

## **Cover Page**

**Thomas Pert**

Lincoln College, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

Correspondence email: [tompert@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:tompert@hotmail.co.uk)

**Article Title: Pride and Precedence: The rivalry of the House of Orange-Nassau and the Palatine Family at the Anglo-Dutch wedding of 1641**

**Word Count (excluding endnotes): 6646**

**Word count (including endnotes/without bibliography): 7812**

**This manuscript has been accepted for publication and will available in The**

**Seventeenth Century <Accepted 28 August 2020>**

**<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/0268117X.2020.1819395>**

## **Pride and Precedence: The rivalry of the House of Orange-Nassau and the Palatine Family at the Anglo-Dutch wedding of 1641\***

**Abstract:** 'They doe seek to get my eldest Neece but that I hope will not be granted it being too low for her'. These words of Charles I's sister, Elizabeth of Bohemia, regarding Princess Mary's upcoming nuptials with William of Orange-Nassau highlight the importance of precedence in the high politics of early modern Europe. This article will demonstrate that the Anglo-Dutch wedding of 1641 provided the backdrop to the competition for status between the family of the bridegroom, the House of Orange-Nassau, and Elizabeth's court-in-exile based in The Hague. As the diplomatic stage was one on which every player's conduct and reception was subject to intense scrutiny, it was essential for exiled regimes to safeguard their position in the hierarchy of European princes. However, such considerations are often overlooked in studies of the actions of Elizabeth's son in London before and after the marriage celebrations, but can provide a valuable insight into diplomatic practices of the early modern period.

**Keywords:** early modern; diplomacy; exiles; dynasty; Thirty Years' War

On 2 May 1641, Princess Mary, the eldest daughter of Charles I, married William, the only son of Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange, at the Palace of Whitehall in the first royal wedding on English soil for twenty-eight years. The nine-year-old Princess Royal, clad in silver and pearls, was escorted to the chapel by her brothers, Charles, Prince of Wales, and James, Duke of York, as well as numerous similarly-aged and identically-dressed daughters of the nobility, where she was given away by the king to her fourteen-year-old betrothed in a

ceremony conducted by the Bishop of Ely. However, contemporaries noted that this happy occasion was somewhat marred by the curious behaviour of the bride's cousin: Charles Louis, the exiled Elector of the Palatinate.

The eldest son of Charles I's sister, Elizabeth, Charles Louis arrived in England uninvited in February 1641, having journeyed from his family's court-in-exile at The Hague, where the exiled Palatine electoral dynasty family had been living as honoured guests of the House of Orange-Nassau since 1621. Charles Louis reportedly spurned an invitation to attend the private supper for the bride, groom, and members of the royal family held after the wedding ceremony, and he similarly refused to call upon William in his quarters, exciting the suspicions of contemporary observers.<sup>1</sup> These actions have been interpreted by subsequent scholars as simple petulance which supposedly substantiated speculation that the twenty-three-year-old Charles Louis wanted to marry Mary himself.<sup>2</sup> However, such an interpretation is not supported by contemporary evidence. Although Charles Louis and his mother were undoubtedly critical of the Stuart-Orange match, the exiled prince's actions in London in the spring of 1641 were driven by concerns of rank and prestige, rather than resentment for supposedly having lost the chance of marrying his cousin.

This article will demonstrate that the elector's behaviour, as well as the mutual resentment of Charles Louis and William, was the product of a struggle for precedence between the 'princely' House of Orange-Nassau and the exiled 'royal' Palatine family, which had arguably started in 1625 and intensified after 1637. Although the importance of precedence in early modern political culture has attracted much attention within the broader scholarship on the cultural history of diplomacy produced in the last two decades, being described by one writer as 'the chief principle underlying European diplomatic protocol' in the period, its significance for exiled rulers has not been addressed.<sup>3</sup> This article will show that precedence was a vital facet of the politics of display practised by dispossessed regimes attempting to

exploit their professed rank to attract material, financial, and diplomatic support for their cause.

## I.

The honour derived from precedence was a much-coveted commodity in early modern diplomacy. Louis XIV himself noted that people ‘usually judge by what they see from the outside, and most often it is by precedence and rank that they measure their respect and obedience’.<sup>4</sup> The manner in which an ambassador was received and treated at their host court, such as whether they took precedence over fellow diplomats at official occasions, bestowed them with ceremonial prestige and was seen as a public demonstration of the strength and dignity of the ruler they represented.<sup>5</sup> As the hospitality shown to one state’s representative could provide an indication of their host’s foreign policy preferences and objectives, ambassadors’ reports regularly featured concerns of precedence in meticulously detailed accounts of court receptions and the treatment of their counterparts.<sup>6</sup> The hierarchy of ruling titles was generally accepted in early modern diplomatic circles, with the representatives of the Holy Roman Emperor preceding those of kings, who in turn outranked those of electors, dukes, and other ruling dignities. However, political and military developments caused the hierarchy of states being to be constantly in flux. This resulted in a near-continual competition for rank amongst ambassadors, leading to contention over matters such as their positions in official processions and seating arrangements at state dinners and in court chapels.<sup>7</sup>

As an ambassador being afforded a position of precedence was a public demonstration of their host’s support for the ruler they represented, it was also therefore an act of recognition that their master was the rightful holder of their professed title.<sup>8</sup> Such considerations made concerns of precedence of inordinate importance for exiled regimes, many of whom lacked

the military strength necessary to recover their lands and titles by force. If a dispossessed ruler or their representatives were able to retain their prior position within the hierarchy of diplomatic precedence at another court, it acted as both a declaration of that state's support for the exile's cause, and a clear rejection of any other claimants to their lost territories and offices. Such an act of public recognition not only helped to legitimize an exiled ruler's claims, but it could be used as grounds to demand similar precedence elsewhere on the diplomatic stage. For example, after the Governor General of the Spanish Netherlands received the exiled Charles II in a manner befitting the latter's professed regal status in December 1656, one contemporary claimed that 'the cavaliers brag notably of his civilities to their Charles'.<sup>9</sup> Such cockiness undoubtedly came from the knowledge that news of this royal reception would shortly be reported in ambassadorial correspondence all across Europe.<sup>10</sup>

Many dispossessed heads of state often sought to exploit dynastic connections as a means of obtaining public recognition of their professed status, and therefore justify their demands for precedence. It was often expected that early modern rulers would defend the claims of their exiled kin and provide appropriate assistance to their cause. For example, after the death of Charles Louis's father, one English government administrator asserted that 'our King and State are obliged to do more for a nephew than a brother-in-law, and more likewise for a widow than for a wife'.<sup>11</sup> In the absence of any independent military force or significant financial reserves, such implicit obligations within bonds of kinship were vital in preventing exiled regimes from becoming irrelevant on the international political stage, and being forced to surrender precedence to other states. Familial connections to other ruling houses meant that dispossessed dynasties could still be advantageous marriage options for ambitious status-conscious elite families, or for powers seeking to benefit from an exile's close ties to a more powerful ruler for their own ambitions.<sup>12</sup> For example, James Stuart, the 'Old Pretender', married one of the richest heiresses in Europe in 1719, and several members of the Palatine

family were approached by a variety of prospective marriage partners during their exile, including the wealthy heiress Marguerite de Rohan, Elector Friedrich Wilhelm of Brandenburg, and King Władisław IV of Poland.<sup>13</sup>

However, dynastic networks were only useful for exiles if their extended family were willing and able to recognise their professed status and safeguard their precedence. Such recognition was not always forthcoming, as Philip IV of Spain refused to acknowledge Marie de Medici's royal status during her exile in the Spanish Netherlands, thereby denying his mother-in-law the ability to engage in diplomatic activity in accordance with her professed rank.<sup>14</sup> Even if a monarch wanted to assist their exiled relatives, inability could often appear as unwillingness, and jeopardise support from other powers. For example, a lack of meaningful military support from Charles I in the early-1630s led several Protestant states to consider abandoning the Palatine family's cause in February 1634, as it appeared that 'England, which, has such strong ties of obligation, cares nothing about it'.<sup>15</sup>

Such concerns would resurface and come into sharp focus at the Anglo-Dutch wedding of 1641, as the political realities facing Charles I had publicly humiliating implications for the precedence of the exiled Palatine family. Not only was Charles Louis unable to utilise his family connections and status to obtain Dutch material and diplomatic support for his cause, but he was compelled by his uncle to acknowledge the heir to the lesser-ranking House of Orange-Nassau as a social equal. This public demonstration signalled a decisive shift in the relative precedence of the two houses from when the Palatine family first established their court-in-exile at The Hague in April 1621.

## II

The entry of Charles Louis's parents in The Hague came scarcely fifteen months after their acceptance of the crown of Bohemia from the hands of Protestant rebels in September 1619

at the outset of the Thirty Years' War. The intervening period had seen his father, Elector Frederick V of the Palatinate, reduced from one of the highest-ranking princes of the Holy Roman Empire to an impoverished exile. The 'Winter King' was expelled from his recently-acquired kingdom in November 1620 following a crushing defeat at the Battle of White Mountain, and his ancestral German lands were invaded and occupied by Imperial, Bavarian and Spanish forces after Emperor Ferdinand II declared him an outlaw by placing him under the Imperial Ban in January 1621. The new emperor also bestowed Frederick's prestigious electoral title upon the catholic Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, a distant relative of the Palatine family, and head of the rival Bavarian branch within the Wittelsbach dynasty.

In spite of their misfortunes, the exiles were invited to The Hague by Prince Maurits of Orange, the half-brother of Frederick's mother, and were feted as royal guests. For example, the States General provided them with the Wassenaer Hof palace, which would serve as the hub of the Palatine court-in-exile, as well as paying for its partial furnishing and granting a monthly pension.<sup>16</sup> Numerous scholars have posited that the Dutch felt compelled to provide such royal treatment the Palatine family due to a fear for their own honour and reputation if they did not provide for the stadtholder's kin, or because it was felt that the presence of a 'royal' court in The Hague would improve the standing of the Prince of Orange and the States General on the international stage.<sup>17</sup> Regardless, the public reception and feting of Frederick and Elizabeth as royal guests, as well as the later treatment of Charles Louis with the honour appropriate to the son of a king, reinforced the exiles' claims to regal status and the associated precedence.

The precedence of the Palatine dynasty over the House of Orange-Nassau went largely unquestioned during the first years of their residence in The Hague, in spite of their exiled status. After all, Frederick and Elizabeth had been crowned King and Queen of Bohemia, as well as being Elector and Electress of the Palatinate, and they had familial connections to

several royal dynasties. In contrast, the quasi-monarchical standing of the Princes of Orange within the Dutch Republic had a very shaky constitutional basis. The title itself referred to a small sovereign French principality which had been in the possession of the House of Nassau since 1530, and had no political significance within the republic, apart from making the Prince of Orange the highest-ranking of the small number of noblemen in the country.<sup>18</sup>

Whilst a princely title and their central role in the republic's struggle against Spain since 1568 gave the House of Orange-Nassau an unrivalled degree of social eminence and prestige within the republic, their political power came from cumulative possession of several stadtholderates.<sup>19</sup> In particular, the Stadtholder of Holland and Zeeland, a title held by successive Princes of Orange since 1572, was normally also appointed Captain-General of the Army and Admiral-General of the Fleet. Although these titles were not hereditary, as each of the seven Dutch provinces appointed their own stadtholders, Maurits had also been selected by Utrecht, Guelders, and Overijssel in 1590.<sup>20</sup> As a result, Princes of Orange ranked very low in the order of precedence of European rulers in the first decades of the seventeenth century. This was clearly demonstrated by the fact that the mode of address for the Prince of Orange was 'excellency', a style afforded to high officials, rather than those of 'highness' or 'majesty' given to sovereign heads of state.

The spheres of the Palatine and Orange courts intersected in April 1625 when Frederik Hendrik married one of Elizabeth's ladies in waiting, Amalia of Solms-Braunfels, at the insistence of his ailing and unmarried half-brother Prince Maurits.<sup>21</sup> The daughter of Frederick's Grand Chamberlain, Amalia had been a member of Elizabeth's household at the Palatine court in Heidelberg since 1615, and Sir Thomas Roe congratulated Elizabeth that one of her servants had married the heir to the principality of Orange: 'One glorye I will ascribe to your Ma.tie [is] that you have made one of yours a Princess'.<sup>22</sup> However, this wedding initiated the competition for precedence between the Palatine family and the House



of Orange-Nassau, especially after Frederik Hendrik's accession as Prince of Orange and appointment as Stadtholder of Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Gelderland, and Overijssel less than three weeks after his wedding. Whereas Elizabeth had been the leading female figure at The Hague since her arrival in 1621, Amalia's elevation to Princess of Orange threw this established order into question. Although the royal status of the 'Winter Queen' trumped the increased rank of her former servant, Amalia became the 'first woman' at the Orange court, a development which has been viewed as initiating the cooling of the women's once intimate relationship and triggering the rivalry between the two courts based in The Hague.<sup>23</sup>

It is unlikely that the precedence of the Palatine family was deliberately targeted by the House of Orange-Nassau from the mid-1620s, but rather it became an inevitable casualty of Frederik Hendrik's attempts to increase his family's standing on the international stage, as well as to promote their sovereignty within the Dutch Republic. In a clear demonstration of the rhetoric of display, the new Prince and Princess of Orange embarked on a comprehensive programme of building grandiose palaces and castles, and introduced the first trappings of royalty to their court at The Hague.<sup>24</sup> An increase in the number of courtiers and servants from 100 to 250 made the Orange court comparable with those of the electors of the Holy Roman Empire, and the introduction of a codified French-style of etiquette was a stark contrast to the soldierly atmosphere at Maurits's court.<sup>25</sup> It has even been suggested that the decision to engage the services of Gerrit van Honthorst, the favoured portraitist of the Palatine exiles, was because the Prince and Princess of Orange sought to emulate the artistic tastes of their royal neighbours at The Hague.<sup>26</sup>

Frederik Hendrik also secured recognition of his infant son as heir to the stadtholderships of Utrecht, Overijssel, Gelderland, Holland, and Zeeland by 1631, an unprecedented development which marked the first step towards the offices becoming a hereditary possession of his dynasty.<sup>27</sup> The Prince of Orange's attempts to obtain greater standing for his

family appeared vindicated in 1636, when Louis XIII of France ordered a change in the mode of address to be used for the stadtholder from 'Excellency' to 'Highness'.<sup>28</sup> The States General similarly voted to use this more prestigious style of address, typically reserved for lesser sovereigns and their relatives, for the stadtholder in January 1637, and Frederik Hendrik swiftly began insisting that his children be similarly addressed.<sup>29</sup>

In spite of these advances to the status of the House of Orange-Nassau, the Palatine family were afforded the pre-eminent positions at the wedding of Amalia's sister, Louise Christina, in February 1638, an event described by the English resident ambassador to the Netherlands as having 'so much feasting, running at ye ring, and such other shewes as hath not been seen in these parts'.<sup>30</sup> Charles Louis, who inherited his father's claim to the electoral lands and titles upon Frederick's death in November 1632, preceded even Frederik Hendrik in the procession into the chapel, and Elizabeth was given similarly prestigious roles in the festivities. She was afforded the position of honour on the dais at the wedding banquet, distributed prizes at the celebratory tournaments, and was the one to give the signal for the bridal couple to be left alone in their bedchamber.<sup>31</sup> However, this order of precedence would not be repeated at the Anglo-Dutch wedding three years later.

### III

The marriage of William and Mary in May 1641 has been described as a victory of the House of Orange-Nassau over the Palatine family, since the former allegedly outmanoeuvred their exiled guests to win a bride coveted by both dynasties, thereby attaining 'royal descent, grandeur and status'.<sup>32</sup> However, the significance of the wedding goes beyond a supposed competition for the hand of the nine-year-old Princess Royal. The events surrounding the nuptials marked and cemented a decisive shift in the 'balance of status' between the two dynasties, with considerable implications for the Palatine family's prior precedence over their

hosts. The political realities facing Charles I by late-1640 meant that the superior status of the 'royal' Stuart and Palatine dynasties counted for naught. Accordingly, the House of Orange-Nassau was able to dominate the negotiations and reject any demands for military, financial or political support for the Palatine family as part of the marriage treaty. Just as galling, however, was the fact that Charles Louis was ultimately forced by his uncle to recognise William, the scion of a non-noble dynasty and a child of his mother's former lady-in-waiting, as a social equal.

The announcement of an Anglo-Dutch marriage in late-1640 came at a particularly low point in the fortunes of the Palatine family. Elizabeth's second son, Rupert, was languishing in imperial custody in Linz following Charles Louis's short-lived military campaign in Germany, for which he drained the family coffers and which came to an ignominious end in a disastrous defeat at Vlotho on 17 October 1638.<sup>33</sup> Charles Louis himself was arrested in October 1639 by agents of Cardinal Richelieu whilst travelling through France in an attempt to secure command of a mercenary army which had been in French pay 1635, and he was imprisoned until August 1640.<sup>34</sup> In addition, Charles I's expensive defeats in the Bishops' Wars, together with the financial obligations imposed by the Treaty of Ripon, had dire consequences for the Palatine family's finances. As the king was obliged to pay £850 per day to the victorious Scots Covenanters, it is unsurprising that the payments of Charles Louis's annual pension of £12,000, which had been paid in full until 29 September 1640, 'began to bee obstructed in part, & soone wholly' as a result of 'the distemper of these times'.<sup>35</sup>

The military humiliations and financial plight of the Palatine family, immediately preceding the outbreak of hostilities within Charles I's kingdoms, were especially untimely as it seemed that Charles Louis and his most consistent supporter on the European stage would be unable to effectively champion the Palatine cause at the Imperial Diet at Regensburg. The *Reichstag* opened in September 1640 was the first in twenty-seven years, and had been summoned by

Emperor Ferdinand III in an attempt to bring about a general peace within the Holy Roman Empire which risked excluding the Palatine family.<sup>36</sup> Accordingly, the announcement of a dynastic marriage between the Stuart crown and another European power presented an opportunity for the Palatine family to obtain vital material or diplomatic support to facilitate their restoration.

Nevertheless, Charles Louis and Elizabeth were amongst the chorus of dissenting and confused voices which questioned the hastily-arranged union between such young individuals.<sup>37</sup> Charles Louis confided to a contact in London, the MP Sir Richard Cave, that 'I do not conceive that should make the King precipitate the match, seeing both parties are of so unripe an age', and Elizabeth bewilderedly wrote to Sir Thomas Roe that 'I cannot see what the king can gain by precipitating this marriage'.<sup>38</sup> The hostile reaction of Charles Louis and his mother to the news of the upcoming nuptials, and the elector's journey to England shortly before the wedding, have long been viewed as demonstrating that they believed Mary should have been betrothed to Charles Louis instead, and that they then sought to disrupt the match.<sup>39</sup> It should be noted, however, that at the time these critical letters were written, Charles was only willing to allow his second daughter, Princess Elizabeth, to marry into the House of Orange. The king would not agree for William to wed Mary until February 1641, when his desperation for money as military confrontation loomed within his kingdoms, as well as the absence of any possibility of assistance from Spain, forced him to agree to Dutch demands for the elder daughter who had previously been intended as a bride for Philip IV's heir apparent.<sup>40</sup> Accordingly, contemporary correspondence shows that the disapproval of the elector and his mother was due to the manner in which the marriage negotiations were conducted, as well as concerns of status.

Elizabeth only learned of the proposed Anglo-Dutch match in early-December 1640, after she met with the Princess of Orange, who informed her that Charles had only been willing to wed

his second daughter to William, and asked for her help in concluding the marriage. Amalia reportedly made 'great excuses' to her former mistress for keeping the negotiations from her, claiming that 'she concealed it, by the Kings especiall command'.<sup>41</sup> It is certainly true that Charles had not informed his sister of the marriage talks, and the Palatine family railed against this secrecy. The Venetian ambassador in The Hague reported that 'The Princess Palatine has not had any share in the affair' and 'is much displeased at such evidence of want of confidence', and Charles Louis wrote that 'the concealing of this businesse thus long from the Queene, my Mother, sheweth much distrust and little affection either from the King, Queene, or Prince of Orange to her'.<sup>42</sup>

However, considerations of status played a greater role in the reaction of the Palatine family to news of the Stuart-Orange marriage negotiations. Even recent works which address the 1641 wedding, such as that of Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline van Gent, overlook the considerable disparity in rank between the House of Orange-Nassau and the Palatine family. They compare the marriage to that of Elizabeth and Frederick in 1613, describing the latter as 'a scion of the Nassau dynasty', thereby overlooking the high status and influence of the Electors of the Palatinate prior to the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War.<sup>43</sup> Even when it seemed that Charles would only agree to Princess Elizabeth marrying into the House of Orange-Nassau, Charles Louis stated that such a betrothal 'is the greatest [that] can befall [William] in this world'.<sup>44</sup> Both the elector and his mother regarded the House of Orange-Nassau as hardly worthy of a royal match. Charles Louis claimed that 'it is a great sausinesse in them to demand the breeding of soe great a kings daughter', and Elizabeth scoffed at her hosts' ambition to marry their son to Princess Mary, describing the House of Orange-Nassau as 'too low for her'.<sup>45</sup> Although we cannot rule out the possibility that Elizabeth had envisioned a match between her son and her eldest niece, she makes no mention of it in her private correspondence, even when voicing her displeasure at the upcoming Stuart-Orange

nuptials. The Winter Queen was unashamedly candid in her letters, making it highly unlikely that she would not have told her intimate correspondents of either her wish for a Palatine-Stuart wedding, or any pre-existing arrangement with her brother for the same, had such a design actually existed.

Whilst critical of the ambitions of the Prince and Princess of Orange, as well as puzzled by Charles I's motives for pursuing the marriage, the Palatine family did not want to prevent the wedding. On the contrary, Charles Louis hoped that he would be able to profit from the public occasion brought about by the union, claiming that 'if this occasion of the King and people's meeting be neglected...I am lost'.<sup>46</sup> Such hopes were hardly unreasonable, as Charles I declared to the House of Lords on 10 February 1641 that 'use may be had of this Friendship towards the Reestablishment of My Sister and Nephews'.<sup>47</sup> Even Elizabeth was hopeful of a good outcome, declaring that 'I hope I shall have cause to be glad of the match', as she hoped that the parliament's support for the Palatine cause and the king's obligation to help his exiled relatives would result in England demanding Dutch support for the Palatine family in exchange for a royal bride.<sup>48</sup>

It certainly would not have been the first time that Charles Louis attempted to use a public occasion to promote his family's cause. At the wedding of Louise Christina of Solms-Braunfels in February 1638, Charles Louis lost no opportunity in demonstrating his claim to his father's confiscated lands and titles.<sup>49</sup> For example, whilst leading a team of six men dressed as Moorish squires in one of the celebratory tournaments, the young elector carried an orb representing the emblem of the high office of Arch-Steward, *Archidapifer*, of the Holy Roman Empire, the highly prestigious role traditionally held by the Electors of the Palatinate.<sup>50</sup> It is evident, however, that Charles Louis and his mother hoped to obtain more tangible support from the conclusion of the Stuart-Orange marriage treaty. When the elector found out about the proposed union, he wrote that 'I doe beseech...that nothing may be

rashly concluded in this businesse, but that some advantage may be made of it in my Cause'.<sup>51</sup>

Charles Louis arrived in England in late-February 1641 to present demands he believed should be included in the marriage treaty between the House of Orange-Nassau and the Stuarts.<sup>52</sup> It should be noted that, earlier that month, Charles I had dispatched the Clerk of the Privy Council, Richard Browne, to the Palatine court-in-exile, to inform the elector 'how inconvenient it would be to our service, if att present he should undertake the journey'.<sup>53</sup> At a time of civil strife within Charles I's kingdoms, the Venetian ambassador speculated that the king feared the presence of 'a prince so near to the succession, the son of a mother acclaimed by the people, and one for whom they have always displayed the greatest affection'.<sup>54</sup> Indeed, Elizabeth and her offspring had long been regarded as viable potential replacements for Charles I.<sup>55</sup> However, as the Palatine family had been excluded from the earlier negotiations regarding the Anglo-Dutch match, it is understandable that Charles Louis would defy his uncle and journey to England to represent his interests in person.

Shortly after his arrival, the elector's propositions were given to the Marquis of Hamilton, a long-standing supporter of the Palatine family and one of the lords appointed to the committee to negotiate the marriage treaty, who then read them to the committee for discussion on 8 March.<sup>56</sup> These demands, which were presented to the Dutch two days later, are almost breathtakingly strident, and show that Charles Louis was either oblivious to the dire situation facing his uncle in spring 1641 or, as is more likely, he believed that it should not matter. As the disparity in rank between the Stuarts and the House of Orange-Nassau featured heavily in the reactions of Charles Louis and Elizabeth to the news of the Anglo-Dutch marriage, the Palatine family undoubtedly believed that the king could demand Dutch assistance for his exiled relatives as part of the price for the privilege of marrying into a royal dynasty.

Charles Louis proposed that any formal agreement between England and the Dutch should oblige both parties to demand a full Palatine restoration in any peace talks or alliance treaties with other powers, and insisted that, if England declared war on Spain, the Dutch should do likewise against the emperor, Bavaria, and ‘whosoever els shall oppose ye restitution of the Electorall Palatine howse’.<sup>57</sup> The elector also demanded numerous concessions from the Dutch in the event that he was able to raise an army, asking them ‘to assist him with such reasonable & proportionable aides, either in men or money’. Such supposedly ‘reasonable’ support included providing Charles Louis with weapons, ammunition, cannon, horses, and other supplies ‘without enjoining his Highnes to pay ye charges, toles, licenses, excises or other impositions of ye country’, and he even demanded they provide him with ‘some Towne upon their frontier’ for him to use as a base of operations.<sup>58</sup>

Although the Dutch ambassadors did not reject the elector’s demands outright, their response on 15 March amounted to little else. As in their negotiations with Charles’s representatives, in which they refused to commit to a political alliance alongside the marriage treaty, the ambassadors professed that they had solely been instructed ‘to treat with [the king] the marriage of the princess his daughter with ye young prince of Orange’, and therefore had no authority to comment on Charles Louis’s propositions.<sup>59</sup> They also chided the elector that any demands should have been presented to the States General in The Hague, where they could be ‘treated upon ye places where the souveraigne authority of ye states sideth & such affaires may bee cleared & resolved’.<sup>60</sup> Ultimately, the most the Dutch ambassadors agreed to was to send Charles Louis’s demands to Frederik Hendrik and the States General for consideration.<sup>61</sup>

Charles I’s inability to pull rank to obtain support for his exiled relatives was certainly a blow to the Palatine family’s professions of social superiority over the Princes of Orange. The elector’s noticeable absence from the wedding ceremony and banquet on 2 May 1641, as well as the fact that he had not made any visits to William following the bridegroom’s arrival on



18 April, led many onlookers to suggest that he was sulking after failing either to obtain Mary for himself or obtain Dutch assistance for the Palatine cause.<sup>62</sup> However, an incident less than two weeks after the wedding demonstrates that the elector's absence from the festivities, and his reluctance to call upon the bridegroom, were more due to concerns of prestige and a reluctance to surrender precedence to the House of Orange-Nassau.

Throughout the marriage negotiations in early-1641, Charles I went to great lengths to play to the Dutch ambassadors' professions of the status of their masters, the Prince of Orange and the States General. For example, at the public entry of the Dutch ambassadors into London, the king's Master of Ceremonies attempted in vain to persuade the coachmen of the Venetian ambassador 'to yield place to those of Holland', reportedly resulting in the Dutch coach making repeated attempts to overtake that of the Venetians during the procession.<sup>63</sup> As Charles I's own dependency on prospective Dutch financial and military support in 1641 made him more amenable to their demands for increased precedence amongst non-monarchical states, it is highly likely that Charles Louis avoided the Dutch party so that the Palatine family's hitherto higher standing would not be challenged. For example, in mid- and late-May, Charles Louis complained to his mother of 'how the little Prince of Orange carrieth himself towards me', and resolved not to follow the king's suggestion to visit William and pay his respects without an express demand that he do so, claiming that it would otherwise be to his own prejudice.<sup>64</sup> However, the elector's letter shows that he was especially incensed by his uncle's recommendation because it would have required him to be the one to initiate contact, and make the journey to the young prince's quarters to call upon him, protesting that '[William] have not yet been with me'.<sup>65</sup>

Although this stubbornness reeks of petulance to modern writers, such an interpretation completely overlooks the considerable importance that contemporaries placed on diplomatic ceremonial, especially the issue of precedence.<sup>66</sup> To all observers aware of the tensions

between the two princes, by presenting himself at William's accommodation to pay his respects, Charles Louis risked being seen in a supplicatory role, potentially undermining the Palatine family's claims to precedence over the House of Orange-Nassau. Indeed, the sequence and manner in which princes or dignitaries visited each other was often a matter of great contention.<sup>67</sup> The elector claimed that he would only visit William following an explicit command from his uncle, as this would mean that 'to the eye of the World...I may have that excuse' for doing it.<sup>68</sup> When such an order came, Elizabeth voiced her hope that 'since the king did so absolutlie command it his honour is saved'.<sup>69</sup> However, when Charles Louis wrote to the Dutch ambassadors to arrange his visit, it was evident that the tensions regarding precedence between the Palatines and the House of Orange-Nassau were far from resolved. The ambassadors insisted that, when William called upon the elector in return, the little prince was to receive the same ceremonial treatment as they would afford Charles Louis, tantamount to a public demonstration that the Palatine and Orange dynasties were of the same rank. Elizabeth complained to Sir Thomas Roe that 'they looked to be used as they used him...all things equal'.<sup>70</sup>

The audacity of such a demand was striking. Although Charles Louis's right to the title of Elector of the Palatinate was a matter of great contention in diplomatic circles, and very few powers acknowledged his parents' titles of King and Queen of Bohemia, no-one disputed the status owed to him as a grandson of James VI and I. Even the French ambassador in London, whilst refusing to acknowledge Charles Louis as elector due to the Franco-Bavarian Treaty of Fontainebleau of 1631, addressed him as 'highness', stating in 1635 that 'for *Altesse* we will make no difficulty to give as he is a prince born and of the blood'.<sup>71</sup> In contrast, not a drop of royal blood coursed through the veins of the future William II of Orange. Frederik Hendrik had recently acquired the mode of address of 'highness', however this honour was linked to the office of stadtholder and not to the House of Orange-Nassau.<sup>72</sup> Although Princes of

Orange had held the stadtholderate since the 1570s, the role would not be made hereditary until 1747, and so any attempt to claim the style of 'highness' for William in 1641 was open to contention. Indeed, the issue of the young prince's rank was so dubious that it was thought expedient to appoint him as head of the Dutch embassy, thereby entitling him to all privileges afforded to an ambassador.<sup>73</sup> As noted by Elizabeth, William 'must be an Ambassadors to mend his ranck'.<sup>74</sup>

In spite of Charles I's initial hostility to the Dutch demand for an equal reception, he ultimately relented and commanded Charles Louis to agree to their wishes, prompting Elizabeth's outrage that 'my sonne was bothe the sufferer and forced to give satisfaction too, which is verie hard, and it grieves me not a little'.<sup>75</sup> As the Dutch ambassadors refused to do anything more than present Charles Louis's propositions to the States General and Frederik Hendrik, it is likely that the king advised his nephew to avoid antagonising them.<sup>76</sup> Such a decision not only suggests Charles's own dependency on prospective military and financial assistance from the House of Orange-Nassau in the wake of the Bishops' Wars, as well as an exaggerated idea of the power of the stadtholder, but also highlights his willingness to accept vague assurances from other powers instead of substantive concessions.<sup>77</sup> Whatever the king's motives, to the wider world it appeared as though the Palatine family's most significant backer, and close relative, was no longer willing to support their cause and claims to precedence. This alone would have been a tremendous blow to the Palatine family, but the king's decision was made all the more galling by the fact that Charles Louis was forced to publicly treat the non-royal offspring of his mother's former lady-in-waiting as an equal. Elizabeth bitterly complained that her son's acquiescence to the Dutch demands would not 'breed the good effects' intended by the king, and would only serve to make the House of Orange-Nassau 'more proud and insolent to us, seing that instead of ressetting there coldness my sonne, by his command did doe as they desired'.<sup>78</sup>

Although Elizabeth and Frederik Hendrik would work to restore cordial relations between their respective families, it was clear that the 1641 wedding signalled the final victory of the House of Orange-Nassau over the Palatine family in their simmering ‘cold war’ for precedence.<sup>79</sup> The marriage to the eldest daughter of the King of England was a tremendous coup for the House of Orange-Nassau, and was celebrated in cultural demonstrations of the dynasty’s aggrandizement. A commemorative medal was struck in Amsterdam, and the Prince and Princess of Orange commissioned a Van Dyck portrait of the newly-married couple in their wedding garments.<sup>80</sup> In this painting, the traditional hierarchical placement of the husband on the left is reversed, demonstrating Mary’s superior status as the daughter of a king.<sup>81</sup>

Elizabeth continued to be treated with dignity as an honoured guest by the House of Orange-Nassau, such as being invited to lay the first stone for the Huis ten Bosch palace in September 1645. However, it was clear that the ‘Winter Queen’ and her children had been eclipsed by their hosts.<sup>82</sup> This was evident in the competition between Elizabeth and Amalia over whose daughter would marry Friedrich Wilhelm, the young Elector of Brandenburg. Although Elizabeth reported in January 1642 that Friedrich Wilhelm wished to marry her second daughter, Louise Hollandine, pragmatic considerations led the elector to instead marry Louise Henriette of Nassau, the eldest daughter of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia, in December 1646.<sup>83</sup> The Palatine family could not hope to match the large dowry provided by the House of Orange-Nassau which would alleviate Frederick William’s debts, nor were they able to support him in his dynastic quarrels over Jülich-Berg and Pomerania and help to safeguard his estates from threatened incursions by the Duke of Pfalz-Neuburg or the King of Poland.<sup>84</sup> Whereas the Dutch offered potential military and diplomatic assistance, Charles I’s defeat in the first English Civil War negated any possibility of obtaining significant martial or political benefits from Elizabeth’s homeland, rendering a match with the impoverished Palatine family

doubly unattractive. Even after Charles Louis's restoration under the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, the Princes of Orange retained a higher position of precedence on the international stage.<sup>85</sup>

It is perhaps unsurprising that the Stuart-Orange wedding of 1641 has attracted scant scholarly attention. The marriage had little to no bearing on the events of the civil war period, and even the wedded couple themselves, both of whom died in their twenties, have been overshadowed by their son and niece: the *other* William and Mary. Literature on the Palatine family makes little mention of it, since the wedding itself, and Charles Louis's conduct, caused neither an open rift with the House of Orange-Nassau nor a noticeable worsening of relations between the two dynasties. In addition, even works which directly address the rivalry between the Palatine and Orange courts tend to simplify the public disagreements between Charles Louis and the Dutch as a dispute for Mary's hand in marriage, and gloss over the clash over the respective receptions which occurred following the wedding.

Although Charles Louis would undoubtedly have been frustrated at having lost the opportunity of obtaining military or financial assistance in the Anglo-Dutch marriage treaty, such an interpretation overlooks the central role of status and precedence in the Palatine family's thinking. The longer a ruling dynasty remained in exile, the more difficult it became to stay relevant on the European political stage, and it was therefore vital for the Palatine family to safeguard their traditional social standing over the Princes of Orange. The reaction of Charles Louis and Elizabeth to the announcement of the Anglo-Dutch marriage was dismay over the relative disparity in status between the prospective bride and groom. A similar belief in the centrality of rank also led Charles Louis to believe that his uncle could demand Dutch assistance for the Palatine family in spite of the civil strife plaguing Charles

I's kingdoms. Finally, the disagreements regarding the respective receptions to be afforded to Charles Louis and William were an important development in redefining the relative statuses of the House of Orange and the exiled Palatine dynasty. The actions of the young elector, as well as his public spat with the Dutch over precedence, therefore provide a valuable insight into diplomatic practices and the importance of status and image in the high politics of early modern Europe.

## **Notes**

### **Bibliography: Manuscripts**

- Bodleian Library, Oxford. MS Nalson 18.
- British Library, London. MS Stowe 133.
- The National Archives, Kew. SP 16, SP 81, SP 84.

### **Bibliography:**

- Akkerman, Nadine, ed. *The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011-Present.
- Akkerman, Nadine. *Courtly Rivals in The Hague: Elizabeth Stuart (1596-1662) & Amalia von Solms (1602-1675)*. Venlo: VanSpijk/Rekafa Publishers bv, 2014.
- Alsteens, Stijn and Adam Eaker. *Van Dyck: The Anatomy of Portraiture*. New York: The Frick Collection and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Baillie, Robert. *Letters, and journals: containing an impartial account of public transactions, civil, ecclesiastical, and military, in England and Scotland, from the beginning of the civil wars, in 1637, to the year 1662*. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: 1775.
- Becker, Jochen. "Groote kosten en magnificien: Die Haager Hochzeit von 1638-Formen und Funktionen eines Festes." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 49, no. 1 (1998): 209-253.
- Birch, Thomas, ed. *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*. Vol. 5. London: Fletcher Gyles, 1742.
- Birch, Thomas and Robert Folkestone Williams, eds. *The Court and Times of Charles the First*. Vol. 2. London: H. Colburn, 1848.
- Bray, William, ed. *Memoirs, illustrative of the life and writings of John Evelyn, Esq.* 2 vols., London: Henry Colburn, 1819.
- Breslow, Marvin Arthur. *A Mirror of England: England Puritan Views of Foreign Nations, 1618-1640*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Broomhall, Susan, and Jacobus Josephus Maria van Gent. *Dynastic Colonialism: Gender, Materiality and the Early Modern House of Orange-Nassau*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Corp, Edward T. *The Jacobites at Urbino: An Exiled Court in Transition*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Cressy, David. *Dangerous Talk: Scandalous, Seditious, and Treasonable Speech in Pre-Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Cust, Richard. *Charles I: A Political Life*. Harlow: Longman, 2005.
- Geevers, Liesbeth. "The Nassau Orphans: The disputed legacy of William of Orange and the creation of the Prince of Orange (1584-1675)." In *Dynastic Identity in Early Modern Europe: Rulers, aristocrats and the formation of identities*, edited by Liesbeth Geevers and Mirella Marini, 197-216. Farnham: Ashgate, 2015.
- Geyl, Pieter. *Orange and Stuart, 1641-72*. Translated by Arnold Pomerans. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1969.
- Green, Mary Anne Everett. *Lives of the Princesses of England: From the Norman Conquest*. 6 vols. London: Henry Colbourn, 1850-1855.
- Groeneweg, Irene. "Court and City: Dress in the Age of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia." In *Princely Display. The court of Fredrik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia von Solms*, edited by Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, 201-218. The Hague: Haags Historisch Museum and Zwolle: Waanders, 1997.
- Groenveld, Simon. "The House of Orange and the House of Stuart, 1639-1650: A Revision." *Historical Journal* 34, no. 4 (1991): 955-972.

- Guthrie, William P. *The Later Thirty Years War: From the Battle of Wittstock to the Treaty of Westphalia*. London: Greenwood, 2003.
- Hamilton, William Douglas, ed. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles I, 1640-1*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1882.
- Helmers, Helmer. "Public Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe." *Media History* 22 no. 3-4 (2016): 401-420.
- Hennings, Jan. *Russia and Courtly Europe: Ritual and the Culture of Diplomacy, 1648-1725*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Hennings, Jan. "Textual Ambassadors and Ambassadorial Texts: Literary Representation and Diplomatic Practice in George Turberville's and Thomas Randolph's Accounts of Russia (1568-9)." In *Cultures of Diplomacy and Letter Writing in the Early Modern World*, edited by Tracey Sowerby and Joanna Craigwood, 175-189. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Hibbard, Caroline. *Charles I and the Popish Plot*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1983.
- Hinds, Allen B, ed. *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, Volume 23, 1632-1636*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1921.
- Hinds, Allen B, ed. *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, Volume 24, 1636-1639*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1923.
- Hinds, Allen B, ed. *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, Volume 25, 1640-1642*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1924.
- Hughes, Ann and Julie Sanders. "Gender, Exile and The Hague Courts of Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia and Mary, Princess Orange in the 1650s." In *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Médicis to Wilhelm II*, edited by Philip Mansel and Torsten Riotte, 44-65. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Israel, Jonathan I. "The United Provinces of the Netherlands. The Courts of the House of Orange c.1580-1795." In *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture under the Ancien Régime 1500-1750*, edited by John Adamson, 119-140. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1999.
- *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 4, 1629-1642*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1771.
- Keay, Anna. "The Shadow of a King?: Aspects of the Exile of King Charles II." In *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Médicis to Wilhelm II*, edited by Philip Mansel and Torsten Riotte, 105-119. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Keblusek, Marika. "The Bohemian Court at The Hague." In *Princely Display. The court of Fredrik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia von Solms*, edited by Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, 201-217. The Hague: Haags Historisch Museum and Zwolle: Waanders, 1997.
- Leland, John. *Joannis Lelandi antiquarii de rebys britannicis collectanea*. Vol. 5. London: 1770.
- Levin, Michael J. "A New World Order: The Spanish Campaign for Precedence in Early Modern Europe." *Journal of Early Modern History* 6 no. 3 (2002): 233-264.
- Lisle, Leanda de. *White King: Traitor, Murderer, Martyr*. London: Chatto & Windus, 2018.
- Loomie, Albert Joseph, ed. *Ceremonies of Charles I: The Note Books of John Finet Master of Ceremonies, 1628-1641*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1987.
- Luttervelt, Remmet van. "Het portret van Willem en Maria Stuart in het Rijksmuseum." *Oud Holland – Journal for Art of the Low Countries* 68 no. 1 (1953): 159-169.



- MacHardy, Karin J. "Cultural Capital, Family Strategies and Noble Identity in Early Modern Habsburg Austria, 1579-1620." *Past & Present* 163 (1999): 36-75.
- May, Niels F. "Staged sovereignty or aristocratic values? Diplomatic ceremonial at the Westphalian peace negotiations (1643-1648)." In *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c.1410-1800*, edited by Tracey Sowerby and Jan Hennings, 80-94. London: Routledge, 2017.
- McKay, Derek. *The Great Elector*. Harlow: Longman, 2001.
- Mettam, Roger. *Power and Faction in Louis XIV's France*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- Miller, Jaroslav. "The Henrician Legend Revived: The Palatine Couple and its Public Image in Early Stuart England." *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire* 11 no. 3 (2004): 305-331.
- Mörke, Olaf. "The Orange Court as Centre of Political and Social Life during the Republic." In *Princely Display. The court of Fredrik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia von Solms*, edited by Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, 58-104. The Hague: Haags Historisch Museum and Zwolle: Waanders, 1997.
- Mout, Nicolette. "Der Winterkönig im Exil: Friedrich V. von der Pfalz und die niederländischen Generalstaaten 1621-1632." *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 15 no. 3 (1988): 257-272.
- Nicolas, Sir Nicholas Harris. *History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire*. Vol. 1. London: 1842.
- Oman, Carola. *Elizabeth of Bohemia*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- Osborne, Toby. "Chimeres, monopolies and stratagems: French Exiles in the Spanish Netherlands during the Thirty Years' War." *The Seventeenth Century* 15 no. 2 (2000): 149-174.
- Osborne, Toby. "A Queen Mother in Exile: Marie de Médicis in the Spanish Netherlands and England, 1631-41." In *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Médicis to Wilhelm II*, edited by Philip Mansel and Torsten Riotte, 17-43. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Osborne, Toby. "The Surrogate War between the Savoyes and the Medici: Sovereignty and Precedence in Early Modern Italy." *The International History Review* 29 no. 1 (2007): 1-21.
- Ottenheim, Koen. "Possessed by such a passion for building. Frederik Hendrik and architecture." In *Princely Display. The court of Fredrik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia von Solms*, edited by Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, 105-125. The Hague: Haags Historisch Museum and Zwolle: Waanders, 1997.
- Ploeg, Peter van der and Carola Vermeeren. "From the 'Sea Prince's' Monies: The Stadholder's Art Collection." In *Princely Patrons: The Collection of Frederick Henry of Orange and Amalia of Solms in The Hague*, edited by Peter van der Ploeg and Carola Vermeeren, 34-60. The Hague: Mauritshuis and Zwolle: Waanders, 1997.
- Prak, Maarten Roy. *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Golden Age*. Translated by Diane Webb. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Price, J.L. *Holland and the Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Politics of Particularism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- *Relation de ce qui s'est passé à la Haye au mois de Fevrier l'an 1638...au mariage de monsieur de Brederode et de Madamoyselle de Solms*. The Hague: 1638.
- Rohr, Alheidis von. "Die Pfalz-Kinder: Timon, Le Diable, Willfull Ned, Signora Antica, Mademoiselle sans Façon und die Successio Britannica." In *Der Winterkönig, Friedrich von der Pfalz: Bayern und Europa im Zeitalter des Dreißigjährigen Krieges*, edited by Peter Wolf et al., 208-219. Stuttgart: Theiss, 2003.

- Roosen, William. "Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial: A Systems Approach." *The Journal of Modern History* 52 no. 3 (1980): 452-476.
- Ross, Josephine. *The Winter Queen: The Story of Elizabeth Stuart*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979.
- Rowen, Herbert Harvey. *The Princes of Orange: The Stadholders in the Dutch Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *The Personal Rule of Charles I*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Stewart, Alan. "Francis Bacon's Bi-lateral Cipher and the Materiality of Early Modern Diplomatic Writing." In *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture*, edited by Robyn Adams and Rosanna Cox, 120-137. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Strachan, Michael. *Sir Thomas Roe, 1581-1644: A Life*. Salisbury: Michael Russell, 1989.
- Thomas, Andrew L. *A House Divided: Wittelsbach Confessional Court Cultures in the Holy Roman Empire, c.1550-1650*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Tiethoff-Spliethoff, Marieke. "Role-play and Representation. Portrait Painting at the Court of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia." In *Princely Display. The court of Fredrik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia von Solms*, edited by Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, 161-200. The Hague: Haags Historisch Museum and Zwolle: Waanders, 1997.
- Tucker, Rebecca. "Inside the Dutch Garden: Prince Frederick Hendrik and Honselaarsdijk." *Studies in the History of Gardens & Designed Landscapes* 26 no. 3 (2006): 209-236.
- Tucker, Rebecca. "The Patronage of Rembrandt's Passion Series: Art, Politics, and Princely Display at the Court of Orange in the Seventeenth Century." *The Seventeenth Century* 25 no. 1 (2010): 75-116.
- Wedgwood, Cicely Veronica. *The King's Peace, 1637-1641*. London: Collins, 1955.
- Welch, Ellen R. *A Theater of Diplomacy: International Relations and the Performing Arts in Early Modern France*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017.
- Wilson, Peter H. *Europe's Tragedy: A New History of the Thirty Years War*. London: Allen Lane, 2009.
- Wilson, Peter H. *The Holy Roman Empire: A Thousand Years of Europe's History*. London: Allen Lane, 2016.

\* I thank Peter H. Wilson, Grant Tapsell, and Martin Greig for their comments on an earlier draft of this article.

1. Hinds, *CSPV: 1640-42*, 147; Loomie, *Ceremonies*, 313. John Leland reported that the private supper was attended by the bride and groom, the king and queen, the bride's siblings Charles, James, and Elizabeth, and the Queen Mother. See Leland, *Joannis Lelandi antiquarii de rebys britannicis collectanea*, 348.
2. Oman, *Elizabeth*, 355; Wedgwood, *The King's Peace*, 386, 397-8; Ross, *The Winter Queen*, 121; Hibbard, *Popish Plot*, 176-7; Strachan, *Sir Thomas Roe*, 255; Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court," 56; Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 953 n.2 and her *Courtly Rivals*, 73; de Lisle, *White King*, 131.
3. Quotation from Welch, *Diplomacy*, 33.
4. Mettam, *Power and Faction*, 117.
5. Hennings, *Russia and courtly Europe*, 112.
6. Stewart, "Bi-lateral Cipher," 121; Osborne, "Surrogate War," 4; Roosen, "Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial," 452-76; Helmers, "Public Diplomacy," 401-20; May, "Staged sovereignty or aristocratic values?," 80-94.
7. Hennings, "Textual Ambassadors and Ambassadorial Texts," 189; Welch, *Diplomacy*, 33-4; Levin, "A New World Order," 235; Sowerby and Hennings, *Practices of Diplomacy*, 13; Osborne, "Surrogate War," 4.
8. Osborne, "Surrogate War," 4.
9. Birch, *Thurloe*, 250.
10. Keay, "The Shadow of a King?," 108; Stewart, "Bi-lateral Cipher," 121.
11. Birch and Williams, *Court and Times*, 206.
12. Wilson, *Holy Roman Empire*, 426; MacHardy, "Cultural Capital," 47-8.
13. Corp, *Jacobites*, 92; The National Archives, Kew [TNA]: SP 81/42 ff.322-3: Considerations presented by Queen of Bohemia on marriage offered by King of Poland to her daughter Elizabeth, [Undated, 1634] and SP 81/53 ff.16-18: Proposal for marriage between the Elector of Brandenburg and Princess Palatine Louise, 22 Jan. 1642; Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 521, 1021; von Rohr, "Die Pfalz-Kinder," 213.
14. Osborne, "Queen Mother," 21-2 and his "Chimeres," 157-8.
15. Hinds, *CSPV: 1632-36*, 191, 231.
16. Oman, *Elizabeth*, 248-9; Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court," 48.
17. Mout, "Der Winterkönig im Exil," 261; Thomas, *A House Divided*, 318; Israel, "Courts of the House of Orange," 122; Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court," 50.
18. Geevers, "The Nassau Orphans," 198; Price, *Holland*, 247-8.
19. Price, *Holland*, 248; Prak, *Dutch Republic*, 180.
20. Mörke, "Orange Court," 59.
21. Tiethoff-Spliethoff, "Role-Playing and Representation," 164.
22. Akkerman, *correspondence*, I, 730.
23. Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court," 50.
24. Ottenheim, "Frederik Hendrik and architecture," 105-6, 109-124; Israel, "Courts of the House of Orange," 126-30; Rowen, *Princes of Orange*, 60.
25. Tucker, "Dutch Garden," 211 and her "Art, Politics, and Princely Display," 94-7; Prak, *Dutch Republic*, 180; Israel, "Courts of the House of Orange," 125; Mörke, "Orange Court," 59.
26. van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "The Stadholder's Art Collection," 55.
27. Price, *Holland*, 253.
28. Israel, "Courts of the House of Orange," 128.

29. Ibid., Hamilton, *CSPD*: Charles I, 1640-1, 561.
30. TNA: SP 84/153 f.193: William Boswell in The Hague to Secretary Coke, 5/15 Feb. 1638; Israel, "Courts of the House of Orange," 128; Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court," 49-50 and Groeneweg, "Court and City," 201.
31. *Relation de ce qui s'est passé à la Haye au mois de Fevrier l'an 1638*, 1-3; Becker, "Groote costen en magnificien," 221; Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court," 50.
32. Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals*, 73.
33. Wilson, *Europe's Tragedy*, 594-5; Guthrie, *Later Thirty Years War*, 72-3.
34. Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 857-8; TNA: SP 81/48 f.147: Roe to Secretary of State, 1 Nov. 1639; Hinds, *CSPV*: 1636-39, 591.
35. A breakdown of the Palatine finances in this period can be found in a document presented to parliament in 1645: Bodleian Library, Oxford: MS Nalson 18 f.456: The humble remonstrance of James Harrington, concerning the affaires of His High:s the Prince Elector Palatine, 17 Feb. 1645.
36. Wilson, *Europe's Tragedy*, 625.
37. For other expressions of concern see: Baillie, *Letters, and journals*, 5; Hinds, *CSPV*: 1640-42, 103, 106-7.
38. TNA: SP 16/472 f.67v: Charles Louis to Sir Richard Cave, 30 Nov./10 Dec. 1640; Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 943.
39. Wedgwood, *The King's Peace*, 386, 397-8; Ross, *Winter Queen*, 121; Oman, *Elizabeth*, 355; Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 953 n.2; Strachan, *Sir Thomas Roe*, 255; Hibbard, *Popish Plot*, 176-7; Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court," 56; de Lisle, *White King*, 131.
40. Hinds, *CSPV*: 1640-42, 5, 36, 120; Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, 896; Hughes and Sanders, "Gender, Exile and The Hague Courts in the 1650s," 49.
41. TNA: SP 16/472 f.67.
42. Hinds, *CSPV*: 1640-42, 103; TNA: SP 16/472 f.68v.
43. Broomhall and van Gent, *Dynastic Colonialism*, 43.
44. TNA: SP 16/472 f.68v.
45. Ibid.; Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 943.
46. TNA: SP 16/472 f.68v.
47. *House of Lords*, 157.
48. Hamilton, *CSPD*: Charles I, 1640-1, 468.
49. TNA: SP 84/153 f.193: William Boswell in The Hague to Secretary Coke, 5/15 Feb 1638.
50. *Relation de ce qui s'est passé à la Haye au mois de Fevrier l'an 1638*, 7.
51. TNA: SP 16/472 f.68v.
52. Loomie, *Ceremonies*, 304. Charles I's Master of Ceremonies, Sir John Finet, recorded that Charles Louis was in London at the time that the Knights of the Order of the Garter celebrated the Feast of Saint George (although he did not attend despite being a member of the Order). This celebration was held between 1 and 3 March 1641. See Nicolas, *Knighthood*, 235.
53. Instructions to Richard Browne reproduced in Bray, *Evelyn*, II, 164-6.
54. Hinds, *CSPV*: 1640-42, 130.
55. Breslow, *Mirror*, 37-8; Miller, "The Henrician legend revived," 310; Cressy, *Dangerous Talk*, 163-5.
56. British Library, London: Stowe MS 133 ff.303-4v. The committee appointed to negotiate the marriage treaty were Bishop Juxon, the Marquis of Hamilton, the Earl of Arundel and Surrey, Philip Earl of Pembroke, Edward Earl of Dorset, Henry Earl of Holland, and Secretary Vane: Hamilton, *CSPD*: Charles I, 1640-1, 501.

57. British Library: Stowe MS ff.303-4v.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid., f.306.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid., f.306-306v.
62. Loomie, *Ceremonies*, 313; Hinds, *CSPV 1640-42*, 135, 147; Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 960.
63. Hinds, *CSPV: 1640-42*, 114.
64. Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 952, 958.
65. Ibid., 957.
66. In her annotations for Charles Louis's letters of 17 and 28 May 1641, Nadine Akkerman claims that the elector had wanted to marry Mary himself: Ibid, 952, 958.
67. Osborne, "Surrogate War," 4.
68. Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 958.
69. Ibid., 959.
70. Ibid., 964.
71. Loomie, *Ceremonies*, 188-9.
72. Israel, "Courts of the House of Orange," 128.
73. Green, *Lives*, VI, 113.
74. Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 964.
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid., 960. Sir Thomas Roe reported a conversation with Frederik Hendrik, in which the Prince of Orange told Roe of 'unkindness conceived on his part' against Charles Louis regarding the young elector's motives for travelling to England.
77. Groenveld, "Orange," 958-9; Geyl, *Orange and Stuart*, 8; Cust, *Charles I*, 125; Wilson, *Europe's Tragedy*, 594.
78. Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 964.
79. Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals*, 73.
80. Green, *Lives*, VI, 118-20; van Luttervelt, "Willem II en Maria Stuart," 159-69.
81. Alsteens and Eaker, *Van Dyck*, 208.
82. van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "The Stadholder's Art Collection," 47.
83. Akkerman, *correspondence*, II, 1021; von Rohr, 'Pfalz-Kinder', 213.
84. McKay, *The Great Elector*, 36.
85. Roosen, "Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial," 475; Geyl, *Orange and Stuart*, 323.