking at the strategies that Waller uses in *To the queen, upon her majesties birth-
day*, as he was a diligent royal panegyrist with much experience representing members of the royal
family. In the 1630s, Waller had written a sequence of romantic poems about Henrietta Maria’s and
Charles I’s engagement. In the poem *Of the danger his majesty (being Prince) escaped in the road at
St Andrews* (c. 1636), Karen Britland notes, Charles I is depicted as a “virile, masculine hero who
confronts the disorders of the natural world and overcomes them with his stalwart self-control”.24 A
similar process is at work in *To the queen, upon her majesties birth-day*, as Waller tries to build a
romantic myth from Catherine’s sickness. The opening concentrates on Catherine’s recovery, echoing
the nuptial literature that had welcomed her to England just a year before. Like many other panegyrist,
Waller equates Catherine’s landing with the arrival of a new spring:

> Farewell the Year which Threatned so

22 *The Intelligencer* 8 (19 October 1663); *The Intelligencer* 9 (November 1663).
23 Edmund Cooper, *On the recovery of our most gracious queen Katharine from her late grievous and
deplorable fit of sickness a vision* (London: 1664); Katherine Philips, *Poems. By the incomparable, Mrs. K.P*
in eight loyal poems* (London: for the author, by H. Brugis, 1663).
24 Karen Britland, “A Fairy-Tale Marriage: Charles and Henrietta Maria’s Romance,” in *The Spanish Match:
128.
The fairest Light the World can show;
Welcome the New, whose every day
Restoring what was Snatch’d away
By pining Sickness from the Fair,
That matchless Beauty do’s repair.25

Waller avoids dwelling on the limitations of Catherine’s body and constructs her image by using superlatives: she is described as “the fairest Light”, “the Fair” and “That matchless Beauty”. Similarly, the poet plays with the term “pining Sickness”. On one hand, this description diagnoses Catherine with a wasting disease. However, Waller adds an extra dimension by personifying the illness itself, so that it seems to steal from the queen. The sickness pines for Catherine’s beauty and thereby affirms her attractiveness. Through this structural echo of the marriage panegyrics, Waller implies the queen’s desirability even as he accepts her physical weaknesses.

Within the space of this early poem, Catherine’s ill health becomes a ruse to depict Charles as a romantic hero. In the concluding lines, Waller’s speaker depicts Charles bettering medical practitioners by healing Catherine with his tears. He describes the King at Catherine’s bedside:

For when no healing Art prevail’d,
When Cordials and Elixirs fail’d,
On your pale Cheek he dropt the shour,
Reviv’d you like a Dying flour.

The idea that Charles’ tears have the power to heal Catherine extends the concept of the king’s touch, in which Charles was perceived to have the capacity to heal scrofula. Catherine’s recovery thus proves Charles’ ordained gifts. Furthermore, the King’s ability to revive his wife can also be seen as parallel with his earlier ability to heal the nation after the Restoration. Waller imagines Charles restoring his wife’s health, on which the succession depends, as in 1660 he had seemed to restore the nation’s security. Catherine’s sickness here provides an opportunity to flatter the king’s capacity as protector and progenitor of the realm – although notably the queen consort is seen to be a vulnerable, rather than a fertile flower, imagery that was common in earlier representations of the royal consorts.26

25 Edmund Waller, To the Queen, upon her majesties birth-day ([London]: for Henry Herringman, [1663]), 1.
As the 1660s and 1670s continued, writers increasingly moved away from motifs of fertility and sought alternative ways in which to praise Catherine’s contribution. In particular, writers emphasised the queen consort’s piety and her experience in the country. In a much later poem, Waller starts by commenting on the changes that both the English people and Catherine had experienced in their country. “What revolutions in the world have been,” Waller writes: “How are we changed since we first saw the Queen”. Throughout this piece, Waller works to make Catherine and the royal marriage a symbol of national unity. His speaker reminds the reader about the announcement of Catherine’s marriage in 1661:

When Lords and Commons, with united voice,
The Infanta named, approved the royal choice;
First of our queens whom not the king alone
But the whole nation, lifted to the throne.
With like consent, and like desert was crowned
The glorious Prince that does the Turk confound.27

Waller’s half lines create balance and equality between the Lords and Commons, the queen consort and the king. In addition, the speaker creates an association between the 1662 marriage and the Restoration by repeating a similar syntax to describe both events. This retrospective image of the royal marriage is designed to create a sense of shared experience, or communal memory. He also praises Catherine’s chastity. “Though louder fame attend the martial rage,” the speaker notes: “‘Tis greater glory to reform the age”. Given the notoriety of Charles’ libertinism court, Waller’s comments might seem somewhat glib. But the act of remembering the royal marriage still creates an impression of unity between the royal couple and their subjects.

While court panegyrists moved away from traditional images of fertility when representing the queen consort, court satirists were quick to capitalise on these motifs. A culture of court satire, which can be distinguished from the substantial underground culture of early Stuart libels, burgeoned at the Restoration court.28 As Harold Love has shown, this genre started to develop in earnest after 1660. Many court lampoons were written by and for court insiders, to serve the needs of different factional groups.29 Some satirists were audacious in their representation of Catherine’s fertility. From the mid-

1660s, the epithet “infecund” came to be associated with the queen.30 “Would you once bless the English Nation, / By changing of Queen Kate’s Vocation,” asks the speaker in The Lord Chancellor’s speech to the parliament (1679): “And find one fit for procreation”.31

One of the longest and most fascinating satires about Catherine from this time is The queen’s ball (1671): a sustained piece written in response to one of Catherine’s court ballets. The satire survives in nine separate manuscript copies, suggesting that it had some traction at the time. Structured in pentameter couplets, The queen’s ball creates heroic expectations only to imply that Catherine is not worthy of such praise. The central conceit is that Catherine is neither a graceful dancer, nor an effective queen consort. The speaker describes her dancing in detail:

Poore Private Balls content ye Fairy Queene,
You must dance, & dance damn’dly, & be seen,
Ill-natur’d little Goblyn, & design’d
For nothing, but to dance, & vexe mankind.

[...]

If old Acteon in the Bathe had seene
In fair Diana’s roome our Gipsy Queene,
He would have fled, & in his full careere,
For greater hast, have wish’t himselfe a Deere,
Preferr’d the bellyes of his Dogs to hers,
And thought them ye more cleanly sepulchres. 32

This sophisticated passage brings together disparate references to literature and classical mythology, which are made to cohere by the author’s consistent focus on Catherine’s body. For example, the speaker mocks Catherine’s “bellye” as he blackly inverts the mythical story of Diana and Actaeon. In the mythical tale, Actaeon watches Diana bathe and is then punished by being turned into a deer and hunted by his own hounds. The speaker claims that Actaeon would be so revolted if he chanced upon England’s queen consort that he would volunteer to transform into a deer and, ultimately, go to his death. The author’s comparison between the dogs’ stomachs and the queen consort’s is important, as “bellye” was a

32 All quotations of The queen’s ball are taken from Bodleian Ms don b8, 206-207. The poem is titled “To her Ma[j]tie upon her dancing, Ano 1670”.
The suggestion that the hounds offer a “more cleanly sepulchre” than Catherine equates her stomach – and, by implication, her womb – with a tomb. The court satire thus undercut idealised images of Catherine’s dancing, and also draws attention to the fact that her body has not carried a healthy heir.

The emphasis on Catherine’s fertility is subtle here, but further expanded later in the satire. “What stupid Madman would not choose, to have / The settled rest, & silence of a grave,” the speaker asks: “Rather, then such an hell, which always burnes, / And from whence Nature expects noe returns?”. The association between the dancing queen consort and a hell “which always burnes” conjures a sense of excessive heat, which might gesture towards Catherine’s rumoured dysmenorrhoea (excess of the blood). The speaker places emphasis on the “returns” that can be expected from the queen, implying that Catherine will not be able to deliver the heir that was expected of her. Crucially, the author’s leading question and derisory tone moves away from simple criticism of the queen consort to cast aspersion on the “madman” who would be willing to keep her in her place. The satire concludes as the speaker describes the end of Catherine’s performance, and imagines her dancing from the stage to a grave: “While wee your Funerall Rites devoutly pay, / And dance for joy, that you are danc’d away”.

What impact did the queen’s fertility have on concerns about the succession? Early modern political theorists tended to justify their political positions by promising to protect traditional rights rather than innovate, and consequently did not often raise the topic of divorce in print. But from the early 1670s, people started to canvass options for Charles displacing Catherine and taking a new bride. At first, Charles seems to have encouraged such speculation. He attended several of the parliamentary sessions about what became known as the Lord Roos case, a politician debated whether John Manners should be permitted judicial separation from his wife. The successful motion was seen as a possible testing ground for Charles’ separation from Catherine, which meant that the King’s apparent interest in

34 Similar images appear in the more gruesome satire “Thou worst of flesh in superstition stew’d”. For a full analysis and discussion of Catherine’s representation see Love, English Clandestine Satire, 246.
35 Rachel Weil, Political Passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England 1680-1714 (Manchester: MUP, 1999), 23.
the case caught people’s attention. When it seemed that Charles would not displace Catherine after all, some members of Parliament took drastic action. In November 1680 the Earl of Shaftesbury, who led opposition to the Duke of York’s accession, drafted a bill for royal divorce. Shaftesbury’s bill was buried before it reached the House of Lords, but it shows that Catherine’s position was tenuous and that her health fostered anxiety. Mark Knights argues that we should talk about the Succession Crisis rather than narrowly the Exclusion Crisis precisely because several expedients, of which Charles II’s divorce and remarriage was one, were fielded at the time.

Around the time that Shaftesbury put forward the motion for divorce, his associate William Lawrence, a former Cromwellian judge, authored the tract _Two great questions determined by the principles of reason & divinity_ (1681). In this tract, Lawrence justifies divorce by focusing on female fertility. He argues that the marriage contract supposes two married partners will be a “perfect Man or Woman”: able to bear a child. If one of the partners cannot produce an heir, then the marriage contract is invalid. These people “are not joined together by God and Nature”, Lawrence writes: “without more adoe, [they] are Actually Single”. Crucially, Lawrence urges Charles to get remarried so that there will be a Protestant heir to the throne rather than the Catholic Duke of York. The queen “never had, nor, morally speaking, ever can have, and bring forth an Heir”, Lawrence writes: “‘Tis absurd, that a Prince should suffer His People to incur such great danger [James II’s accession] and destruction knowingly”. By drawing on conventional motifs that were associated with the queen’s role, Lawrence demonstrates that neither Catherine nor Charles is fulfilling their perceived duty to the country. Images of queenly infertility here justify his radical counsel to the king. From the late 1660s, then, and certainly by the early 1670s, writers were disassociating the motifs of queenly fertility from the incumbent queen consort. These representations of Catherine emphasize the issue of succession, associating the dynastic motifs intrinsic to royal marriage with big political questions about the future of the Stuart dynasty.
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39 William Lawrence, _Two great questions determined by the principles of reason & divinity_ (London: for Richard Janeway, 1681), 11r-12r.
II: Motifs of fertility and the York household

On 20 October 1673 the House of Commons put forward an extraordinary request to Charles II. The King had recently announced that his brother and heir, James, was taking the Italian Duchess Mary Beatrice as his second wife. Charles informed the Houses of Parliament about the marriage only after the proxy ceremony had taken place in Modena, with the Earl of Peterborough standing in for James. MPs were horrified. Despite the fact that Mary Beatrice was already on her way to England, they requested that “the intended Marriage of his Royal Highness with the Princess of Modena be not consummated”. Thomas Clarges justified this bold move by noting “how near the Duke is to the Crown, and [that] these marriages may be of great Consequence in future times”. The Parliament’s concern about James’ marriage shows the importance of his family to the royal succession. How far did writers use motifs of fertility to celebrate Mary Beatrice’s position at the Carolean court, and to what extent was she depicted as a royal consort in-waiting?

Long before it was clear that Catherine would not produce an heir, James and his family were accused of ambition. This theme appears frequently in satire about James’ first wife Anne, whose father, as we have seen, was described as an upstart. In the panegyric Instructions to a painter for the drawing of a picture of the state and posture of the English forces at sea, under the command of his Royal Highness (1665), Waller celebrated the Duke of York’s involvement in the Anglo-Dutch Wars and idealised Anne. The speaker describes her at Harwich on the English coast: “The gazing sea-gods, since the Paphian queen / Sprung from among them, no such sight had seen”. Andrew Marvell, however, derided Waller’s depiction of the Duchess of York. In the satire The second advice to a painter (1666), Marvell attacked Waller’s sycophancy and the perceived hypocrisy and failures of Charles’ court. Marvell’s speaker readies a “Pencil of Ermin, Oyl of Ambergreece” to describe Anne Hyde: expensive materials, ineffectual for writing, which imply that Waller is excessive and grandiose in his praise. He proceeds to describe Anne Hyde as “Pallas for art, / Venus for sport, and Juno in your heart”, ostensibly
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flattering the Duchess by comparing her with the classical goddesses, yet also subtly casting the aspersion that she wishes to be Juno, queen to Jove.44

Rumours about James’ and his family’s ambition might have circulated for some time, but his second marriage to Mary Beatrice changed the stakes. The Modena Match was designed to provide James with a male heir, as his two surviving children from his first marriage were both female. The Duke of York’s decision to marry an Italian Catholic the same year that he refused to conform to the Test Act was seen to be an ominous sign of his priorities. The Modena match also increased people’s concerns about the direction of Charles II’s leadership. Mary Beatrice’s family was known to have close links with Louis XIV, with whom many people believed Charles II was too close.45 Opposition to the marriage can be seen in Parliament and on the streets. The annual November pope-burning parade took place on a much bigger scale than usual as people prepared for Mary Beatrice to arrive.46 The anonymous author of the pamphlet A discourse on the dukedom of Modena (1674) comments darkly that Mary Beatrice’s relative Cardinal d’Esté is “a Zealot in the French Cause; by whose friendship his Family is enriched and well moneyed”.47

Some years after Mary Beatrice’s arrival, George Granville, the future dedicatee of Alexander Pope’s Windsor forest (1712), depicted her nuptials as the start of a new era for the Stuarts. He describes Charles’ struggles to produce an heir: “HIS Juno barren, in unfruitful Joys, / Our BRITISH Jove his Nuptial Hours employs”. Dynastic hopes are instead transferred to the Duke of York and Mary Beatrice: “So Fate ordains, That all our Hopes may be, / And all our prospect, gallant York, in THEE.”48 But this poem was written after the fact, probably to celebrate James II’s accession in 1685.49 Royal panegyrists were much more wary about praising Mary Beatrice when she actually landed. Whereas twenty-two individual poems greeted Catherine’s landing, only five poems were published to welcome Mary

44 Ibid., lines 67-68 page 335.
45 Mary Beatrice’s mother, Duchess Laura, was Cardinal Mazarin’s niece.
48 George Granville, “To the Earl of Peterborough, on his Happy Accomplishment of The Marriage between His Royal Highness and the Princess Mary D’Esté of Modena,” in The genuine works in verse and prose, of the right honourable George Granville, Lord Lansdowne (London: for J. Tonson and L. Gilliver, 1732), B9r.
49 For more on Granville, see Elizabeth Handasyde, Granville the Polite: The Life of George Granville Baron Lansdowne, 1666-1735 (London: OUP, 1933), 10-12; Fat Rogers, Pope and the Destiny of the Stuarts (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 74-81.
Beatrice to England: three in the vernacular. We might expect the Duke of York’s marriage to gain less press than the King’s, but the discrepancy is nevertheless striking.

Charles seems to have been aware of popular opposition to the Modena match, as he took steps to palliate people’s worries about the consequences of the marriage. Unlike each of the earlier Stuart royal brides, Mary Beatrice was not allocated a royal chapel in which she could hold Catholic services. Perhaps as a consequence, there was little mention of the marriage in the British Catholic press. Charles also emphasized his own personal commitment to the English Church, even if his brother could not be said to practise the same. Immediately before Mary Beatrice landed, Charles issued a Proclamation which urged local justices to prosecute Catholic recusants and promised to do the same at court. “Let all our Subjects see, that no care can be greater then Our own, in the effectual suppressing of Popery”, the King wrote. In The London Gazette, details about Charles’ new proclamation and Mary Beatrice’s landing appeared side-by-side.

The new Duchess of York’s arrival prompted a wave of satire. Whereas early Restoration satire tended to circulate within the court, amongst a select court clique, satirical writing in the early 1670s was much more likely to be designed for a broader audience: “being read both inside the court, as in-house communications, and outside it as accounts of the circumstances under which the state was being ruled”. These satires, Harold Love argues, lose the “polish and playfulness that redeem the grossness of the true court lampoons” and come to “display an almost hysterical misogyny” and anti-Catholicism.

One such text about Mary Beatrice’s arrival is the satire Advice to a painter to draw the duke by (c.1673). This piece is a loose parody of Waller’s earlier panegyric for James, but includes several new

50 The vernacular poems are A congratulatory epithalamium, or speech on the arrival of Her Royal Highness, and happy marriage to the most illustrious prince James Duke of York (London: [s.n.], 1673); Nozze reali: or, a lyrick poem, celebrating the nuptials of the most worthy renouned prince, his royal highness, James duke of York, with the highly virtuous, most noble and most illustrious lady, Josepha-Maria d’Este (London: 1674); Richard Flecknoe, Euterpe Revived (London: by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1675). See also Albert-Eugene de Lancellle de Grancour, Serenissimorum principum Jacobi Stuarti et Mariæ Beatricis Estiæ Eboraci ac Albaniae (Londini: typis Tho. Newcombe, 1673); Payne Fisher, In nuperas nuptias illustrissimi celsismilique Principis Jacobi Ducis Eboraci, & Ducis Albaniae &c. et illustrissimae Principis Mariæ Beatricis de Este (Londini: impensis authoris, [1673]).
51 Mary Hopkirk, Queen over the Water: Mary Beatrice of Modena, Queen of James II (London: John Murray, 1953), 24.
52 One Catholic tract is dedicated to Mary Beatrice, in which the author hopes that she will be a “Tutelar Angel of Great Britain” who can heal the “Frozen hearts in this cold Northern Clime”. This pamphlet is part of an existing polemic debate about the conversion of Andrew Sall to the Church of England, though, and was not sanctioned by Mary Beatrice. See J. E., A soveraign counter-poison prepared by a faithfull hand for the speedy reviviscence of Andrew Sall late sacrilegious apostat (Louvain: 1674), A3.
54 Love, English Clandestine Satire, 51.
stanzas about people not mentioned in the original poem. The speaker starts by criticising the Earl of Peterborough, who helped to negotiate James’ second marriage. He then describes Mary Beatrice coming to England, “Hast’ning to be envenom’d with the pox”:

Poor Princess, born under a sullen star,
To find this welcome when you’re come so far!
Better some jealous neighbour of your own
Had call’d you to some sound, though petty throne,
Where, ’twixt a wholesome husband and a page
You might have linger’d out a lazy age,
Than in false hopes of being once a queen,
Die before twenty, rot before sixteen.55

The tone of mock-empathy here, like the mock-empathy for Catherine in The queen’s ball, is a levelling mechanism. The speaker raises general themes of cuckoldry through the idea that Mary Beatrice would need both a page and husband to satisfy her – and there is also a snide denigration of the “sound, though petty” titles of Duchy states such as Modena. Crucially, the humour hinges on the idea that Mary Beatrice will die of sexually transmitted disease before she can gain the crown. The violence of this satire, like the violence of Catherine’s imagined death in The queen’s ball, demonstrates the increasing polarisation of public debate.

Despite the political pressures that attended Mary Beatrice’s arrival, the York marriage was celebrated on the court stage. The opera Ariadne, or, the marriage of Bacchus (Jan. 1674) belatedly lauded Mary Beatrice’s arrival. Attended by both James and Mary Beatrice and Charles and Catherine, the opera was based on a French original by Pierre Perrin and set to music by the Master of the King’s Music, Louis Grabu. It includes a new prologue in which representatives of the Thames, the Seine and the Tiber address the “Royal Eares”. The speakers list Charles’ virtues: “Vallor and Justice both may act their Parts, / But Love makes Charles to Rule his People’s hearts”. The nymphs then praise Charles’ role as royal matchmaker. They are joined by the Italian river Po, who claims to have carried Mary Beatrice to England. Po addresses the Thames deferentially, while also highlighting the advantages of her arrival:

“Leaving my fertile Plains and Shoars, to bring / A Royal Sister to thy Greatest King”. This focus on the Italian land’s fertility heralds the role that Mary Beatrice might play as the mother to future Stuart heirs.

The prologue to Ariadne touches on the possibility of opposition to Mary Beatrice’s arrival and absorbs its risks. Thames considers Mary Beatrice’s reception and provides some assurance to Po:

And thou maist see his [Charles’] People now,
To thy Princess, both love and honor shew:
This Bliss, thou ow’st to her alone, whose Charm,
In ’spight of Fate, all resistance disarm:
And makes Envy it self t’adore
Her now, whom it oppos’d before:  \( \text{(All these Four joine and sing as before.)} \)

The carefully structured passage moves from one individual voice to a choral display of unanimity and, implicitly, consensus. This sense of order displaces criticism of the new Duchess and provides a harmonious frame for her arrival. Suggesting that Mary Beatrice’s beauty will overcome opposition, this passage raises the prospect of hostility and deftly shuts it down. The act of celebrating Mary Beatrice’s arrival, according to these nymphs, will help to solidify support for the regime.

Little more than a year after the royal family attended Ariadne, the Yorks were involved with one of the most important cultural events on the Carolean court stage, John Crowne’s masque Calisto, performed in February 1675. Princess Mary, aged twelve at the time, took the title role of the nymph Calisto, a member of the goddess Diana’s entourage. She was accompanied on stage by her sister Princess Anne, who played Calisto’s sister, Nyphe. Several of Charles’ natural children also participated, including the Duke of Monmouth, who danced a minuet. Based on Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Calisto focuses on an attempt by the classical king of the gods, Jove, to woo Calisto. While in the myth Calisto is pursued and ultimately raped by Jove, Crowne excises the rape so that Calisto’s chastity is both preserved and extolled. The entertainment was performed before the royal couple, James and Mary Beatrice, who had given birth to a daughter just weeks before. Matthew Jenkinson argues that Crowne uses this masque as an opportunity to counsel Charles, the libertine King. Calisto provides, Jenkinson
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56 Pierre Perrin, Ariadne, or, The marriage of Bacchus, an opera, or, a vocal representation; first compos’d by Monsieur P.P, revised by Louis Grabut ([London]: In the Savoy, by Tho. Newcombe, 1674), B2v.
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argues: “a serious moralistic critique of a dangerous philosophy and way of life”. While I share Jenkinson’s sense that *Calisto* is concerned with the dynamic of the Carolean court, the masque also explores the possibilities for the Stuart family’s representation in more ambiguous ways.

Like *Ariadne*, *Calisto* opens with a prologue in which a representative of the River Thames greets Charles and Catherine: “The God and Goddess too of this bless’d Isle”. Thames is then accompanied by representatives of Asia, Africa and the Americas, all of whom come together to praise the achievements of Charles’ reign. The presence of these three international figures gestures towards Charles’ imperial ambitions, which, we have seen, Catherine’s dowry helped to make possible. Significantly, the Thames represents the King and queen consort as complementary influences by describing Catherine’s chastity: “Chaste Beauty in Her Aspect shines / And Love in His does smile”.

There is, however, a degree of irony in Thames’ praise. As Catherine and most members of this entertainment’s audience would have been aware, the actress playing Thames, Mary Davis, was a former mistress of Charles. The mother of one of his acknowledged natural children, Davis had had a long career on the professional stage. Her performance in this prologue at once praises Catherine’s chastity, and titillates the King whose earlier “Love” for her was well-known. For Davis to describe Catherine’s “Chaste Beauty” thereby undermines an idealised sentiment, even as she expresses praise.

The dynamic of royal marriage provides a structure for *Calisto*, but images of royal marriage here also resist the idealising impulse in earlier masques such as those for Charles I and Henrietta Maria. Whereas the first half concentrates on Jove’s failed attempt to woo Calisto, the action in the second half of the entertainment focuses on Juno’s revenge. She first descends from the heavens in Act Three: Scene One, changing the masque’s tempo. The character’s opening scenes show that she is a canny political operator, as well as a beleaguered wife. Her opening lines are a monologue, in which she confides to the audience that she is aware of Jove’s sexual antics. “I am assur’d he does not wait”, she says drily: “On any politick Affairs of State”.

Later in Act Three, Juno confronts Jove with the innocent Calisto and attempts to convince her husband to rejoin her in the heavens. Rather than appealing to his sense of duty as a husband, or indeed his affection for her as his wife, Juno makes a political threat. She states that she will mobilise the gods against Jove if he fails to return. “I’le make em chuse another in
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thy Throne,” she warns: “To save both Heav’n and Earth from being undone”.\(^{62}\) For the queen of the gods to threaten to recruit the other gods against her husband-king is unlike anything that appeared in earlier Jacobean or Caroline court masques. While this is of course a fictional representation of royal marriage, and does not directly represent Charles and Catherine, it is telling that dynastic imagery is not associated with Jove or his wife. Instead their marriage is situated in a pragmatic, political context.

When dynastic motifs are deployed in *Calisto*, it is to praise the young nymphs in Diana’s train rather than the king and queen of the gods. The entertainment concludes when Jove foils a plot against Calisto and convinces Juno to forgive the young nymph. Jove says that he will turn Calisto and Nyphe into stars, so that they can retain their chastity but share the benefits of their beauty with many nations. Immediately after the characters leave the stage, however, Jupiter returns to deliver the epilogue. He addresses the two princesses Mary and Anne, stressing that “This inferiour World can scarce dispence / With the entire loss of so much Excellence”. Jupiter states that: “With each of you I can oblige a Throne, / I’ll keep you then to grace some Fav’rite Crown”.\(^{63}\) This image of Jupiter giving Mary and Anne to other powers gestures towards their future role on the international marriage market. The young princesses were eligible marriage candidates given their proximity to the throne, and this entertainment advertises the role that they might play in international dynastic politics. The use of dynastic imagery in *Calisto* is crucial, as it shows the importance of the York household as a whole in positive images of Charles’ reign. Even as concerns about his brother’s personality grew, Charles’ nieces could be a positive symbol of the Stuart monarchy’s future.

Two years after *Calisto* was performed, Charles announced that Mary was going to marry her first cousin William, Stadtholder of the Dutch Republic. The marriage was designed to be part of a new short-term political strategy, putting pressure on Louis XIV to co-operate in peace talks with the Dutch Republic. Charles pledged military support to the Dutch Republic and hoped that the stronger Anglo-Dutch alliance would provide more leverage for William.\(^{64}\) The marriage received high approval in Britain, where writers feted Mary’s nuptials and there were bonfires in London, a banquet in Edinburgh, and a display of ship lights in Yarmouth.\(^{65}\) Although the marriage was principally decided on account of this political context, it also had long-term implications for the succession. Mary was still second in line
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\(^{65}\) The Edinburgh celebrations were reported in the newsbooks: see *The London Gazette* 1249 (5 Nov – 8 Nov).
to the throne when she got married, while William was the fourth in line to the throne after James, Mary and Anne. Mary’s marriage gave people an opportunity to reflect on the dynastic future for the Stuarts, immediately before the succession crisis exploded in Parliament. One option proposed in the Commons to solve the succession problem was excluding James but keeping the crown ‘in-house’ by giving it to Mary and William.\footnote{Howard Nenner, “Ideas of Monarchical Succession in the Debate on Exclusion,” in Restoration, Ideology and Revolution: Proceedings of the Folger Institute Center for the History of British Political Thought, Volume 4, ed. Gordon J. Schochet (Washington: The Folger Institute, 1990): 445-461.}

Edmund Waller, the long-time royal panegyrist and established member of the House of Commons, was concerned by the rising hostility towards the Duke of York in Parliament. In October 1673, Waller was “much astonished” by his colleagues’ attempt to block James’ second marriage. He made a speech urging MPs to consider “how the Duke has exposed his Person – Consider the thing and the Person, and [he] hopes you will decline in this manner of proceeding”.\footnote{Anchitell Grey, ed., Debates in the House of Commons, from the Year 1667, to the Year 1694, Volume 2 (London: for T. Becket and P. A. De Handt, 1769): 193.} In what remains the best full-length study of Waller’s works, Warren Chernaik argues that Waller increasingly urged for moderation in both literature and politics.\footnote{Warren Chernaik, The Poetry of Limitation: A Study of Edmund Waller (New Haven: Yale UP, 1968), 135.} To conclude this chapter, I look at how Waller framed images of fertility in his poem Of the Lady Mary & c. (1677) and probed the succession debate.

Waller’s poem about Mary was published in a single broadside, along with another companion poem about the prince. Unlike some of Waller’s earlier poems about royal marriage, which created lengthy romantic narratives, this piece brings together a series of seemingly disparate images and metaphors. It comprises ten octosyllabic quatrains, which share a simple rhyme scheme. Waller opens with an oblique description of Mary’s descent from James:

\begin{quote}
As once the lion honey gave,
Out of the strong such sweetness came;
A royal hero, no less brave,
Produced this sweet, this lovely dame.\\footnote{Waller, “Of the Lady Mary, &c.,” ed. G. Thorn Drury, in The Poems of Edmund Waller, Volume 2 (London: Routledge & Sons Ltd, 1906), lines 1-4 page 80.}
\end{quote}

The contrast between Mary’s sweetness and her father’s strength demonstrates well Waller’s favoured poetic device of antithesis, which was designed to show harmony between different elements. The image of honey and the lion derives from Judges 14, wherein Samson is attacked by a lion when travelling to
Timnath to arrange his first marriage. Samson kills the creature, and later sees that bees have created a hive in its carcass. He uses the episode in a riddle to trick his wife’s kinsmen: “Out of the eater came forth meate, and out of the strong came forth sweetnesse.” This biblical story is connected with the theme of providence, encouraging the reader to place their faith in God’s word.

Waller’s decision to use the story of the lion’s death as a metaphor for Mary’s descent is intriguing, all the more so because he had actually used this imagery some years before. In 1657 Waller wrote an entertainment for the marriage between Oliver Cromwell’s youngest daughter, Frances, and Robert Rich, grandson of the Earl of Warwick. Here he used the same image to describe the Protector’s daughter: “Soe Honny from the Lyon came, / And sweetness from the strong”. Edward Holberton has shown that Frances’ expensive wedding was seen at the time to show Cromwell’s increasing fondness for a courtly style of leadership. Holberton contends that Waller subtly aligns Cromwell with the lion, which readers would know is dead in the biblical text. By doing so, Waller suggests that a more regal style of governance will develop after Cromwell’s death: “This image promises that, as long as no one rocks the boat, the return to a courtly government will be smooth, bloodless, and probably quite soon”.

For Waller to recycle his earlier metaphors about Cromwell to describe the Duke of York in 1677 invites similar concerns about the prospect of succession and future authority. Mary’s image is seen to be a positive symbol of the future Stuart dynasty, as Waller praises her union with the Protestant Prince. But the relationship between Princess Mary and her father is, in these images, more ambiguous and more strained.

III: Conclusion

Images of royal family and royal fertility continued to be important for Charles II’s iconography, but also contributed to concerns about the shape of his reign and the future. Writers welcomed Catherine to England by putting forward optimistic images for a new and different Stuart dynasty, and they then faced a challenge to find ways to represent the queen consort when she was not able to provide a new heir for the throne. From the early 1670s, literature about the queen consort shows people asking questions about the direction of Charles’ governance, and the sustainability of his policies. The fact that
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panegyrists still used dynastic motifs to describe the York household shows the enduring attractiveness of this imagery, even if it could not be applied to the queen consort. Charles’ representation was still a family representation, and the presence of the York family was in some ways advantageous. At the same time, literature about Mary Beatrice and Princess Mary also shows concern about the sense of brewing domestic division to which their marriages contributed. Even as writers such as Waller recycle conventional dynastic motifs, their texts demonstrate a growing sense of unease over this symbolism’s capacity to unify. More generally, there are underlying questions in masques such as Calisto about the utility of traditional motifs of praise in the libertine environment of Charles II’s court.

How do these images of Stuart dynasty compare with earlier representations of the Stuart reign, and what implications does this have for contemporary politics? Part 1 showed that dynastic imagery was integral to the Stuart brand. James I’s family was frequently celebrated in early succession texts, as were the anticipated heirs of Charles I. Motherhood was thus a staple theme of texts about the consort, as writers praised their expected role in the royal family. Although writers’ ideas about what the Stuart family should stand for differed, their texts shared an assumption that dynastic imagery could demonstrate monarchical legitimacy. This assumption was challenged in the 1650s, when Charles I’s family was divided. It was further problematized by Henrietta Maria’s presence in England in the 1660s.

As Chapter 7 showed, panegyrists were unsure that it was expedient or desirable to return to earlier images of the Stuart family. The literature that I have studied in this chapter shows that, at the very heart of the Carolean court, writers questioned the capacity of dynastic imagery to unify people in support of the Stuart monarchy. Images of Catherine’s and Mary Beatrice’s fertility, in particular, contributed to an increasingly rancorous political debate. As politicians started to consider the constitutional limits of a monarch’s power, writers register awareness and anxiety about being on the cusp of political change.
Chapter Nine

Royal romance at the court of Saint-Germain

This chapter examines writings about Mary Beatrice that circulated in England during the early 1690s, as her former subjects adjusted to her exile. No single event has influenced a queen consort’s representation to the same extent as the birth of Mary Beatrice’s son Prince James. The queen’s pregnancy catalysed people’s concern about James II’s reign, which seemed more critical now there was the prospect of a Catholic dynasty for years to come. James’ opponents spread a number of remarkable rumours that were designed to delegitimise Prince James, including the claim that Mary Beatrice was having an affair and that she had smuggled the child into St James’ Palace. This latter story came to be known as the warming pan plot, and James’ opponents used it to fan the flames of political dissent. In November 1688, William III circulated a pamphlet justifying his invasion. He highlighted in it “just and visible Grounds of Suspicion” about Mary Beatrice’s “pretended Bigness”.¹ These rumours demonised the Catholic queen.² Their scale and vitriol also fostered negative attitudes towards women’s involvement in politics more generally, perhaps influencing the focus on gender in pamphlets discussing Mary II’s capacity of rule as part of the joint sovereignty agreement. Rachel Weil argues that the warming pan plot “both reflected and shaped contemporary understandings of women’s relationship to political life”.³

What kinds of stories circulated about Mary Beatrice’s behaviour at the exiled court, and how did these images contribute to contemporary politics? How, in the wake of such a large public scandal, could supporters of the exiled Stuarts forge positive images for the exiled queen? We know that there was substantial debate about William’s and Mary’s leadership in the years after the 1689 political settlement, during which time there was a real chance that James would be restored.⁴ Rather than being

³ Rachel Weil, Political Passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England, 1680-1715 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 87.
⁴ For an accessible narrative account of the 1690s, which emphasises the problems facing William and Mary, see Craig Rose, England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1999).
a fringe movement, Jacobitism was a plural identity with which many people could identify. Jacobite writers developed a number of motifs to advocate the exiled couple’s return. “The pastoral imagery of Jacobitism was well established at many levels,” writes Murray Pittock: “It was perhaps in this context that the lover’s knot became a ‘Jacobite device’, and that the flaming hearts began to appear as a Jacobite moniker”. While scholars have established the importance of romance motifs in Jacobite culture, there has been surprisingly little work on representations of the actual royal marriage. Michael McKeon argues that Jacobite writers turned away from the representation of public figures such as Mary Beatrice. Early eighteenth century Jacobite romance, McKeon argues, concentrates on “speaking of low, sensible things to common people”.

In fact, an outpouring of literature continued to be produced about Mary Beatrice after she left England for the final time, dressed incognito as a laundry woman and accompanied by her infant son. She was settled at the court of St. Germain in France, where she would live for the remaining thirty years of her life. This court provided a hub of resistance to William’s and Mary’s regime. From a printing press on site, James published declarations to his English subjects which were designed to incite support for his restoration. The exiled couple also patronised portraits that showcased their marriage and children. As the wife to a King who was often on campaign to regain his lands, Mary Beatrice came to be more involved with the daily management of the court than in England. And after her husband’s death, she also acted as regent for their young son. Edward Gregg notes that Mary Beatrice “assumed an importance which she had never had before the Revolution” at St. Germain. In what follows I explore a range of writings about the exiled queen, concentrating in particular on a series of prose narratives that speculated about her possible behaviour at the exiled court. Opponents of the exiled Stuarts built on a long tradition of secret history writing to create dystopian images of the exiled court.

8 Sandra Jean Sullivan, “Representations of Mary of Modena, Queen Consort and Exile: Images and Texts” (PhD Diss, University College London, 2008), 310.
9 James II, *His majesties most gracious declaration to all his loving subjects commanding their assistance against the Prince of Orange, and his adherents* (St. Germans: by Thomas Hales, 1692); James II, *His majesties most gracious declaration to all his loving subjects* [London, 1693].
But Jacobite writers also engaged with this imagery, drawing on the conventions of secret history and romance writing to rehabilitate the exiled queen’s memory and forge a more positive image of St. Germain.

I: Bad romance

Given that stories about Mary Beatrice’s pregnancy had helped to stimulate opposition to James II in the months leading up to the Revolution, it is no surprise that English writers and readers were interested in what happened to the queen consort after it had taken place. There were restrictions on the movement of goods and people between England and the exiled court, but newsbook reports and printed pamphlets nonetheless speculated about what was taking place there. The level of public interest in Mary Beatrice is attested by the number of newsbook reports about her initial journey to France. In December 1688, for example, The Universal Intelligence reported that “the Queen, Prince of Wales, and they say Father Peters, crost the Water”. The following issue speculates that “The Queen and the Child are no doubt safe arrived beyond Sea, but where, not yet certainly known”. Finally, the newsbook reports several issues later that Mary Beatrice has arrived in France. In the months after Mary Beatrice’s departure, hundreds of pamphlets, poems and plays were published about her.

A good number of the writings about Mary Beatrice looked back on the warming pan plot, or considered its aftermath. The one-time Jacobite agent and now writer, William Fuller, continued to author texts that capitalised on the warming pan plot well into the 1690s. Fuller claimed that he was in the employ of one of Mary Beatrice’s attendants when a pregnant Irishwoman named Mary Grey was smuggled into St James’ Palace before Prince James’ birth. In A brief discovery of the true mother of the pretended Prince of Wales known by the name of Mary Grey (1696), Fuller argues that Mary Beatrice brought Mary Grey with her to France and then tried to have the woman confined to a nunnery, to prevent the truth coming out. According to Fuller, Mary Grey attempted to escape the nunnery and Mary Beatrice decided, with Louis XIV’s support, that Mary Grey should be murdered. “She trusted me with some part of the bloody Commission”, Fuller states, darkly commenting on Mary Beatrice’s

12 The Universal Intelligence (December 11th 1688).
13 The Universal Intelligence (December 15th 1688).
14 The Universal Intelligence (January 1st 1689).
15 See for example the play The abdicated prince, or, The adventures of four years a tragi-comedy, as it was lately acted at the court at Alba Regalis (London: for John Carterson, 1690); and the speech The French King’s speech to the Queen of England, at her arrival in Paris: and the Queens answer ([London]: 1689).
“Furious Zeal” for secrecy. This text, and others like it, reiterates the anti-popery that was already endemic in literature about the queen consort.

Alongside anti-Catholicism, misogyny continues to be prominent in the literature about Mary Beatrice’s time at St. Germain. The anonymous author of the pamphlet Remarks upon the dream of the late abdicated Queen of England (1690), for example, purports to transcribe and decipher a nightmare that Mary Beatrice had on Christmas Eve 1689. Before the author explains his interpretation of Mary Beatrice’s dream, he reminds the reader that she “is by birth an Italian Princess, a Bigotted Papist, and much devoted to the Pope, and to the Jesuits: thence it was, she entertain’d a firm Design to ruine the English, and to Extirpate the Protestant Religion”. He states that she “pretended a Prince of Wales was born, and was the occasion thereby of that Tragi-Comedy so known to all Europe”. The author’s focus on Mary Beatrice’s religion and his argument that she interfered with politics suggests that, as a woman, she had no cause to be involved at all. The queen becomes a scapegoat for the failings of James’ reign, but also a symbol of corruption and mismanagement that could in turn be projected onto the court at St. Germain.

The blend of fact and speculation in these newsbook reports helped to fire people’s imaginations about the queen’s behaviour. In addition to texts that revisited her time in England, a number of original prose fictions were published about her life at the court of St. Germain. These texts appear to have been popular commercial ventures, such as The amours of Messalina (1689) series, which described in five separate books the escapades of one Queen Messalina of Albion. They were often episodic, focusing on specific moments of intrigue. This structure makes them similar to secret history texts, and indeed works such as The court of St. Germain’s: Or, the secret history of the late King James and Queen Mary (1695) were advertised that way. Rebecca Bullard notes that secret histories of the 1690s “become part of a celebration of newfound freedoms rather than a means of opposing existing oppression”.18

---

16 William Fuller, A brief discovery of the true mother of the pretended Prince of Wales known by the name of Mary Grey. By a gentleman, who sometime ago belonged to the retinue of the late queen in France (London: printed and sold by Jer. Wilkins, 1696), C2v. For more on Fuller see Kate Loveman, Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2008), esp. 119-123.

17 Anon, Remarks upon the dream of the late abdicated Queen of England, and upon that of madam the Dutchess of La Vallerie, late mistress to the French king, and now nun of the order of Bare-Footed-Carmelites at Paris. By the author of the harmony of prophesies, &c (London: for Tho. Salusbury and to be sold by R. Baldwin, 1690), B1v.

Similarly, these prose fictions about St. Germain enabled people to explore the possibilities for representing Mary Beatrice in the wake of the warming pan plot.

It seems unlikely that people believed that they were reading true reflections on the court at St. Germain, but they were especially interested in the purported events in the royal bedchambers. Rumours about Mary Beatrice’s sexual activities were rife across different kinds of printed texts. In particular, writers speculated that Mary Beatrice was having an affair with Louis XIV, on whom she and James depended for financial support. “If Lewis did send the poor King o’ one side”, writes the anonymous author of the broadside poem *The vindication, or scandal reprov’d* (1689), explaining why Louis XIV helped to fund James’ military campaigns: “Yet you’re Sawcy to Guess what he did with his Bride”. The space and narrative structure of these prose fictions enabled writers to expand on popular rumour and provide readers with a dystopian fantasy of the exiled court. The narrator of *The amours of Messalina*, for example, notes that Messalina was always wanton in Albion, but finds a “more agreeable and nature element” for her “Air of Love and Pleasure” in Gothland. She promptly starts an affair with King Polydorus (Louis XIV) soon after she arrives.

The romantic intrigues in Gothland went beyond the sexual innuendo that could often be found on the late Stuart stage. At the start of the third book of this series, for instance, Messalina’s lover is involved in an unwitting bed-trick. She and Count Davila have arranged a liaison in her bedchamber, where her attendant the Marchioness de Tamazo is also sleeping. When Davila arrives, he mistakes the Marchioness for Messalina in the dark and leaps into bed: preparing to “attack the Fort, mingling with his Kisses, his short Amorous sighs”. When Messalina then enters the bedchamber with a light, the couple realise their mistake. It comes at a compromising moment: “the Count, raised on his Knees between Tomazo’s Leggs, and in a posture which plainly discovered the drift of his intentions”. Thankfully for Davila, Messalina sees the funny side. The narrator states that she “burst out in Laughter”

---

19 The narrator of *The court of St. Germain’s* is flippant about the credibility of this story, admitting in the final lines that he is only “pretty well Convinc’d of the Truth which I have deliver’d”. See *The court of St. Germain’s: or, The secret history of the late King James and Queen Mary. From their first arrival in France, to this time. From the French original* (London: [s.n.], 1695), F12v.

20 Anon, *The vindication, or scandal Reprov’d* (London: 1689).

21 Anon, *The amours of Messalina, late Queen of Albion. In which are briefly couch’d, secrets of the imposture of the Cambriot prince, the Gothick league and other court intrigues of the four last years reign, not yet made publick. By a woman of quality, a late confident of Q. Messalina* (London: for John Lyford, 1689), O1v.

22 Ibid., P1v.

23 Ibid., P2v.
when she realised the mistake: “[and] told the Count in Drollery, the Weather began to be cold, and therefore he would do well to take care and cover his Mistress and himself”.24

These prose fictions could foster a variety of reactions from the reader, including titillation and amusement. In the above episode, Messalina’s good humour matches the intended reaction from the reader. By putting the character and the reader on a par, the writer might appear to make Messalina more endearing and somewhat undermine the sharp criticisms of Mary Beatrice elsewhere. Yet this blend of humour and sexualisation would have been familiar for contemporary readers, as it also appears in other English texts that represent Catholic environments as a space for fear and fantasy.25

More often than not, the joke is on Messalina. When the narrator describes Messalina’s departure from Albion, as one example, he remembers the character’s accession. “This very Messalina,” he states: “of all those Floating Castles, the late attending Pageants of her Triumph, all those once Impregnable Famed Walls of Albion; left Mistress of no more than a poor Cock-boat!”26 Juxtaposing the character’s former grandeur with her now depleted circumstances, the narrator makes Messalina the target of his satire. The fictional queen, and by implication Mary Beatrice, are reassuringly ludicrous.27

When restoration continued to be a live issue throughout the 1690s, these humorous narratives had serious implications. For writers to claim that Mary Beatrice was not faithful to James cast aspersion on the legitimacy of her children, and by extension their claim to the throne. It also undermined James’ status as a Stuart patriarch. The later narrative The court of St. Germain’s, for instance, contrasts Mary Beatrice’s extra-marital successes with James’ personal failures. The text is an anonymous English translation of a French original. Mary Beatrice is depicted as a loquacious and lascivious individual, as are many members of the French court. She takes a number of lovers, including the Archbishop of Paris, Louis XIV and the Curate of Saint Martin, her “Ecclesiastical Adonis”.28 The narrator claims that Mary Beatrice’s affair with Louis XIV angered Madame de Maintenon, who was in real life his morganatic wife. Maintenon contrives to set up a rival for Mary Beatrice by placing various young women before James, but he is unable to seduce them. Indeed, one “fell a laughing” when James
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24 Ibid., P2.
26 Anon, The Amours of Messalina, St'.
28 Anon, The Court of St. Germain, Dv'.
entered her bedchamber: “And the Charming Picardin,\textsuperscript{29} observing how she had silenc’d the Poor King, left him with a Smile of Derision, and said no more to him”.\textsuperscript{30} The fact that authors could represent the royal consort in this manner confirmed and ultimately cemented her fall from grace.

II: Recreating Royal Romance

Faced with the scale of slanderous literature about Mary Beatrice, James’ supporters had to find an alternative way to write about her status at the exiled court. It was a dangerous business to criticise William and Mary in print, or publish support for the exiled monarchs. Government censors monitored underground print networks and Jacobite publishers like William Anderton faced execution if they were caught.\textsuperscript{31} Nevertheless, a surprising amount of Jacobite literature was published in early 1690s England, ranging from explicit satire about William to coded utopian pamphlets and political tracts.\textsuperscript{32} I investigate here how Jacobite writers challenged the rumours that surrounded Mary Beatrice and set out to recreate ideals of royal romance that had been so important in 1685.

The anonymous pamphlet \textit{The blatant beast muzzl’d} (1691) sets out to defend “a Princess whose Incomparable Worth and Unblemish’d Virtue is such, that it never permitted any occasion to the least sinister Imagination in any that knew her”.\textsuperscript{33} This text is a point-by-point riposte to the earlier pamphlet \textit{The secret history of the reigns of K. Charles II and K. James II} (1690), which concentrated on James rather than Mary Beatrice. But the author opens with a lengthy preface in which he challenges negative representations of the exiled court more generally, especially the “lively Expressions” and “Bawdy Contents” of \textit{The amours of Messalina}. He compares those who peddled secret histories with the “blatant beast” of Edmund Spenser’s \textit{The faerie queene} (1590), explaining that Spenser “represents that pernicious Vice of Calumny or Slander by a deformed Creature, which he calls The Blatant Beast”.


\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., E1°.


\textsuperscript{32} See for example \textit{Antiquity reviv’d: or The government of a certain island antiently call’d Astreada, in reference to religion, policy, war, and peace} (London: 1693); \textit{Great Britain’s just complaint for her late measures, present sufferings, and the future miseries she is exposed to} ([London]: 1692).

\textsuperscript{33} N.N, \textit{The blatant beast muzzl’d: or, Reflexions on a late libel, entituled, The secret history of the reigns of K. Charles II. and K. James II} (London: 1691), A8°.
Seeming truth, the author argues, is stranger than fiction: “Had that Poet liv’d in the same time of this Libeller, his Fiction might have been History”.34

The use of this figure from Spenser’s allegorical epic establishes a contrast between secret histories and romance, which would be useful for this author. By the time that he was writing, romances had indeed long been associated with the cause of royalists in exile. During the 1650s, when many supporters of Charles II were exiled on the continent, romance writing took on a distinctly royalist hue. Some of Charles’ supporters translated continental prose romances during their time in Europe. For example, Charles Cotterell, Charles’ future Master of Ceremonies, undertook an English translation of La Calprendee’s Cassandre in the early 1650s. Philip Major notes that Cotterell’s choice of text had particular royalist undertones, as Charles I had owned a copy of Cassandre, which he entrusted to the loyal peer the Earl of Lindsay shortly before his death. The translation could thus be seen as “an English vernacular companion piece to a precious relic”.35 Cotterell’s Cassandra (1652) was published in England, but also circulated among royalist emigrés on the continent and helped to form a literary network of readers. Projects of translation such as this could therefore foster a sense of royalist community at a disturbing time.

In addition to the translation of continental romances, royalist writers also produced a series of original English vernacular prose romances. These romances were often lengthy, stretching to hundreds of pages, and would have been affordable only to elite readers. The texts were very different to chivalric romances of times passed, but like them they were often invested in themes of exile and return.36 Lois Potter shows that the clear narrative structure of romance also offered royalist writers a coherent model at a confusing time: romance was part of the “royalist plot”.37 Once Charles was restored, some of the 1650s romances were republished to celebrate the King’s return. The Cloria and Narcissus (1653) series, first printed in instalments during the Protectorate, was republished in toto in 1661 under the
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34 Ibid., A3°.
new title *The Princess Cloria: or, the royal romance* (1661). The title page advertised that this romance contained “the story of most part of Europe, for many years last past.”

These politically engaged mid-century romances examined the dynamic of sovereignty rather than simply eulogising the memory of the Stuarts. One example is *Panthalia: or the royal romance* (1659) by Richard Brathwaite. The story comprises an allegorical history of English monarchs from the reign of Elizabeth I. Brathwaite does not idealise the fictional counterparts for the Stuarts, and sometimes questions their choices. For instance, James I’s equivalent is named Basilius after the negligent King of Philip Sidney’s *Arcadia*. However, Brathwaite’s narrator breezily guides the reader through some of the greatest scandals in Stuart history, including the Duke of Buckingham’s supposed plot to murder James I. The text concludes with an imagined restoration, when King Rosicles’ and Queen Irina’s son, Charicles, is invited back to his native country. Charicles returns to the capital with his mother. Although they are “imbathed with tears” at the memory of his father, the pair put aside their unhappy memories of the past and enter the capital together: “high and consequent affairs injoyn’d their divertisement from a pursuit of passion, to such a composure or moderation, as might better suit with the necessity of their addresses”. This scene offers a fantasy of restoration, and also a pledge to readers that a restored king would mind their expectations of how he should behave.

For the author of *The blatant beast muzzl’d*, the association between romance and political writing helps to challenge the secret historians and writers who claimed that they alone could disclose truths about the exiled court. He mentions two early prose romances, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia, written by Sir Philippe Sidnei* (1590) and John Barclay’s *Joannis Barclaii Argenis* (1622). He states that “the Arcadia and Argenis, by the help of a Clavis, may have much Truth cover’d under those Poetical Veils”. The secret history, by contrast, claims to represent fact yet instead creates fiction: “Blatant’s History is barr’d of that Plea, by professing to contain nothing but Real Verities.” The author
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38 Anon, *The Princess Cloria: or, the royal romance. In five parts. Imbellished with divers political notions, and singular remarks of modern transactions. Containing the story of most part of Europe, for many years last past* (London: by Ralph Wood, to be sold by William Brooke, 1661).
39 Brathwaite was a Catholic northern gentleman, who was by this time nearing the end of a long and fascinating literary career.
41 Richard Brathwaite, *Panthalia: or the royal romance. A discourse stored with infinite variety in relation to state-government and passages of matchless affection gracefully interveined, and presented on a theatre of tragical and comical state, in a successive continuation to these times* (London: by J.G. to be sold by Anthony Williamson, 1659), V3.
43 Anon, *The Blatant Beast, A9*. 
here suggests that scandal-mongering narratives about the exiled couple are part of an oppositional mode of writing, which follows conventions rather than actually revealing truths of any kind. Intriguingly, both romance writing and secret histories are seen in this line of argument to present versions of the truth – rather than facts that can be taken as such. The author thus turns some focus on to the reader, encouraging them to question and evaluate images of the exiled couple.

The 80-page Jacobite pamphlet *An historical romance of the wars, between the mighty giant Gallieno, and the great knight Nasonius, and his associates* (1694) puts forward one alternative narrative about the exiled court that readers would have to decipher in such a way. *An historical romance* tells the story of the Knight Nasonius (William), as he seeks to dethrone his father in-law Eugenius (James) and then battles with the Giant Gallieno (Louis). It starts by describing a revolution in the Kingdom of Utopia (England), and uses this to explain a later military conflict between the Hydra (the Dutch Republic) and Luyslandia (France). The use of an exotic location and allegorical names does not seem to have been a ruse to evade censorship. The people who are likely to have wanted to read a copy of *An historical romance* would not have needed a clavis to know that Nasonius represented William and Gallieno represented Louis. It is probably for this reason that one distributor of *An historical romance*, Simon Weeld, was apprehended and questioned by government officials. Rather, this fictional framework offers a means to respond to the negative narratives about the exiled court and create an alternative fantasy about the exiled pair.

True to its title, *An historical romance* centres on a love plot. Before Nasonius invades Utopia, after which he had “long gap’d”, he attempts to woo a princess named Victoria. When Victoria says that she does not want to marry Nasonius, he tries to rape her and then imprisons her in his military camp. Victoria is rescued by the “mighty Giant” Gallieno and accepts sanctuary at his court. Gallieno successfully woos the princess, after a very structured courtship in which he challenges all of his rivals to a joust. The wedding scene promotes traditional values of royal dynasty. A chorus of singers praises the royal couple, hoping that “Golden Glories [will] circle their bright Throne; / And joyn their Foes Crowns to their own”. The singers add that Gallieno and Victoria will “live / Crowns to regive / To injur’d

---


45 *An historical romance of the wars, between the mighty giant Gallieno, and the great knight Nasonius, and his associates* (Dublin: 1694), C2².
Princes, who for their Protection sue". \(^{46}\) This romance plot depicts Gallieno as a traditional romantic hero. In *An historical romance*, then, the fictional exiled court is a bastion of traditional morals against its counterpart presided over by Nasonius.

While this chivalric plot helps to cast Gallieno in a flattering light, it can also be connected with bigger questions such as the dynamic of James’ relationship with Louis. Many Jacobites in England were not Catholic, and would have been alarmed by James’ growing dependence on France. The country was now also engaged in a war against France, joining a conflict that had been raging for some years as William challenged France’s imperial authority. The author of *An historical romance* rewrites this chronology, so that the Utopian revolution occurs before war breaks out. In Chapter 8, Eugenius appeals to Gallieno for assistance. Gallieno promises to protect the weaker King not because of religious affiliation, but because of his commitment to the rights of a brother monarch. He pledges his support for Eugenius in a rhyming couplet that is unusual in this prose text, and echoes the earlier epithalamium: “I’ll either set you on your Throne, / Or I resolve to lose my Own”. \(^{47}\) For Gallieno to support Eugenius here seems to confirm his status as a romantic hero. It raises the prospect of restoration for the exiled King, but also provides a framework to interpret the European wars. Dynastic honour - rather than religious solidarity - is the most important theme connecting these two characters.

The idealised romantic relationship between Gallieno and Victoria is counter-balanced with a dystopian romance between Nasonius and his demonic concubine, the devil’s daughter Ambitiosa Superba. Prior to his invasion of Utopia, Nasonius agrees to take Ambitiosa as his mistress in return for help gaining the kingdom. She descends from the sky to meet her new lover: “with a train of Black-Brow’d Furies, or Fiends attending her: Her self was clad in a gorgeous Robe, with many great Crowns dangling about it, spurning many lesser ones, and trampling them under her Feet”. \(^{48}\) Ambitiosa’s name obviously signifies ambition, and she does indeed enable Nasonius to achieve his aims in Utopia. She effectively becomes his spin doctor, advising him on the most effective ways to use print as propaganda. In particular, Ambitiosa tells Nasonius to “make use of the Letters of his partial Friends, and his own Gazzettes (the Gospel of the vulgar) to keep up the repute of his Courage and Conduct”. \(^{49}\) “Utopia is
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\(^{46}\) Ibid., C2r.
\(^{47}\) Ibid., E2v.
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ready to receive me with open Arms,” Nasonius gloats: the people are “courting me as their noble Deliverer: while in reality I go only to enslave them.”

Ambitiosa’s conduct replicates and magnifies some of the claims that had been made about Mary Beatrice. Interestingly, the author of An historical romance does not try to titillate the reader in the same way as texts like The amours of Messalina. Nasonius spends little time with his demonic concubine and instead sleeps in the same room as his favoured companion, the symbolically named Sodomicus. An historical romance therefore incorporates the common Jacobite slur that William might be homosexual. But Ambitiosa’s involvement in the run-up to the invasion mirrors the negative images of Mary Beatrice’s involvement in politics before James was exiled. The presence of this female character at the heart of Nasonius’ corrupt court might also reflect ill on Mary II, who was also often accused of ambition by the Jacobite press. Ambitiosa is to some extent abused and neglected by her lover, but she is also seen to transgress decency and enable a corrupt regime. This in turn corrodes a sense of public trust. Whereas Nasonius states in public that he is acting on behalf of the Utopian people’s faith, he fails to live up to these expectations in private. “Piety!”, scorns Sodomicus: “Are you yet such a Puny, such a Novice in Politicks, as to stand upon the weak supports of that sneaking Vertue, Piety? [...] I tell you, POWER is all in all: Get but Power, and let the demure Gentlewoman Piety go hang her self”.

Both The blatant beast muzz’d and An historical romance draw on the history of romance writing to discredit secret history narratives, while also placing emphasis on a lack of credibility in negative representations of the court. This strategy undermines the opposition’s argument, but it also creates a sense of competition in which one claim to truth can be met with a counter-claim. The resulting division in turn undercuts the motifs of reconciliation and unity that were historically found in chivalric texts. In the final lines of An historical romance, the narrator states that Gallieno continues to fight for Eugenius but stresses there is no inevitable happy ending. He reflects on the facts:

Contrary to the relation of all Histories, and all Countries known to us, [we see] that the Giants in these countries generally beat the Knights, and that the Giants are
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53 Mark Knights identifies growing tension over claims to truth in partisan culture. See Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 272-232.
courteous, sweet-humour’d, and cheerfully undertake the Protection and Relief of wronged Ladies, and all distressed persons.\textsuperscript{54}

The narrator draws attention here to what can be misleading about political representation. By virtue of his title, the Knight Nasonius should have been expected to be a hero in line with the romance genre. Yet Gallieno and his compatriots have actually fulfilled that role. Drawing attention to this discrepancy, the narrator encourages the reader to be careful and critical about the labels and claims they might find in other texts. But while this author uses some conventions from romance writing to correct negative images of the exiles, he does not go so far as to produce a fantasy of Eugenius’ return. The structure of this romance, which consists of one idealised relationship and one dystopian relationship and concludes with no clear or finite sense of resolution, seems to epitomise the challenge of recreating positive royal romance in the divided post-Revolution context.

III: Conclusion

The range and variety of literature that was published about Mary Beatrice during the first years of her exile in France was part of an urgent debate about who had the right to govern in England and the style of the monarchy itself. Following the warming pan plot, printed depictions of the exiled queen were all the more important for public debate. Opponents of the Jacobite court created amusing and commercially successful fictions about her behaviour, which reified stereotypes and undermined her family’s capacity to govern. Meanwhile, Jacobite writers also used print to contest Mary Beatrice’s legacy. Themes such as chivalry, dynasty and restoration seem to have provided a means to celebrate certain characters and frame the challenging events in England and Europe. But in pamphlets such as An historical romance, it seems to be more effective to criticise negative representations of the exiled court than produce a sustainable image of restoration for the Jacobites. Furthermore, the fact that this text incorporates the same strategies as negative narratives about Mary Beatrice suggests that negative images of the queen consort had had a lasting impact on the ways in which royal women could be represented.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., L3r.
Conclusion

In the early eighteenth century, as the English people welcomed George I, both supporters and opponents of the Hanoverian succession tried to claim a traditional vocabulary for the royal consort. Despite the fact that George I was divorced from his wife, a scandal which Jacobite writers did much to highlight, the image of his daughter in-law Caroline helped to forge an affective relationship between the Hanoverian monarch and his subjects. Writers praised Caroline’s Protestant credentials, comparing her with an earlier Stuart predecessor Mary II. Her image, Hannah Smith argues: “was crucial to the successful establishment of the dynasty in Britain”. Jacobite writers too deployed dynastic images that originated in the Stuart past. The ballad *The happy meeting, or the joyful bride* (c. 1719) heralds James III’s marriage to the Polish princess Clementina Sobieska. Specific references to “the Bridegroom, you know whom I mean” are excised, but the author praises the “fair” new bride and hopes that she will produce “a lovely Son or a Daughter fair” – like her predecessor, Mary Beatrice.2

This thesis has reconstructed how the Stuart consort’s royal image was created and contested during the long seventeenth century, arguing that this form of royal representation was integral to political culture. The evolution of literature that was published at moments of succession shows that depictions of the individual Stuart consorts across the era were closely connected. At these pivotal moments, established writers such as John Dryden wrote allegorical operas and panegyrics that were not designed to be subtle, but to praise the monarch and cultivate support for the new reign. While these portrayals of the Stuart consorts deployed often familiar conventions of praise, they also required considerable inventiveness, as writers reworked the tropes, images and themes that had come to be associated with the Stuart consorts. These writings also participated in a sensitive process, praising the monarch while offering counsel, or forging subtle criticism of the direction in which the Stuart monarchy was headed.

The significance of the royal consort’s representation can only be understood in light of recent scholarship which has established the nature of political representation in Stuart England and its perceived importance for contemporaries. Mark Knights has shown that the growth of partisan politics in late Stuart Britain created a sense of conflict which in turn fostered concern about presented truths

---


2 Anon, *The happy meeting: or, the joyful bride* (London: by J. Jackenson in St. Giles, [1719]).
and counter-claims. Concentrating on the development of the monarchy’s image by tracing the representation of individual monarchs, Kevin Sharpe has argued that the Stuart monarchs used a wide array of visual media – including print, portraiture, pageantry and coinage – to promote images of their rule. This in turn created a “representational monarchy” in Britain, whereby the monarchs had to court their subjects while presenting images of the royal court. William III’s reluctance to utilise traditional forms of dynastic and divine monarchy, Sharpe suggests, also undermined these ideals. By the time that Anne ascended the throne, “the monarchy as the affective centre of the nation was – well, if not dead, ‘moribund’.”

Placing the royal consort’s image centre stage, this study has affirmed some of Sharpe’s individual contentions but has also painted a picture of a lively and lasting debate about the royal consort’s image. While Sharpe’s trilogy covers a huge variety of forms of representation, it concentrates on the individual monarchs to the neglect of their spouses or associates. I have shown that the royal consorts’ images were also an integral component of royal representation, as the monarchs and their advisors recognised. Their image could often supplement the iconography of their partner, but also highlighted the wider web of family members, political advisors and diplomatic contacts that affected the monarchy’s position. The royal consorts thus introduced additional facets to succession writing, encouraging people to think not only about the persona of individual monarchs but also what could be expected of the new reigns. The fact that both supporters and opponents of the Hanoverian monarchy deployed the royal consort’s image tells us something about the Stuart consorts’ legacy. After a century in which printed images of the royal consort had grown to be increasingly prominent, writers recognised the importance of using the royal consort’s image. In order to explain the nature of rule after 1714, writers created positive links with earlier Stuart royal consorts – even as they looked back to different incarnations of the Stuart consort’s role.

Part 1 set out to explore how the royal consort’s image was created in Stuart England, what changed and why, by exploring the literature that was produced at moments of succession. I examined the novel tropes and motifs that developed to represent the Stuart consorts and traced how these were re-used and adapted. From 1603, James I, his wife and numerous writers developed a set of conventions that could be associated with the Stuart queen. Some of these images were predictable enough, common in earlier representations of royal women, but all were deployed in such a way as to be specific for James’

3 Sharpe, Rebranding Rule, 676.
kingship. After James I’s succession, writers seem to have developed their representation of the royal consorts by building on earlier precedents and templates. In 1625 writers produced an image of Henrietta Maria that obliquely connected with her Protestant predecessor, trying to find a model of praise that could be suitable for a Catholic queen consort. Later in the century, literary portrayals of Mary Beatrice, Mary II and George were informed by the memory of earlier royal consorts. Throughout the period, the royal consort’s representation came to be an explicit focus of debate.

Part 2 explored how writers developed the themes and images that had been associated with the royal consorts at moments of succession later in the century, when the issue of succession came to be a potent source for political debate. The three case studies concentrated on Henrietta Maria, Catherine and Mary Beatrice, who were all condemned in the tradition of Whig historiography. I have drawn attention to these women’s longevity and their continued importance within political culture later in their careers. In her capacity as Queen Mother, Henrietta Maria was still an important symbol of the Stuart dynasty. Her presence at Charles II’s court invited questions about the shape of the Restoration monarchy. People’s reticence about the tropes that had been used to represent Henrietta Maria shows a concern about the negative legacy of Caroline culture, and sheds light on the tensions during Charles II’s early reign. As the 1660s and 1670s wore on, writers were again forced to adapt images associated with royal consorts. While ideals of the queen’s fertility had helped to differentiate Charles from his father by looking ahead to a new age, writers reworked these conventions when it became clear Catherine would not bear an heir. They continued to praise Charles’ other family members, preserving a sense of the dynasty’s importance. Yet texts produced at the very heart of Charles’ court show concern about the growing fragmentation in political debate.

This approach transforms our understanding of the royal consort’s role across the period by highlighting the potential significance of the Stuart consort’s patronage. Additionally, the variety of literature printed about the royal consorts reorients the common themes that have dominated scholarship on the royal consorts in the past. On the topic of religion, it is clear that Henrietta Maria’s, Catherine’s and Mary Beatrice’s Catholicism fostered suspicion at certain moments in their careers. However, the Stuart consort’s Catholicism only seems to have been an urgent concern for writers in 1625 and 1685, when Henrietta Maria and Mary Beatrice made their faith a central part of their self-representation. For Catherine, writers do not seem to have been so concerned by her Catholicism and

---

4 In particular, Catherine’s patronage of royal ballets and the prevalence of Mary II’s image as the Stadtholder’s wife merit further attention.
there is very little commentary on the queen’s faith. If we accept that the Catholic queens were not always unpopular, and that writers found diverse ways to write about them, it opens more interesting questions about religious toleration and contemporary pressure points. This also sheds light on the image of George, who was made a figurehead by some non-conformist writers despite the fact that he did not make Lutheranism a central aspect of his voting policy in the Lords.

What does this study tell us about Restoration political culture more generally that we did not know before? The fact that the Stuart monarchs and their advisors used print to create images of their spouses affirms the increasingly public-facing nature of royal representation in the period. By closely analysing the creation and dissemination of the royal consort’s image in print, we also gain a new perspective on how a variety of established and little-known writers, readers or publishers participated in making the royal image. Talented authors such as John Dryden and Aphra Behn revived, parodied and pastiched the conventions associated with the royal consorts and thereby participated in some of the biggest contemporary political debates. To look at the royal consort’s image helps to broaden our perspective of monarchical iconography, taking us beyond the charismatic figures of individual kings or queens. Through their representations of the royal consorts in the later Stuart period, writers forged an interesting and complicated set of connections between the present and the past.

While this thesis has shown considerable change, it also highlights the enduring desire for continuity in many texts. Chapter 9 reveals a genuine concern, from supporters of James II but also his opponents, about how and why they should represent the royal consort. Writers of all political stripes seem to have been surprised by the volume of literature that denigrated Mary Beatrice during the warming pan scandal. The extensive literature that was published about Mary Beatrice’s life at St. Germain explores some of the ramifications that this might have for future political debate. The fact that anti-Jacobite writers created scurrilous tales about the queen consort shows that her family image still commanded a sense of legitimacy, which would need to be combatted. The lengths to which Jacobite writers went to rehabilitate the ideal of royal romance, and the concerns about truth and political representations in their texts, suggests that people were concerned about the plausibility of earlier conventions and the limitations for royal representation in a changing climate. The uses of the royal consort’s image show a struggle to acclimatise to a changing political culture – which unnerved writers, even as they helped to create it.
A Note on the Appendices

These appendices are designed to be an easily navigable tool for the reader to explore the body of succession writings discussed in Part 1. The section introduced a large number of texts, often gesturing towards works and suggesting comparisons. These six tables provide a list of all the sources, with details that should create a foundation for future comparative work. All of the texts listed were published within 24 months of the royal succession and respond to it in some way, either by praising the new monarch or by debating the consequences of their ascent to the throne. Some of these writings describe the royal consort in more detail than others, but all of them contain some reference to the royal consort and use their image in illustrative ways.

The tables present the core information about each of the publications, with works that were specifically dedicated to the royal consorts highlighted in bold. I have included information in the first column about the author of a text, where the writer’s name is given on the text or a sound attribution is made in the ESTC. Unverified attributions are signalled by the use of square brackets. The second column provides the text’s title as listed in the ESTC. The third column lists the genre of each text. Some of the texts are multi-generic. In instances such as these I have used more than one description, to show for example that a prose pamphlet takes the form of a letter. I hope this will make the tool easier to use for people who are interested in the evolution of particular genres or trends throughout the period. The fourth column shows which printers or publishers produced the text where details are given. If the text does not provide details about the printer or publisher, I have used the phrase “[Details not listed]” in square brackets. Finally, the fifth column explains what format the text was printed in. The formats range from single sheet texts (1) to folio, quarto, octavo and duodecimo (12).

Taken together, these appendices should not be seen to list every reference to the royal consort at moments of succession. I have not included details here about ephemeral news reports, which are described and cited in the main body of the thesis. I have also not included references from the Book of Common Prayer or individual prayers, which were the most ubiquitous form for representing the royal consorts. Furthermore, I have included details about the first edition of a text but not the number of editions printed in total. This means that the basic information in the table about certain titles will need to be supplemented with further research, or compared with my discussion of the material in the main body of the thesis. However, bearing in mind this scope, the appendices should provide an opportunity to start exploring changes in the royal consort’s representation.
Appendix One: Texts about Anna in 1603

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>P/P</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Abbot</td>
<td>Antichristi demonstratio, contra fabulas pontificias, &amp; ineptam Roberti Bellarmini de antichristo disputationem.</td>
<td>Religious polemic</td>
<td>By Robert Barker</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A new song to the great comfort and rejoicing of all true English harts, at our most gracious King James his proclamation, upon the 24. Of March last past in the Cittie of London</td>
<td>Broadside</td>
<td>For Robert Waldegrave</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A supplication to the kings most excellent majestie, wherein, several reasons of state and religion are briefly touched</td>
<td>Religious polemic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A true report of the most triumphant, and royall accomplishment of the baptism of the most excellent, right high, and mightie Prince, Henry Fredericke, by the grace of God, Prince of Scotland, and now Prince of Wales. As it was solemnized the 30. day of August. 1594</td>
<td>Entertainment Account</td>
<td>By Thomas Creede for John Browne</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Englands wedding garment. Or a preparation to King James his royall coronation</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For Thomas Pavier</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Northerne poems congratulating the Kings Majesties most happy and peacable entrance to the crowne of England</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>By John Windet for Edmund Weaver</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Barlow</td>
<td>The summe and substance of the conference which, it pleased his excellent majestie to have with the lords, bishops, and other of his clergie, (at which the most of the lordes of the councell were present) in his majesties privy-chamber, at Hampton Court</td>
<td>Theological tract</td>
<td>By John Windet [and T. Creede] for Mathew Law</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bilson</td>
<td>A sermon preached at Westminster before the King and Queenes Majesties, at their coronations on Saint James his day, being the 28 of July 1603</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>By V.S for Clement Knight</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Chettle</td>
<td>Englandes mourning garment.</td>
<td>Elegy</td>
<td>By V.S for Thomas Millington</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Craig</td>
<td>The poetical essays of Alexander Craig Scotobritane Scene and allowed</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>By William White</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Daniel</td>
<td>The true discription of a royall masque. Presented at Hampton Court, upon Sunday night, being the eight of January 1604. And personated by the Queenes most excellent Majestie, attended by eleven ladies of honour</td>
<td>Masque</td>
<td>By Edward Allde</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Daniel</td>
<td>The vision of the 12. goddesses presented in a maske the 8. Of January, at Hampton Court: by the Queenes most excellent majestie, and her ladies</td>
<td>Masque</td>
<td>By Thomas Creede for Simon Waterson</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Davies</td>
<td>Microcosmos, the discovery of the little world, with the government thereof</td>
<td>Political history</td>
<td>By Joseph Barnes</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dekker</td>
<td>The magnificent entertainment given to King James, Queene Anne his wife, and Henry</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>By T[homas] C[reede]</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title / Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick the Prince</td>
<td>Upon the day of his majesties triumphant passage (from the Tower) through his honourable citie (and chamber) of London, being the 15.of March. 1603</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>Humphrey Lownes, Edward Allde and others for Tho. Man</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dekker</td>
<td>The wonderfull yeare. Wherein is shewed the picture of London lying sicke of the plague.</td>
<td>Plague literature</td>
<td>By Thomas Creede</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dowland</td>
<td>Lachrimae, or seaven teares figured in seaven passionate pauans with divers other pauans, galiards, and almands, set forth for the lute, viols, or violons, in five parts</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>By John Windet, to be sold at the authors house</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dowland</td>
<td>The third and last booke of songs or aires</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>By P. S for Thomas Adams, by patent of T. Morley</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Drayton</td>
<td>A paean triumphant composed for the societie of the goldsmiths of London: congratulating his highnes magnificent entering the citie. To the majestie of the king</td>
<td>Entertainment Account</td>
<td>By Felix Kingston for John Flasket</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Dugdale</td>
<td>The time triumphant declaring in briefe, the arival of our soveraigne liege lord, King James into England, his coronation at Westminster: together with his late royal progresse, from the towre of London through the cittie, to his highnes manor of White Hall</td>
<td>Entertainment Account</td>
<td>By R.B</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Fletcher</td>
<td>A briefe and familiar epistle shewing his majesties most lawfull, honourable and just title to all his kingdomes</td>
<td>Political pamphlet</td>
<td>For John Harrison</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.G</td>
<td>A most strange and true report of a monsterous fish, who appeared in the forme of a woman, from her waste upwards</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Pamphlet</td>
<td>For W.B</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simione Graham</td>
<td>The passionate sparke of a relenting minde</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>By Humfrey Lownes</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hanson</td>
<td>Time is a turne-coate. Or Englands three-fold metamorphosis Wherin is acted the pensive mans epilogomena, to Londons late lamentable heroicall comi-tragedie</td>
<td>Plague Literature</td>
<td>[By R. Field] for I. H[anson] and are to be sold [by G. Potter]</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Harrison</td>
<td>The arch’s of triumph erected in honor of the high and mighty prince James</td>
<td>Entertainment Account</td>
<td>By John Windet</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Holland</td>
<td>Pancharis the first booke</td>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>By V.S for Clement Knight</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hubbock</td>
<td>An oration gratulatory to the high and mighty James of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, King, defender of the faith, &amp; c.</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>By Joseph Barnes</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I</td>
<td>A proclamation enjoyning all lieutenants, and justices of peace, to repaire into their Countrieys, and all idle persons to depart the Court</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>Robert Barker</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Editor/Printer</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I</td>
<td>A proclamation signifying his majesties pleasure, touching the resort of people to his coronation</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>Robert Barker</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I</td>
<td>Basilikon doron. Or his majesties instructions to his dearest sonne, Henrie the prince</td>
<td>Mirror for princes</td>
<td>Richard Field for John Norton</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Johnston</td>
<td>A trewe description of the nobill race of the Stewards succeedinge lineallie to the Croun of Scotland unto this day: and now this yeir 1603</td>
<td>Genealogy</td>
<td>At the expense of Andrew Hart</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Jonson</td>
<td>B. Jon: his part of King James his royall and magnificent entertainment through his honorable cittie of London, Thursday the 15. of March. 1603 so much as was presented in the first and last of their triumphall arch</td>
<td>Entertainment Account</td>
<td>By V.S for Edward Blount</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Leccey</td>
<td>A petition apologetical, presented to the kings most excellent majesty, by the lay Catholikes of England, in July last</td>
<td>Religious polemic</td>
<td>By John Mogar</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew Kellison</td>
<td>A survey of the new religion detecting manie grosse absurdurdis which it implieth</td>
<td>Religious polemic</td>
<td>By Laurence Kellam</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludowick Lloyd</td>
<td>The practice of policy written by Lodowike Lloyd</td>
<td>Political pamphlet</td>
<td>By Simon Stafford</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Monipenne</td>
<td>Certeine matters concerning the realme of Scotland, composed together the genealogie of all the kings of Scotland, their lives, the yeeres of their coronation, the time of their reigne, the yeere of their death, and maner thereof, with the place of their buriall</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>By A. Hatfield for John Flasket</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Muggins</td>
<td>Londons mourning garment, or funerall teares worne and shed for the death of her wealthy cittizens, and other her inhabitants London</td>
<td>Plague Literature</td>
<td>By Ralph Blower</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Muriell</td>
<td>An answer unto the Catholiques supplication, presented unto the kings majestie, for a tolleration of popish religion in England</td>
<td>Religious polemic</td>
<td>By R. R[ead]. for Francis Burton</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Playfere</td>
<td>The power of prayer</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>By John Legat for Simon Waterson</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pricket</td>
<td>Honors fame in triumph riding. Or, the life and death of the late honorable Earle of Essex.</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>By R. B for Roger Jackson</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Robinson</td>
<td>The schoole of musicke wherein is taught, the perfect method, of true fingering of the lute, pandora, orphanion, and viol de gamba; with most infallible generall rules, both easie and delightfull</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>By Thomas Este for Simon Waterson</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Savile</td>
<td>King James his entertainment at Theobalds: with his welcome to London, together with a salutatorie poem</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>By Thomas Snodham for T. Este</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Skinner</td>
<td>Rapta Tatio the mirrour of his majesties present government, tending to the union of his whole iland of Brittonie martiall</td>
<td>Political pamphlet</td>
<td>By W. W[hite] for Simon Waterson</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Willet</td>
<td>An antilogie or counterplea to anapologickal (he should have said) apologetical epistle</td>
<td>Religious controversy</td>
<td>For Thomas Mann</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Author/Publisher</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Willet</td>
<td>Ecclesia triumphans: that is, the joy of the English church for the happiest coronation of the most vertuous and pious prince, James by the grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defendour of the faith, &amp; c.</td>
<td>Religious controversy</td>
<td>By John Legat for Simon Waterson</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Willoughbie</td>
<td>Mnemosyn[on kyrio]-euchariston A treatise of the supper of the Lord in commemoration of his death, and the manifolde benefits thereby received</td>
<td>Religious controversy</td>
<td>By Joseph Barnes to be sold by Simon Waterson</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Willymat</td>
<td>A princes looking glasse, or a princes direction, very requisite and necessarie for a Christian prince, to view and behold himselfe in</td>
<td>Mirror for princes</td>
<td>John Legat for Simon Waterson</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Texts about Henrietta Maria in 1625

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>P/P</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A relation of the glorious triumphs and order of the ceremonies,</td>
<td>Festival Book Account</td>
<td>By T.S for Nathaniel Butter</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>observed in the mariage of the high and mighty Charles King of Great</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Britaine, and the ladie Henrietta Maria, sister to the most Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King of France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A true discourse of all the royal passages, triumphs and ceremonies,</td>
<td>Festival Book Account</td>
<td>By John Haviland for Hanna Barret</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>observed at the contract and mariage of the high and mighty Charles,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King of Great Britaine, and the most excellentest of ladies, the lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrietta Maria of Burbon, sister to the most Christian King of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Lachrymae Londinenses: or, Londons lamentations and teares for Gods</td>
<td>Plague literature</td>
<td>By B. Alsop and T. Fawcet for H. Holland and G. Gibbs</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heauie visitation of the plague of pestilence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Mount Taraghs triumph, 5 July, 1626 to the tune of the Careere</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The run-awayes [sic] answer to a booke called, A rodde for runne-</td>
<td>Plague</td>
<td>[A. Mathewes]</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>awayes</td>
<td>literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D.B</td>
<td>Eclogue, ou chant pastoral sur les nopces des Serenissimes Princes</td>
<td>Pastoral</td>
<td>By Edward Allde</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Roy de la Grand’ Bretagne, France &amp; Irlande, &amp; de Henriette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie fille de Henry le Grand, Roy de France, &amp; de Navarre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B[rewer]</td>
<td></td>
<td>literature</td>
<td>to be sold by Nath: Browne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas</td>
<td>The holy court. Or the Christian institution of men of quality with</td>
<td>Devotional</td>
<td>[English College Press at St. Omer]</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caussin, trans.</td>
<td>examples of those, who in court have flourished in sanctity</td>
<td>literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hawkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>A proclamation commanding the repaire of noblemen, knights, and</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>By Bonham Norton and John Bill</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gentlemen of qualitie, unto their mansion houses in the country,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>there to attend their services, and keepe hospitalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>A proclamation for making currant certaine French coyne</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>John Lichfield and William Turner for Bonham Norton and John Bill</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>A proclamation for restraint of disorderly and unnecessary resort to the court</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>By Bonham Norton and John Bill</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>A proclamation for restraint of unnecesarie resorts to the court</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>By Bonham Norton and John Bill</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>A proclamation for the adjournement of part of trinitie term</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>By Bonham Norton and John Bill</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>A proclamation for the avoiding of all intercourse betwenee his majesties royall court, and the cities of London and Westminster, and places adjoyning</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>John Lichfield and William Turner for Bonham Norton and John Bill</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>A proclamation to declare his majesties pleasure touching his royall coronation, and the solemnitie thereof</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>By Bonham Norton and John Bill</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>A proclamation touching the currencie of certaine French coyne</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>By Bonham Norton and John Bill</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Crashaw</td>
<td>Londs lamentation for her sinnes and complaint to the Lord her God</td>
<td>Plague literature</td>
<td>For G. Fayerbeard</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Davies</td>
<td>A warning to the dragon and all his angels</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>By B. Alsop</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Fealy</td>
<td>Ancilla pietatis: or, the hand-maid to private devotion presenting a manuell to furnish her with necessary principles of faith</td>
<td>Devotional literature</td>
<td>For Nicholas Bourne</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fisher</td>
<td>The answere unto the nine points of controversy, proposed by our late soveraygne (of famous memory) unto M. Fisher of the Society of Jesus</td>
<td>Religious polemic</td>
<td>[English College Press at St. Omer]</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Holland</td>
<td>Hollandi posthuma. A funerall elegie of King James: With a congratulatory salve to King Charles</td>
<td>Elegy</td>
<td>[Printed by B. Alsop and T. Fawcet] Impensis, Henrici Holland</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard James</td>
<td>The muses dirge</td>
<td>Elegy</td>
<td>By A.M and I.N for John Browne</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Jonson</td>
<td>The fortunate isles and their union. Celebrated in a masque design'd for the court, on the Twelfth night 1624</td>
<td>Masque</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William L'Isle</td>
<td>Part of Du Bartas, English and French, and in his owne kind of verse, so neare the French Englished, as may teach an English-man French, or a French-man English</td>
<td>Translation Devotional literature</td>
<td>By John Haviland</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Marcelline</td>
<td>Epithalamium gallo-britannicum: or, Great-Britaines, Frances, and the most part of Europes unspeakable joy, for the most happy union, and blessed contract of the high and mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Wales, and the lady Henrette Maria</td>
<td>Prose epithalamium</td>
<td>For Thomas Archer</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Milton</td>
<td>Londons miserie, the countryes crueltie</td>
<td>Plague literature</td>
<td>By Nicholas Okes</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Price</td>
<td>A heartie prayer, in a needfull time of trouble</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>By M. Flesher, for John Grismand</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prymerose</td>
<td>Scotland's complaint. Upon the death of our late soveraigne King James of most happy memorie</td>
<td>Elegy</td>
<td>By John Wreittoun</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>By</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pyne</td>
<td>Anagrammata regia. In honorem maximi et manuetissimi Regis Caroli conscripta</td>
<td>Poetry Anagram</td>
<td>By William Stansby</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pyne</td>
<td>Epigrammata religiosa, officiosa, iocosa</td>
<td>Poetry Epigram</td>
<td>By William Stansby</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Quin</td>
<td>In nuptiis principum incomparabilium, Caroli, Britannii ci imperi monarchae potentissimi, et Henriettae Mariae, Henrici Magni, Galliarum Regis filiae, gratulatio quadrilinguis Quelteri Quinna</td>
<td>Panegyric Translation</td>
<td>By George Purslow</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorat de Bueil Racan</td>
<td>L’Artenice</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>By Edward Allde</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Reginald</td>
<td>Magae Britanniae chronographa imperialia</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.S</td>
<td>Sacrae heptades, or seaven problems concerning antichrist</td>
<td>Religious polemic</td>
<td>By the successors of Giles Thorp</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Taylor</td>
<td>The fearefull summer, or, Londons calamity, the countries courtesy, and both their misery</td>
<td>Plague literature</td>
<td>By John Lichfield and William Turner</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Epithalamium illustriss. &amp; feliciss. principum Caroli Regis, et H. Mariae Reginæ Magnæ Britanniae, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>By Cantrellus Legge</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Vaughan</td>
<td>Cambrensim Caroleia quibus</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>By William Stansby</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Vaughan</td>
<td>The golden fleece divided into three parts, under which are discovered the errors of religion, the vices and decayes of the kingdome, and lastly the ways to get wealth, and to restore trading so much complayned of</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>By William Stansby and Miles Flesher for Francis Williams</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td>Great Britains Salomon. A sermon preached at the magnificent funerall, of the most high and mighty king, James, the late King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &amp;c</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>By John Bill</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Three: Texts about Catherine of Braganza in 1662

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>P/P</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An exact and true relation of the landing of her majestie at Portsmouth, after many high tempests, and a long distresse at sea</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For C Wildebergh and John Ruddiard</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Here is some comfort for poor cavalerees</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For Francis Grove</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The cavaliers comfort, or long lookt for will come at last</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For William Gilbertson</td>
<td>1661/2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The history of the kingdome of Portugal; with a description thereof, and it's original and growth</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>By John Redmayne</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Austin</td>
<td>A joyous welcome to the most serene and most illustrious queen of brides, Catherin, the royal spouse and consort of Charles the Second</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Austin</td>
<td>Triumphus hymene. Londons solemn jubile, for the most auspicious nuptials of their great sovereign Charles the Second King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland</td>
<td>Pageant</td>
<td>[By R. Daniel]</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ayleway</td>
<td>Epithalamia in nuptias letissimas potentissimi Principis Dom. &amp; Regis nostri Caroli Secundi Dei gratia Magnæ Britanniae &amp;c. et Serenissimæ Principis &amp; Domine Catharinæ Magnæ Britanniae &amp;c.</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>By Peter Lillicrap</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bodington</td>
<td>The mystical Solomons coronation and espousals</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>For William Grantham</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Bold</td>
<td>Anniversary to the kings most excellent majesty, Charles the II. on his birth-&amp;-restauration-day, May 29, having resolv’d to marry with the Infanta of Portugal, May the 8th, 1661</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For Henry Brome</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Boreman</td>
<td>An antidote against swearing to which is annexed an appendix concerning an asserterty and promissory oath in reference to the stature of the two now flourishing sister universities</td>
<td>Miscellaneous pamphlet</td>
<td>For R. Royston</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Boys</td>
<td>A panegyrick to his sacred majesty upon the conclusion of the auspicious marriage between the two crowns of England and Portugal</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For Henry Brome</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. C</td>
<td>An epitomy of history. Wherein is shewn how several princes and nations, came to their particular countries and dominions</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>By M. Simmons</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Calamy</td>
<td>An exact collection of farewell sermons, preached by the late London-ministers</td>
<td>Sermons</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles II</td>
<td>His majesties most gracious speech to the Lords &amp; Commons, together with the Lord Chancellour’s. At the opening of the Parliament, on the 8th day of May, 1661</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>By John Bill and Christopher Barker</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Translator(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles II</td>
<td>His majesties most gracious speech, together with the Lord Chancellors, to the two Houses of Parliament, at their prorogation, On Monday the Nineteenth of May, 1662</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>By John Bill and Christopher Barker</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles II</td>
<td>Right trusty and welbeloved, and trusty and welbeloved</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>By James Flesher</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Clark</td>
<td>Hesperia migrans, or an hecatomb to the most august and glorious Queen of Great Brittain, at her happy, and so much long’d for arrival in England</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For Samuel Speed</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Crouch</td>
<td>Flowers strowed by the muses, against the coming of the most illustrious infanta of Portugal Catharina Queen of England, 1662</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For Francis Kirkman and Henry Marsh</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Crouch</td>
<td>Portgallia in portu, = Portugal in harbour: or Englands joy and welcome to the most illustrious infanta of Portugal Donna Katharina Queen of England, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For Richard Hall</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dauncey</td>
<td>A compendious chronicle of the kingdom of Portugal, from Alfonso the first King, to Alfonso the Sixth, now reigning and are to be sold at their shops</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>By Tho. Johnson, for Francis Kirkman, Henry Brome, and Henry Marsh</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre de Cardonnel</td>
<td>Complementum fortunatarum insularum, p. II, sive, Galathea vaticinans</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>By W. G, sold by Joshua Coniers</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre de Cardonnel</td>
<td>Tagus, sive epithalamium Caroli II. Magnae Britanniae Regis, et Catharinae Infantis Portugaliae</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>William Godbid</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Drope</td>
<td>An hymenean essay, or an epithalamy, upon the royall match of his most excellent majesty Charles the Second, with the most illustrious Katharine, infanta of Portugal</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. A. Duval</td>
<td>A geographical dictionary in which are described the most eminent countreys, towns, ports, seas, streights, and rivers in the whole world: very useful for the understanding of all modern histories</td>
<td>Travel pamphlet</td>
<td>J. C. for Henry Brome</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Fane</td>
<td>A panegyrick to the kings most excellent majesty, upon his happy accession to the crown, and his more fortunate marriage</td>
<td>Prose panegyric</td>
<td>By W. Wilson for Henry Herringman</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Gayton</td>
<td>To the most illustrious Prince his Highnesse James Duke of York</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>By Peter Lillicrop</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hall</td>
<td>An exposition by way of supplement, on the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth chapters of the prophecy of Amos</td>
<td>Religious controversy</td>
<td>For Henry Mortlock</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Heath</td>
<td>A brief chronicle of all the chief actions so fatally falling out in these three kingdoms</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>For William Lee</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Heath</td>
<td>The glories and magnificent triumphs of the blessed restitution of his sacred majesty K. Charles II</td>
<td>Festival Book</td>
<td>Printed and sold by N.G., R.H. and O.T</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Author/Translator</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Playford</td>
<td>The second book of the pleasant musical companion: being a new collection of select catches, songs, and glees, for two and three voices</td>
<td>Songs</td>
<td>For John Playford</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Matthew Prior]</td>
<td>On the coronation of the most august monarch K. James II. and Queen Mary, the 23th of April, 1685 by a young gentleman.</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For and to be sold by Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. S.</td>
<td>A congratulatory poem written by J. S</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For D. W.</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. S.</td>
<td>The loyal garland of mirth and pastime. Set forth in sundry pleasant [n]ew songs; the loyal health.</td>
<td>Songs</td>
<td>By J.M. for I. Deacon, 1685</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privy Council, Scotland</td>
<td>The Privy Council of Scotlands letter to the king, together with the arch-Bishops and bishops as also several English addresses to his majesty</td>
<td>Public letter</td>
<td>By Andrew Anderson</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkanah Settle</td>
<td>An heroick poem on the coronation of the high and mighty monarch, James II. King of England, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>By J.L for Benjamin Needham</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Turner</td>
<td>A sermon preached before their majesties K. James II and Q. Mary, at their coronation in Westminster-Abby, April 23. 1685</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>For Robert Clavell</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Moestissimæ ac lattissimæ Academæ Cantabrigiensis affectus, decedente Carolo Isuccedente Jacobo II regibus augustissimis, serenissimis clementissimisque</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>By Joan. Hayes</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Pietas Universitatis Oxoniensis in obitum augustissimii &amp; desideratissimi regis Caroli Secundi</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
<td>The humble address and recognition of the University of Oxford presented to his sacred majesty James II King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland defender of the faith, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>[At the Theatre]</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
<td>To the right worshipful the heads of the respective colleges and halls in the University of Oxford</td>
<td>Ceremony order</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weldon (trans.)</td>
<td>The second nativity of Jesus, the accomplishment of the first (viz) the conversion of the soul fram’d by the model of the Word-incarnate</td>
<td>Devotional literature</td>
<td>By T.N. for the author</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilson</td>
<td>A pindarique to their sacred majesties, James II and his royal consort Queen Mary, on their joynt coronations at Westminster, April 23, 1685</td>
<td>Ode</td>
<td>For Joseph Knight and Francis Saunders</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Five: Texts about Mary II in 1689

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>P/P</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Allix</td>
<td>An account of the private league betwixt the late King James the Second, and the French king</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Chiswell</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Allix</td>
<td>An examination of the scruples of those who refuse to take the oath of allegiance</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Chiswell</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A brief vindication of the parliamentary proceedings against the late King James II</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By and for Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A collection of paintings by the best masters</td>
<td>Art catalogue</td>
<td>Catalogues of which may be had at the said office, Mr. Gillyflowers, Mr. Nott’s, Mr. Wotton’s, Mr. Sare’s and Mr. Bennets</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England</td>
<td>Prose pamphlets</td>
<td>By Richard Janeway</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A collection of the newest and most ingenious poems, songs, catches &amp;c. against popery relating to the times</td>
<td>Verse miscellany</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A description of the ceremonial proceedings at the coronation of their most sacred majesties, King William III and Queen Mary II</td>
<td>Event description</td>
<td>By George Croom</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A discourse concerning the signification of allegiance, as it is to be understood in the new oath of allegiance</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A fifth collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England</td>
<td>Collection Political writings</td>
<td>By Richard Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A fourth collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England</td>
<td>Collection Political writings</td>
<td>By Richard Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A friendly conference concerning the new oath of allegiance to K. William, and Q. Mary</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Samuel Smith</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A friendly debate between Dr. Kingsman, a dissatisfied clergy-man, and Gratianus Trimmer, a neighbour minister</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Dialogue</td>
<td>For Jonathan Robinson</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A full and true account of the death of George Lord Jeffries late Lord High-Chancellor of England</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For R. Gifford</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A justification of the whole proceedings of their majesties King William and Queen Mary, of their royal highnesses Prince George and Princess Ann</td>
<td>Prose pamphlets</td>
<td>For Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A letter from a bishop to a lord of his friends</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>[Folio]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A letter from a clergy-man in the country, to the clergy-man in the city</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A letter from a French lawyer to an English gentleman, upon the present revolution</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>For Richard Chiswell</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A letter from a gentleman in the country to his correspondent in the city, concerning the coronation medal</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A letter from a gentleman to some divines of the Church of England</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>For J. C.</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A letter from a lawyer in the countrey to a member of Parliament, or, Indemnity the effect of vacancy</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>For Richard Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A letter from his holiness the Pope of Rome, to his highness the Prince of Orange containing several proposals and overtures</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A letter from Lewis the great to James the less, his lieutenant in Ireland with reflections by way of answer to the said letter</td>
<td>Poetry Satire</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A letter writ by a clergy-man to his neighbour concerning the present circumstances of the kingdom</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>For Richard Chiswell</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A list of the Lords that enter’d their protest against the vacancy of the throne. Feb. 7. 1688</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A melius inquirendum into the birth of the Prince of Wales</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For J. Wilks</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A memorial of God’s last twenty nine years wonders in England, for its preservation and deliverance from popery and slavery</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>By J. Rawlins for R. Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A modest examination of the new oath of allegiance by a divine of the Church of England</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A poem in vindication of the late publick proceedings by way of dialogue between a high Tory and a trimmer to which is added The high Tory’s catechism</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A new copy [sic] of verses of the weavers loyal resolution</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>Printed and sold by J. Wilkins</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A new Protestant ballad, called England’s congratulation</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A new Protestant litany</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A new song</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A new song made in the praise of the west of England</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For T. R</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A new song, of Father Petre and the devil</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A new song on King William &amp; Queen Mary</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For E. Hawkins</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A ninth collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England</td>
<td>Collection Political writings</td>
<td>By R. Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A pastoral, on the success and coronation of William and Mary, King and Queen of England</td>
<td>Pastoral</td>
<td>Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A poem on the accession of their royal highnesses the Prince and Princess of Orange to the imperial crown of England; being a paraphrase on the 45 Psalm</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A poem on the coronation of King William and Queen Mary</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A seasonable memento to all the electors of knights, citizens &amp; burgesses of England, for the approaching convention to meet the 22. of this instant January, 1689</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A second collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England</td>
<td>Collection Pamphlets</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A second collection of the newest and most ingenious poems, satyrs, songs, &amp;c. against popery and tyranny, relating to the times</td>
<td>Verse miscellany</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A sermon preach’d in a country church February 14, 1688 upon that eminent occasion of thanksgiving for the great deliverance of this kingdom from popery and arbitrary power</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>By H. J. for Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A seventh collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England</td>
<td>Collection Political writings</td>
<td>By R. Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A short and sure method proposed for the extirpation of popery in the space of a few years</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By H.M for John Brotherton</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A short historical account touching the succession of the crown</td>
<td>History Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Baldwin</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A short history of the convention: or, new christned Parliament</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A short scheme of the usurpations that have been made by several of our former Princes</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A short view of the methods made use of in Ireland for the subversion and destruction of the Protestant religion</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>For D. Newman</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A sixth collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs</td>
<td>Collection Political writings</td>
<td>By R. Baldwin (also R. Janeway)</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A speech of a commoner of England, to his fellow commoners of the convention</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A tenth collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England</td>
<td>Collection Political writings</td>
<td>By R. Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A third collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England</td>
<td>Collection Political writings</td>
<td>By Richard Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A third touch of the times</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A view of the true interest of the several states of Europe since the accession of</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>For Thomas Newborough and John Bullord</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A vindication of those who have taken the new oath of allegiance to King William and Queen Mary</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A word in season containing brief remarks upon our late grievances</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>For John Harris</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anon</strong></td>
<td><strong>A word in season: or, a discourse of the three estates to wit, the truly civil, truly spiritual, and false ecclesiastical estate</strong></td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A word to the wise, for settling the government</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An account of the election of the convention of Scotland</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For John Flemming</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An account of the reasons of the nobility and gentry's invitation of His Highness the Prince of Orange into England, 1688.</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>Nathanael Ranew and Jonathan Robinson</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An answer to a late pamphlet, intituled, A short scheme of the usurpations of the Crown of England, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An answer of a letter to a member of the convention</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An answer to the Bishop of Rochester's second letter to the Earl of Dorset &amp;c. by an English-man</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For A. Smith</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An exact and true relation of the present posture of affairs in Ireland</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For James Partridge</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An excellent new song on the happy coronation</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Blare</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An humble offer at the decision of the question, how the vacant throne shall be supplied without wrong to any pretender</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An ode on her royal highness the Princess of Orange. Sung in parts before their Royal Highnesses the 29th of May, 1688</td>
<td>Ode</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An ode on the coronation of his majesty King William III</td>
<td>Ode</td>
<td>For Jacob Tonson</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Britain reviv'd: in a panegyrick to their most august majesties, William and Mary</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For R. Baldwin</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Britain's jubilee: a congratulatory poem on the descent of his highness the Prince of Orange into England</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Considerations proposed to the electors of the ensuing convention</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Eleventh collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England and Scotland</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Political writings</td>
<td>By R. Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>England's deliverance, or God's gracious mercy at the time of misery</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For A. B.</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Englands extasie: or, the nations joy for the happy coronation of King William, and his royal consort Queen Mary</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Bissel</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Englands happiness in the crowning of William and Mary</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For Alexander Milbourn</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Englands happiness; or, the subjects joy for a Protestant King and Queen</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For G. Croom</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Englands holiday or, the nations joy for the happy coronation</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Conyers</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Englands triumph or the kingdoms joy for the proclaiming of King William, and his royal consort, Queen Mary</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For W. Thackeray</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Four questions debated with an answer to the objection that the convention will not have the power of a Parliament</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Great Britains earnest desires for the Princess Marys happy arrival</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For P. B[rooksby]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Great Britains joys compleated</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Blare</td>
<td>[1689 ]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Great-Brittains renown, or, the princely triumph of the glorious coronation of K. William and Q. Mary, which was on the 11th. day of April, 1689</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For G. Conyers</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Innocency vindicated; or, reproach wip’d off</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By J. Darby</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>News from Bath; being a true and perfect relation of the great and splendid procession, and joyful transactions there</td>
<td>Event description</td>
<td>For Richard Baldwin</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>News from Sherburn-Castle</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For P. T.</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>On the occasion of the descent of his highness the Prince of Orange into England, and their highnesses accession to the crown</td>
<td>Ode</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>On the word abdicate</td>
<td>Satire</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Observations upon the late revolution in England</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>On the word abdicate</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For G. C.</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Proposals to this present convention, for the perpetual security of the Protestant religion, and the liberty of the subects [sic] of England</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For T. Tilliar</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Reasons for crowning the Prince &amp; Princess of Orange king and queen joyntly, and for placing the executive power in the Prince alone</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Reasons humbly offer’d, for placing his highness the Prince of Orange singly on the throne during life</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Reflections upon our late and present proceedings in England</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Reflections upon the late great revolution written by a lay-hand in the country</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For R. Chiswell</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Reflections upon the present state of the nation</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Salus populi suprema lex. Or, the free thoughts of a well-wisher, for a good Settlement</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Seasonable motives. To our duty and allegiance (by a lover of the peace of New-England)</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By Will. Bradford</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Several queries relating to the present proceedings in Parliament</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1688/9</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Some considerations touching succession and allegiance</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Chiswell</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Some short considerations relating to the settling of the government</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For N. R.</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Bedford-shire widow; or, the poor in distress reliev'd</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For P. Brooksby, J. Deacon, J. Blare, and J. Back</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The boast of Great Britain; or a song in praise of Mary, present Queen</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J.C by P.K</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Chancellors resolution: or, his last sayings a little before his death</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Church &amp; crown’s felicity consumated: or, Englands happiness compleat, in the joyful reception of the Princess of Orange</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For T. Tillier</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The concluding vote; with the names of the Lords spiritual and temporal who deserted, not protested against the vote in the House of Peers, the sixth instant, against the word abdicated, and the throne vacant, in the same method as they entred their names in the journal book</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For J. Newton</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The countrymans joy, at the coronation</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For Robert Hayhurst</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The courageous soldiers of the West</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Deacon</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The court of England, or, the preparation for the happy coronation of King William and Queen Mary</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>By A. M. for R. Hayhurst</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The courtly triumph, or, An excellent new song upon the coronation of K. William and Q. Mary</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For William Thackeray</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Dutch’s happy conquest: or the French routed</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For Robert Hayhurst</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The duty of dissenters with respect to the late Act of indulgence</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By and for George Larkin</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The eighth collection of papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England</td>
<td>Collection Political writings</td>
<td>By R. Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The history of the late revolution in England, with the causes &amp; means by which it was accomplish’d</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>For Tho. Salusbury</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The history of the most illustrious William, Prince of Orange: deduc’d from the first founders of the ancient House of Nassau</td>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The glory of the English nation: being the manner of the crowning of King William the III and Queen Mary the II</td>
<td>Event description</td>
<td>By George Croom</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The grumbletonian crew reprehended</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Irish-mens prayers to St Patrick</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For Alexander Milbourn</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The joy of London-Derry</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Deacon</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The kingdoms cares endu’d with comfort</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Blare</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The kingdoms joy for the proclaiming King William and his royal consort Queen Mary in the throne of England</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Blare</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The lama-sabachthani, or, cry of the Son of God</td>
<td>Devotional literature</td>
<td>By E. Jones, for Samuel Lowndes</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The lawfulness of taking the new oaths asserted</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By J. Mills for Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The loyal bumper, or England’s comfort</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The loyalty and glory of the city of Bath</td>
<td>Poetry Event description</td>
<td>By and sold by A. Milbourn</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The manner of the proclaiming of King William, and Queen Mary, at White-Hall, and in the city of London, Feb. 13, 1688/9</td>
<td>Event description</td>
<td>For Robert Clavel</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The muses farewell to popery and slavery, or, a collection of miscellany poems, satyrs, songs, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Verse miscellany</td>
<td>For N. R, H. F and J. K</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The mystery of iniquity working in the dividing of Protestants</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The nations address to the committee of grievances in Parliament for the taking off the corporation oath in behalf of all cities, towns-corporate, aldermen, bayliffs, burgesses, as also sheriffs, lord lieutenants, and deputy lieutenants of counties, ministers, and all others concerned for the repealing those acts, which impose the oath following</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>For R. Hayhurst</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The necessity of settling the crown of England</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The new oath of allegiance justified, from the original constitution of the English monarchy</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By and sold by Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The P. of Orange's engagement for maintaining and securing the Protestant religion &amp; liberties of the people of England</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For R. Hayhurst</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The preliminaries to the crown of Scotland, as proposed by the grand committee</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Baldwin</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The present case stated: or, the oaths of allegiance and supremacy no badges of slavery</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Baldwin</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The present conjuncture in a dialogue between a church-man and a dissenter</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By and sold by Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The present convention, a parliament</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1688/9</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Prince of Orange his declaration shewing the reasons why he invades England: with a short preface, and some modest remarks on it</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The prince’s triumph: or the subjects happiness, in a Protestant King</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The princess welcome to England, being, the unanimous joy of her loyal subjects</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For W. Thackeray</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Protestant courage</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Deacon</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Protestant court of England: or, the joyful coronation of K. William III. and Q. Mary II</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For A Milbourn</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Protestant garland of joy and delight</td>
<td>Verse miscellany</td>
<td>For W. T[hackeray</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Protestants Ave Mary, on the arrival of her most gracious majesty, Mary, Queen of England</td>
<td>Satire</td>
<td>For R Baldwin</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Protestants joy; or, an excellent new song on the glorious coronation</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Deacon</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Protestants prayer: Being their hearty wishes for the prosperity of their majesties fleet at sea</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Deacon, P. Brooksby, J. Blare and J. Black</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Protestants satisfaction in a prosperous reign</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Blare</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Protestant’s satisfaction; or, the joy and glory of Hampton-Court</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For P. Brooksby, J. Deacon, J. Blare and J. Black</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The royal dignity: or the happy accession</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For P. Brooksby</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The royal garland of Protestant delight</td>
<td>Verse miscellany</td>
<td>For J. Blare</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The royal health, (three glasses in an hand) to the king, to the queen, to the Protestant religion. Licensed, and entr’d according to order. To the tune of, come, boys, fill up a bumper.</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>For R. Hayhurst</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Scotch Protestants courage</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For P. Brooksby, J. Deacon, J. Blare and J. Black</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The subjects satisfaction, being a new song of the proclaiming King William and Queen Mary</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Deacon</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The terms of toleration, or, the conditions enjoyned Protestant dissenters</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For William Marshall</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The twelfth and last collection of papers (vol. I.) relating to the present juncture of affairs in England and Scotland</td>
<td>Collection Political writings</td>
<td>By R. Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Welsh fortune teller</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For G. Conyers</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Three letters</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Details not listed</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>To his highness the Prince of Orange</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Undaunted Londonderry</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For J. Deacon</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Arwaker</td>
<td>A votive table, consecrated to the Church's deliverers, the present King and Queen</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For W. Canning</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Asham</td>
<td>A seasonable discourse, wherein is examined what is lawful during the confusions and revolutions of government</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet (reprint)</td>
<td>By and for Richard Janeway</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Atwood</td>
<td>Wonderful predictions of Nostredamus, Grebner, David Pareus, and Antonius Torquatus</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>For J. Robinson, T. Foxe, M Wotton</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphra Behn</td>
<td>A congratulatory poem to her sacred majesty Queen Mary, upon her arrival in England</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>By R. E for R. Bentley</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Beverly</td>
<td>The kingdom of Jesus Christ entering its succession at 1697, according to a calendar of time</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Beverly</td>
<td>The late great revolution in this nation</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>For John Salusbury</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Bohun</td>
<td>The doctrine of non-resistance or passive obedience</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Chiswell</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Bohun</td>
<td>The general history of the Reformation of the Church</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>By Edw. Jones, for Abel Swall and Henry Bonwicke</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Bohun</td>
<td>The history of the desertion, or, an account of all the publick affairs in England, from the beginning of September 1688 to the twelfth of February following</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>For Richard Chiswell</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brograve</td>
<td>A sermon preach’d before the King and Queen at Hampton-Court, May the 12th. 1689</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>For William Rogers</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Brooker</td>
<td>Satisfaction tendred to all that pretend conscience for nonsubmission to our present governours</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>[By and sold by R. Janeway]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Burnet</td>
<td>A compleat collection of papers, in twelve parts</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>By J.D. for R. Clavel, Henry Mortlock, and Jonathan Robinson</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Burnet</td>
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<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Baldwin</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wake</td>
<td>A sermon preach’d before the Honourable House of Commons, at St. Margaret’s Westminster June 5th. 1689</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>For Ric. Chiswell and William Rogers</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wake</td>
<td>An exhortation to mutual charity and union among Protestants in sermon preach’d before the King and Queen at Hampton-Court</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>For Ric. Chiswell and W. Rogers</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Walker</td>
<td>The substance of a sermon, being an encouragement for Protestants, or a happy prospect of glorious success</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>By A. Milbourn</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Watts</td>
<td>A sermon preached upon Febr. the 14th. being the day of thanksgiving to almighty God, for having made His Highness the P. of Orange, &amp;c. the glorious instrument of the great deliverance of this kingdom from popery and arbitrary power</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>For R. Wilde</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Welwood</td>
<td>A vindication of the present great revolution in England in five letters pass’d betwixt James Welwood, M.D. and Mr. John March, vicar of Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>By and sold by Randal Taylor</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Whitby</td>
<td>A letter from a city-minister to a member of the high and honourable court of Parliament, concerning the present affairs</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Letter</td>
<td>For Thomas Newborough</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Whitby</td>
<td>Considerations humbly offered for taking the oath of allegiance to King William and Queen Mary</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By John Leake for Awnsham Churchill</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[John Wildman]</td>
<td>A memorial from the English Protestants, for their highnesses, the Prince and Princess of Orange</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wilson</td>
<td>A sermon preached before the mayor, aldermen, and Common-Council of</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>For W. Ewrey</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham in St. Peter's Church, on the 14th of Febr. 1688/9</td>
<td>Robert Wynne</td>
<td>The case of the oaths stated</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For Richard Chiswell</td>
<td>1689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 6: Prince George in 1702

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>P/P</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. A</td>
<td>Princely excellency: or, regal glory. Being an exact account of the most glorious heroick, and matchless actions, of that most serene and potent prince, William the Third</td>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>For W. Spiller</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Allen</td>
<td>The death of a good king a great and publick loss: exemplify'd, in a sermon preached March 29th 1702</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>For A. Bell, and J. Baker</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne I</td>
<td>At the court at St. James's, the ninth day of July, 1702</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>By Charles Bill and the executrix of Thomas Newcomb</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne I</td>
<td>Her majesties most gracious speech to both Houses of Parliament, On Saturday the twenty seventh Day of February, 1702</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>By Charles Bill and the executrix for Thomas Newcomb</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A satyr upon King William, being the secret history of his life and reign.</td>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A true history of the affairs of the north: containing a full account of the rise, growth, and present state of the differences between Denmark, Holstein-Gottorp, Sweden, Poland, and Muscovy</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For John Nutt</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Albion's glory: a pindarique ode on the royal train the attended the happy coronation of her most sacred majesty Queen Ann</td>
<td>Ode</td>
<td>For John Nutt</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A letter to a member of parliament, in reference to his royal highness Prince George of Denmark</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An account of the life and glorious actions of William the Third, late King of England, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>Reprinted by George Jaffrey</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An account of the proceedings of the House of Peers, upon the observations of the commissioners for taking, examining and stating the publick accounts of the kingdom</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>By Charles Bill and the executrix of Thomas Newcomb</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>An exact survey of the Duke of Ormond's campaign in Spain; with reflections on all his marches and camps</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>England's triumph, or an occasional poem on the happy coronation of Anne Queen of England &amp; c.</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Miscellany poems: the first part. Containing variety of new translations of the ancient poets</td>
<td>Poetry Miscellany</td>
<td>For Jacob Tonson</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Poems on affairs of state, from the reign of K. James the first, to this present year 1703</td>
<td>Poetry Miscellany</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The church of England's joy on the happy accession of her most sacred majesty Queen Anne, to the throne</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For John Nutt</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The dancing-master: or, directions for dancing country dances, with the tunes to each dance for the treble-violin</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>By J. Heptinstall for H. Playford</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The english muse: or, a congratulatory poem. Upon her majesty's accession to the throne of England</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>For John Nutt</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The history of the famous may-pole at Ewelm</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The loyalist: a funeral poem in memory of William III</td>
<td>Elegy</td>
<td>For and sold by Nich. Cox</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Folio Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The prerogative of the breeches, in a letter to the sons of men: being an answer to Petticoat-government. Written by a true-born English man</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>By and sold by A. Baldwin</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The Protestant queen: or the glorious proclaiming her royal highness Princess Ann of Denmark, Queen of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, on the 8th of March, 1702</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For John Alkin</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The queen's famous progress, or; her majesty's royal journey to the Bath, and happy return</td>
<td>Event description</td>
<td>For J. W</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>The tavern query, or, the loyal health</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
<td>For S.P</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Barnes</td>
<td>The good old way: or, three brief discourses tending to the promotion of religion, and the glory, peace, and happiness of the queen, and her kingdoms, in Church and state</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For W. Turner</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Shute Barrington</td>
<td>The interest of England consider'd, in respect to Protestants dissenting from the establish'd church</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel Boyer</td>
<td>The history of King William the third. In III parts</td>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>For A. Roper and F. Coggan</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel Boyer</td>
<td>The history of the reign of Queen Anne, digested into annals</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>For Abel Roper / For F Coggan</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel Boyer</td>
<td>The lawfulness, glory and advantage, of giving immediate and effectual relief to the Protestants in the Cevennes</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For John Nutt</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bradshaw</td>
<td>A treatise of divine worship; tending to prove, that the ceremonies imposed upon the ministers of the gospel in England, in present controversie, are in their use unlawful</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>Printed and sold by Anne Baldwin</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah Burchett</td>
<td>Memoirs of transactions at sea during the war with France; beginning in 1688, and ending in 1697</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>For John Nutt</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Burnet</td>
<td>A compleat history of the glorious life and actions of that most renowned monarch, William the third, late King of England, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>For E. Jones</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Calamy</td>
<td>An abridgment of Mr. Baxter's History of his life and times 1702</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>By S. Bridge, for Thomas Parkhurst,</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Davenant</td>
<td>Tom Double return'd out of the country: or, the true picture of a modern whig</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Dialogue</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dunton</td>
<td>The history of living men: or, characters of the royal family, the ministers of state, and the principal natives of the three kingdoms</td>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>By and sold by E. Mallet</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dunton</td>
<td>Petticoat-government. In a letter to the court ladies</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Gender polemic</td>
<td>By and to be sold by E. Mallet</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Dyke</td>
<td>The female muse. A poem on the coronation of her sacred majesty Queen Ann</td>
<td>Panegyric</td>
<td>Printed and to be sold by John Nutt</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. E. Edzard</td>
<td>God save the queen! The most hearty acclamations of the Lutherans in London, expressed at the royal proclamation and coronation of her most sacred majesty Queen Anne</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>By F Collins for Thomas Bennet</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Emes</td>
<td>Vindiciae mentis. An essay of the being and nature of mind</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>For H. Walwyn</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Fiddes</td>
<td>A sermon preached on the Thanksgiving day: December, 3d. 1702</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>By John White, for Francis Hildyard</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Fleming</td>
<td>The blessedness of those who die in the Lord</td>
<td>Devotional literature</td>
<td>Andrew Bell</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Gander</td>
<td>The glory of her sacred majesty Queen Anne, in the Royal Navy, and her absolute sovereignty as Empress of the sea</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet</td>
<td>For the author</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George of Denmark</td>
<td>His royal highness Prince George of Denmark, &amp;c. Lord High Admiral of England and Ireland, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>[Details not listed]</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Harris</td>
<td>Mourning in colours. A dialogue between a city wit, and a St. James's beau</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet Dialogue</td>
<td>For the author</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jones</td>
<td>A compleat history of Europe: or, a view of the affairs thereof, civil and military, for the year, 1702</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>For H. Rhodes; J. Nicholson; and Andr. Bell</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Page Dimensions</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The form of the proceeding to the royal coronation of her most excellent majesty Queen Anne.</td>
<td>Order of ceremony: Edward Jones</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A description of the western islands of Scotland</td>
<td>Topography: For Andrew Bell</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new state of England, under our present sovereign Queen Anne</td>
<td>History: By R. J. for H. Mortlock, and J. Robinson</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Octavo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An act for enabling her majesty to settle a revenue for supporting the dignity of his royal highness Prince George hereditary of Denmark, in case he shall survive her majesty</td>
<td>Act: By Charles Bill, and the executrix of Thomas Newcomb</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix moriendo revixit: or Britain's great mourning for the late King William's death, turned into rejoicing, by the happy succession of Queen Anne on the throne</td>
<td>Panegyric: By and sold by W. B.</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The innocent lampoon: or, the devote [sic] turn’d lover. Dedicated and presented to the queen, for entertainment of her majesty, and her honourable attendance at the Bath</td>
<td>Dialogue: For John Nutt</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A poem to the memory of his late majesty William the Third</td>
<td>Panegyric: For D. Brown; A. Bell; and J. Baker</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Folio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God's dominion over the seas, and the seaman's duty, consider'd. In a sermon preached at Long-Reach on board her majesty's Capital Ship The Royal Sovereign</td>
<td>Sermon: For Richard Mount</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait-royal. A poem upon her majesty's picture set up in Guild-Hall; by order of the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen of the City of London</td>
<td>Panegyric: By J. Rawlins for J. Nutt</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The song for New-Years-Day, 1703. Perform'd before her majesty</td>
<td>Song: For John Nutt</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for addressing his majesty to invite into England their highnesses, the Electress Dowager and the Electoral Prince of Hanover</td>
<td>Prose pamphlet: By and sold by John Nutt</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sermon preach'd before the queen, and both houses of parliament: at the cathedral church of St. Pauls Nov. 12. 1702</td>
<td>Sermon: For Tho. Bennet, sold by C. Yeo</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ode for an entertainment of musick on her majesty's birth-day, and, the success of her majesty's arms by sea and land</td>
<td>Ode: For John Nutt</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Quarto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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