1603. THE WONDERFULL YEARE:
LITERARY RESPONSES TO THE ACCESSION OF JAMES I.

JESSICA LAZAR
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD UNIVERSITY
2016

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (DPhil) in English.

Word Count: 88 371

(not including BIBLIOGRAPHY)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND DEDICATION

This thesis is one of several dedicated to the extraordinary

RUDOLPH GREDITOR SLOBINS

who was better than us in almost every way.

It could not have been completed without the support of my supervisor Professor Tiffany Stern, of my parents Caroline Lazar and Michael Lazar, and of Tom Ford, Edwina Christie, Daisy Johnson, Rebecca Dudill, Georgina Peters, Elizabeth Poston – and Pidge: each one a light shining in the darkness.

Sincere thanks are also due to my examiners, Professor Helen Hackett and Dr Philip West, for a remarkably enjoyable viva; to the Arts & Humanities Research Council and the donors and committee of the Class of '58 Scholarship; to the staff and fellows of University College; to the Bodleian Library and British Library in particular, and to many, many others…

A NOTE ON THE TEXT

All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

All printed early modern texts are quoted from the original source where possible, although reference has been made to critical editions, where available. The use of i/j and u/v has been standardized.

CONTENTS

THESIS ABSTRACT **iv**

INTRODUCTION: ENGLANDS JOY? **1**

i.1 Theories of Propaganda and Communication, and Rhetoric **5**
i.2 Theories of Panegyric **10**
i.3 The Audience **23**
i.4 The Poets **35**
i.5 The Poetry: volume, dates, and precedent **39**
i.6 The Poems: four possible causes (including a brief survey of political and cultural conditions in March 1603) **45**
i.7 Survey of the Critical Field **62**
i.8 Thesis Structure **71**

PART 1 *HAILE KINGLY JAMES, FOES TERROR, ENGLANDS PRIDE*: PROMISE, PROPAGANDA, AND THE PRESENTATION OF JAMES I: **73**

1.1 '*Then did I fear this earth should drenched lie | With purple streames in civill tumults shed*': presentation of threat and the figure of King James **76**
1.2 '*Touching his Majesties title*' **118**
1.3 '*A Phoenix from her ashes*': Elizabethan imagery and the presentation of James **137**
1.4 '*Armed with the greeting tongues of men*': loyalty enacted **158**
1.5 Conclusion **182**

PART 2 '*NOW COMMETH IN OUR LONG-DETAINED SPRING*': PERSONAL AMBITION, CULTURAL REJUVENATION, AND THE PRESENTATION OF THE POET-KING: **186**

2.1 James Stuart, the 'Famous Kingly *Poet*', 1584-1603 **189**
2.2 '*None but thy selfe, Great King, can sing of thee*': poetry, and personal ambition in 1603-4 **220**
2.3 *'Whose Deeds with Words, Whose Words with Deeds Accord*': reading the King **239**
2.4 *'The Pedestall Whereon Thy Greatnesse Stands, | Is Built Of All Our Hearts, And All Our Hands'*: political rejuvenation **255**
2.5 Conclusion – and renewed Poetomachia, 1603-4 **268**

CONCLUSION OF THESIS **282**

BIBLIOGRAPHY **290**

ABSTRACT

1603. The Wonderfull Yeare: Literary Responses to the Accession of James I will argue that when James VI of Scotland was proclaimed James I of England on 24 March 1603, the printed verse pamphlets that greeted his accession presented him as a figure of hope and promise for the Englishmen now subject to his rule. However, they also demonstrate hitherto unrecognized concerns that James might also be a figure of threat to the very national strength, Protestant progress, and moral, cultural, and political renaissance for which he was being touted as harbinger and champion. The poems therefore transform an insecure and undetermined figure into a symbol that represents (and enables) promise and hope.

PART ONE explores how the poetry seeks to address the uncertainty and fragility, both social and political, that arose from popular fears about the accession; and to dissuade dissenters (and make secure and unassailable the throne, and thereby the state of England), through celebration of the new monarch. Perceived legal, political, and dynastic concerns were exacerbated by concrete difficulties when James was proclaimed King of England, and so he was more than fifty miles from the English border (only reaching London for the first time in early May); his absence was further prolonged by plague; this plague also deferred the immediate sanction of public festivities that should have accompanied his July coronation. An English Jacobean icon was configured in literature to accommodate and address these threats and hazards, neutralizing fears surrounding the idea of the accession with confidence in the idea of the king it brings. In the texts that respond to James's accession we observe his appropriation as a figure of hope and promise. PART 2 looks to more personal hopes and fears, albeit within the national context. It considers how the poets engage with the King's own established iconography and intentions, publicly available to view within his own writing – and especially poetry. The image that is already established there has the potential either to obstruct or to enable national and personal causes and ambitions (whether political, religious, or cultural). The poetry therefore develops strategies to negotiate with and so appropriate the King's own self-fashioning.

INTRODUCTION: ENGLAND'S JOY?

On 19 November 1602, John Chamberlain wrote from London to his friend Dudley Carleton, a diplomat then based in Paris. Alongside important news from the Elizabethan Court, Chamberlain describes ('in mirth') a notorious fraud surrounding a play called *England's Joy*:

> I must not forget to tell you of a cousening prancke of one Venn[a]r of Lincolns Inne, that gave out bills of a famous play [*Englands Joy*] on satterday was sevenight on the Banckeside [at The Swan Theatre], to be acted only by certain gentlemen and gentlewomen of account. The price at coming in was two shillings or eighteen pence at least and when he had gotten most part of the mony into his hands, he wold have shewed them a fair paire of heeles, but that he was not so nimble to get up on horsebacke [and so] he was faine to forsake that course and betake himself to the water, where he was pursued and taken and brought before the L[ord] Cheife Justice, who wold make nothing of it but a jest and merriment, and bounde him over in five pound to appeare at the sessions. In the meane time the common people, when they saw themselves deluded, revenged themselves upon the hangings, curtains, chaires, stooles, walles, and whatsoever came in theire way, very outrageously, and made great spoile.

According to Chamberlain, Richard Vennar's *Englands Joy* 'prancke' was 'famous', and the diarist John Manningham likewise records that this 'notable cunnicatching tricke […] gulled many'.[1] More than a decade later, Vennar would publish the complaint that he was still 'abusively called Englands joy'; he would also claim that he had intended to use the funds raised by the 'play' to return to the Scottish Court where, in 1601, he had enjoyed the benevolence of King James VI.[2]

---

[1] John Chamberlain, *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. N. E. McClure, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939), I.172; John Manningham, *The Diary of John Manningham of the Middle Temple*, ed. Robert Parker Sorlien (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1976), p. 123 (November 1602).

[2] Herbert Berry, 'Vennar , Richard (bap. 1564, d. 1615)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2009) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28190 [accessed 15 Jan 2015].

It seemed that a rapacious fraudster favoured by King James had successfully conned 'the common people' into accepting a false cause. The victims of *Englands Joy* suffered both financially and physically: according to Tiffany Stern's research, 'the price at coming in' quoted by Chamberlain (2s. or 18d.) was 'twice the normal entrance fee' for a Bankside performance; and their violent reaction 'when they saw themselves deluded' damaged The Swan Theatre and caused many injuries.[3] In this context, it is puzzling that one of the first literary responses to King James's English accession, just five months later on 24 March 1603, is entitled *Sorrowes Joy. Or, A lamentation for our late deceased soveraigne Elizabeth, with a triumph for the prosperous succession of our gratious King, James, &c.*[4] It is even more puzzling that, in 'A Salutatorie Poeme' that summer, John Savile writes:

> I cannot deeme it now gulling toye,
> Which Vennard [sic] [(]inspir'd) intituled *Englands Joye*.
> I rather gesse hee did our good divine
> Not daring to disclos't before full time,
> Be bold, goe on, nowe's thy praesaging plaine,
> King James is *Englands joy*, long hop'd for gaine,
> That it is hee, who cannot easely prove?
> Sith it is onely hee, wee onely love.[5]

Savile subverts the notorious fraud into praise for James, playing off Vennar's supposed acquaintance with the King for the sake of wit.[6] However, in both

[3] Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 71-2.

[4] Var., *Sorrowes Joy. Or, A lamentation for our late deceased soveraigne Elizabeth, with a triumph for the prosperous succession of our gratious King, James, &c.* ([London]: John Legat, Printer to the University of Cambridge, 1603), t. p. .

[5] John Savile, *King James his entertainment at Theobalds with his welcome to London, together with a salutatorie poeme* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1603), C2rv.

instances, associating a new monarch with a 'gulling toye' which caused notable distress is a remarkable choice for Savile and the men behind *Sorrowes Joy* to make; it could be read as suggesting that the English had once again been defrauded into accepting a false cause, and one which might bring them sorrow. In any case, the association encourages a reader to look beyond the simplest features of encomium in the contemporary literary responses to the accession of King James I and, in particular, in the utterly unprecedented flood of poetry that was published, widely read, and remarkably influential, between Queen Elizabeth's death on 24 March 1603 and mid-May 1604.

1603. The Wonderfull Yeare: Literary Responses to the Accession of James I examines how the threats and hopes arising from the English accession of King James were dealt with in English poetry published in 1603-4. It argues that, when James VI of Scotland was proclaimed James I of England on 24 March that year, the verse pamphlets that greeted his accession (predictably) sought to present the new King as a figure of hope and promise for the English people now subject to his rule. However, they also demonstrate hitherto unrecognized concerns that he might equally prove to be a figure of threat to the very national strength, Protestant progress, and moral and cultural renewal for which he was simultaneously being lauded as harbinger and champion. In the precarious

[6] In the context, it might be helpful to know who John Savile was. His pamphlet is dedicated to George Savile, but as the poet refers to him as 'patron' it seems unlikely that this John Savile is either the Yorkshire landowner, lawyer, MP, and member of the Northern Council (John Savile, 1546-1607) or the politician (John Savile, 1556-1630), who were both George Savile's cousins. See Joan Kirby, 'Savile family (*per. c.*1480–1644)', *ODNB*, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/71873 [accessed 26 Oct 2014].

moment of succession, many of the poems seek to transform an insecure and undetermined figure into a symbol that represents (and so enables) promise and hope. The thesis is inspired principally by Helen Hackett's study of the representation of King James's predecessor Queen Elizabeth I (*Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary*) and Kevin Sharpe's authoritative multi-volume examination of the imagery of England's rulers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (*Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth Century England* and *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealth in England*). Literary representation of King James in the first year of his reign echoes the persuasive necessity of the early Elizabethan 'icon', to use Roy Strong's word, as well as later strategies in her iconography, but neither of these aspects have yet been examined with the rigour of Hackett's study. Kevin Sharpe's concept of the fixing of meaning, and emphasis on the 'artifice and fragility' of symbolic systems, particularly in the context of their reception, is also highly relevant to the poetry's persuasive drive.

The GENERAL INTRODUCTION begins by outlining further aspects of the methodological approach of thesis, explaining the use and relevance of theories of propaganda, rhetoric, and panegyric. Turning specifically to the accession poems, it then offers an survey of their audience and writers (including a discussion of the competing influences of patronage culture and commercial print culture), their volume and date range, a review of their precedents, and a brief consideration of English political and cultural conditions in the final years of Elizabeth's reign. The thesis is then sited within the wider critical landscape. Finally, if gives a summary of the structure of *1603. The Wonderfull Yeare: Literary Responses to the Accession*

of James I. In aiming not to repeat substantial material used elsewhere in the thesis, this INTRODUCTION intentionally provides a concise overview of certain points; these moments will, however, be noted where relevant.

1: RELEVANT THEORIES OF PROPAGANDA AND COMMUNICATION, AND RHETORIC.

The unidentified complexity in Jacobean accession poetry is accentuated when the texts are looked at, for the first time, through the lens of Propaganda and Communication Theory. The poems are texts of persuasion, a form of what the propagandist Edward Bernays would later define as *popular beneficial propaganda* using the *manufacture of consent* (a term coined by Walter Lippmann in *Public Opinion*, a seminal text in the field).[7] *Beneficial propaganda* (also know as *integration propaganda*) aims at intelligent manipulation; that is, 'accustoming the public to change and progress' on a national level, regardless of whether it emanates from or is sanctioned by the State. At the same time, *beneficial propaganda* often also acts as 'propaganda for its authors' services'.[8] In this context, the poems work to ensure that their readers (whether in England or abroad) accept the validity of a Jacobean inheritance, while also promoting the intellectual and artistic skills of the poet to any reader who might be tempted either to employ them directly, or to purchase further published work.

The word 'propaganda' is itself anachronistic. It dates to 1622 and the

[7] Edward Bernays, *Propaganda* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1928), p. 9, p. 66; Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York and London: Free Press Paperbacks, 1997), passim. See also Harold Lasswell, *Democracy Through Public Opinion* (Menasha, WI: George Banta, 1941), and Noam Chomsky and Edward S. Herman, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Bodley Head, 2008).

[8] Mark Crispin Miller, 'Introduction', in Bernays, *Propaganda*, p. 28.

creation of the Roman Catholic *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*, or Office for the Propagation of the Faith (responsible for coordinating overseas evangelism) within the Vatican Curia under Pope Gregory XV.[9] However, Propaganda and Communication Theory examines all forms of written (and artistic) persuasion; also, the techniques of persuasion used in what is now termed 'propaganda' are present and clear in many of the accession poems of 1603-4. In particular, they make extensive use of rhetorical devices designed to further a persuasive agenda and (together and severally) the three forms of persuasion (*πιθανόν*, lit. '[that which is] persuasive') defined by Aristotle: argument by reasoning (*logos, λόγος*), by character (*ethos*, *ἦθος*), and by emotion or experience (*pathos*, *πάθος*).[10]

Such persuasive modes and devices were familiar in 1603-4, recorded and codified in numerous texts on rhetoric. Recognized Classical examples included translations of Plato, Aristotle, Quintilian, Cicero, St. Augustine of Hippo, Boethius; Renaissance examples included work by Desiderius Erasmus, Thomas Wilson, Henry Peacham, and George Puttenham.[11] Rhetoric was not a specialist area of academic interest. From the fifteenth century onwards, under the influence of humanism, the works of Cicero, Quintilian, and Aristotle were being used '[a]s

[9] Miller, 'Introduction', *Propaganda*, p. 9.

[10] Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, trans. J. H. Freese, Loeb Classical Library 193 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926), passim; see also Garth S. Jowett and Victoria J. O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion*, 6th Edition (London: Sage Publications, 2014), pp. 46-7.

[11] A more detailed account of the sources, use and influence of rhetoric at the time can be found in Paul Oskar Kristeller, 'Rhetoric in Medieval and Renaissance Culture', *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1983), pp. 1-17.

standard textbooks' and were 'very widely studied'.[12] Indeed, along with the Erasmian texts they formed a core part of grammar school and university education, as rhetoric was one of the *studia humanitatis* taken from the Medieval *Trivium*.[13] Arthur F. Kinney describes the late Tudor period as its 'own high age of rhetoric', during which 'they drew more and more on what we should call imaginative or creative techniques to attract their listeners and persuade their audiences.'[14]

Nor was rhetoric solely used in oratory (although this is often the focus of the tracts); in practice, as Richard Rainolde's 1563 *Foundacion of Rhetorike* explains, 'both Poetes and Oratours do applie [it] to their use.'[15] Rhetoric is widely applicable, being simply

> [t]he art of using language effectively so as to persuade or influence others, *esp.* the exploitation of figures of speech and other compositional techniques to this end.[16]

In the Renaissance context, according to Paul Oskar Kristeller (one of the most

[12] Kristeller, 'Rhetoric', *Renaissance Eloquence*, p. 3. The particular works were: Cicero's *De Inventione, De Oratore*, and *Orator*; Aristotle's *Art of Rhetoric*; and Quintilian's twelve-volume *Institutio Oratoria*.

[13] Donald Lemen Clark, *John Milton at St. Paul's School: A Study of Ancient Rhetoric in Renaissance Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948); T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakespeare's 'Small Latine & Lesse Greeke'* (Urbana, IL.: 1944, 1956); Heinrich F. Platt, *Rhetoric and Renaissance Culture* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), pp. 6-7.

[14] Arthur F. Kinney, 'Rhetoric and Fiction in Elizabethan England', *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric* ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1983), p. 387.

[15] Richard Rainolde, *A Booke called the Foundacion of Rhetorike* (London: Jhon Kingston [sic], 1563), 3r.

[16] 'rhetoric, n.1', *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010; online edn. 2015), www.oed.com/view/Entry/165178 [accessed 04 September 2015], 1(a).

influential modern specialists in rhetoric) it could be 'defined or understood' broadly, depending on context, 'as the art of persuasion, of the probable argument, of prose style and composition, or of literary criticism'. Most pertinently, Kristeller clearly demonstrates that, in the Renaissance at least, there was

> a close parallelism between rhetorical and poetical theory, and a good deal of mutual influence between the two areas.[17]

Kinney goes further, identifying in Tudor writing the 'indiscriminate practice of what we today would distinguish as rhetoric and poetic'; the two theories are combined 'in what they felt a condign use of language to approximate truth and to persuade men to believe the credible to be probable'. Indeed, Kinney points out, this method was expressly taught in particular grammar school exercises.[18]

Rhetoric, then, was well known as the 'arte' of 'perswasion' (in Rainolde's words), by which (as Thomas Wilson explains) one 'maie reasonably sette furth a matter, and make it appeare probable.'[19] However, while the terminology of Classical and Renaissance rhetorical theory can (and will) describe the specific forms and devices used within the poems, and demonstrate that they definitely employ recognized persuasive tactics, the critical interpretive framework offered by twentieth- and twenty-first-century Propaganda and Communication Theory complements this to bring the poets' strategies of persuasion into even sharper focus. (This is an approach which finds support in the methodology of Kevin Sharpe, who has concluded that the benefit of an understanding of propaganda to

[17] Kristeller, 'Rhetoric', *Renaissance Eloquence*, pp. 1, 16.

[18] Kinney, 'Rhetoric and Fiction in Elizabethan England', *Renaissance Eloquence*, p. 388.

[19] Thomas Wilson, *The Arte of Rhetorique* (London: Richard Grafton, 1553), 3v.

the comprehension of sixteenth and seventeenth century image control vastly outweighs 'the risk of anachronism'.[20]) Specifically, analysis can be explicit as it is not impeded by the moral and ethical concerns that shadowed the Renaissance interpretation and practice of rhetoric. As Plato's critical dialogue *Gorgias* shows, use of rhetoric had been viewed with suspicion since the time of the Greek Sophists in the early fourth century BC, but these qualms gained force under Christianity. Rhetoric, it could be argued, was opposed to truth since 'by its very nature [it] tend[ed] to mislead' on account of its 'manipulation of audiences, its goal of persuasion'.[21]

> Victoria J. O'Donnell and June Kable however define 'persuasion' as
>
> > a complex, continuing, interactive process in which a sender and a receiver are linked by symbols, verbal and nonverbal, through which the persuader attempts to influence the persuadee to adopt a change in a given attitude or behaviour because the persuadee has had perceptions enlarged or changed.[22]

Propaganda and Communication Theory recognizes that we 'relate […] or contrast' any message 'with [our] existing repertoire of information, experiences, or both'. Consequently, anything that 'is already accepted by the persuadee' – termed an *anchor* – can be used to 'relate [a] change to something in which the persuadee already believes.' Such use of 'language and images' to affect a recipient's

[20] Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), p. 18-20, 35.

[21] James A. Herrick, 'Rhetoric in Christian Europe', *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: An Introduction*, 5th Edition (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), pp. 4, 36, 51-54. See also Kinney, 'Rhetoric and Fiction in Elizabethan England', *Renaissance Eloquence*, p. 387.

[22] Victoria O'Donnell and June Kable, *Persuasion: an Interactive-Dependency Approach* (New York: Random House, 1982), p. 9.

'perceptual field' ('formed by the influences of values, roles, group norms, and self-image') is called *shaping perception*.[23] In the context of Jacobean accession verse, we find (for example) the application of established English, Tudor, and distinctly Elizabethan symbols, myths, and traits to the Scottish, Stuart King, or (otherwise) making longed-for national reformation and Protestant progress dependent upon James to ensure, in the precarious moment of succession, that his claim will be generally accepted and celebrated – but also that he will choose to become the King his new people desire. The frequency and precision of the persuasive modes and devices in the accession poetry thus reveal a field of debate that takes the poems into the most complex aspects of *panegyric* as it is understood by modern critics, and warrants investigation.

2: THEORIES OF PANEGYRIC.

From a modern critical standpoint, such poetry is unmistakably associated with verse panegyric, defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as 'a public speech or published text in praise of a person or thing; a laudatory discourse; a eulogy, an encomium'.[24] In their strategic fashioning of King James I as a symbol of English national strength, Protestant progress, and moral and cultural renewal, the poems offer not only panegyrical praise, but also the genre's more complex features of guidance, caution, admonition, and even criticism, for both the subject and his subjects. Yet the term *panegyric* must be used with almost as much caution in this

[23] Jowett and O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion*, pp. 8-15, 31-2, 39.

[24] 'panegyric, n. and adj.', *OED Online* (online edn. 2015), www.oed.com/view/Entry/136787 [accessed 6 April 2015], 2. On the spectrum of encomia, see James D. Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), p. 3-4.

context as the term *propaganda*. In 1603-4, the term is associated with only two pieces of accession poetry, both of which were so named for explicit and distinct reasons not applicable to most of the other verse: Samuel Daniel's *Panegyrike Congratulatorie to the Kings Majestie* in April 1603, and Ben Jonson's 'Brief Panegyre', exactly a year later, in April 1604. It would be erroneous to suggest that the accession poems follow an established culture of English panegyric poetry, but it would be equally erroneous to ignore the fact that they represent a key moment of scarcely-recognized change in its development.

Panegyric is part of the spectrum of *encomia* (sing. *encomium*), a whole category of oratory constituting 'formal or high-flown expression of praise' or, as George Puttenham defines them, 'carols of honour' and 'ballades of praise' praising 'great Princes and heroicke personages'.[25] However, it is generally recognized that '[p]anegyric cannot be dismissed as the empty and formulaic adulation of the time-serving and self-interested.' In fact (Mary Whitby continues) it is often

> produced by the most intelligent and well-read men of their day who us[e] the formulas of long-established tradition to construct a meaningful and individual message for the moment.[26]

These elaborate public compliments given 'to honour the persons of great Princes or to solemnise the pompes of any installment' (Puttenham again) originated in the Classical world (initially as *πανηγυρικός*, *panegyrikos*, Greek festival orations with just one section of praise for the ruler), with notable examples by Isocrates,

[25] 'encomium, n.' *OED Online* (online edn. 2015), www.oed.com/view/Entry/61763 [accessed 6 April 2015]; George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589), I.XX.35.

[26] Mary Whitby, *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1998), pp.12-13.

Pliny the Younger, and Claudian.[27] The genre was derived from two of the three branches of oratory outlined by Aristotle and taught in the study of rhetoric: *demonstrative* (*ἐπιδεικτικός* or *epideictic*: ceremonial oratory of praise or blame) and *deliberative* (*συμβουλευτικός* or advisory).[28] Like rhetoric, panegyric was sometimes criticized in the Ancient World (Pliny himself notes that it is 'tam invisa quam falsa'[29]), but from the beginning of the Christian Middle Ages it suffered from a generally poor reputation. St. Isidore of Seville summarized:

> Panegyricum est licentiosum et lasciviosum genus dicendi in laudibus regum, in cuius compositione homines multis mendaciis adadulantur.[30]

That is, as Thomas Thomas would translate in his 1587 *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae*:

> *Panegyricum* [is] a licentious and lascivious kinde of speaking or oration in the praise and commendation of Kings, wherein men do joyne many lyes with flatterie.[31]

[27] Puttenham, *Arte of English Poesie*, I.XXIII.37; Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, p. 43-4. On the potentially misleading differences between *πανηγυρικός* (*panegyrikos*) and *panegyricus* or *panegyricum*, see Garrison, ibid., pp. 7-8.

[28] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, p. 60; Kristeller, 'Rhetoric', *Renaissance Eloquence*, 1983), p.11; Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, I.1358b, pp. 32-3.

[29] 'hated for its insincerity' or (literally) 'as hated as [it is] false'; Pliny the Younger, *Letters: Volume I: Books 1-7*, trans. Betty Radice, Loeb Classical Library 55 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), Book III Letter XVIII (To Vibius Severus), pp. 226-7; see also Book VI, Letter XXVII (To Vettenius Severus), pp. 458-9.

[30] St Isidore of Seville, *Libri Etymologiarum*, VI.8.7, quoted in David Rundle, '"Not so much praise as precept": Erasmus, panegyric, and the Renaissance art of teaching princes', *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning*, ed. Yun Lee Too and Niall Livingstone (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p.153.

[31] Thomas Thomas, *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae* (Cambridge: Thomas Thomas, 1587), 'panegyricum' (n. p.).

Ironically, *encomia* as a whole was 'consistent[ly]' seen as 'neutral in connotation', as comparative research by James Garrison clearly demonstrates.[32]

During the Renaissance however panegyric began to be rehabilitated (albeit slowly and erratically, as Thomas's 1587 definition shows). At the start of the fifteenth century, Coluccio Salutati, chancellor of Florence and one of the fathers of humanism, defended the genre as something more recognizable to a modern critical reader:

> If praise has been devised untruthfully, as is the case whenever it is dressed up in panegyrics, it warns its subject that he has not been praised as much as told what he should do; it spurs on those who are praised into trying to become like the people they see themselves being praised as, even in error.[33]

His attitude gained force following the rediscovery of the *Panegyrici Veteres,* or *Panegyrici Latini*, by Giovanni Aurispa in 1433. This late third-to-fourth-century AD codex contained Pliny's *Actio Gratiarum* (or *Gratiarum Actio*), a panegyric to the Emperor Trajan which circulated widely and transformed the Renaissance understanding of panegyric's purpose. Contrary to the assumptions of the Isidorean tradition, Pliny urges honesty and moderation in praise of the subject:

> Nowhere should we flatter him as a divinity and a god; we are talking of a fellow-citizen, not a tyrant; […] remember that there can be no merit if greater deference is paid to rulers who delight in the servitude of their subjects than to those who value their liberty.[34]

---

[32] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, p. 4-5.

[33] Coluccio Salutati, *De Laboribus Herculis*, ed. B. L. Ullman (Zurich: Thesaurus Mundi, 1951), p.68, quoted in Rundle, 'Erasmus, panegyric, and the Renaissance art of teaching princes', *Pedagogy and Power*, p.154.

[34] Pliny the Younger, *Letters: Volume II: Books 8-10, Panegyricus*, trans. Betty Radice, Loeb Classical Library 59 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), pp.324-29 (Chapters 2-3). Pliny's Latin reads:

(cont.)

Furthermore, such a modest approach was expounded upon in Pliny's letters which (practically unknown during the Middle Ages) were rediscovered by Guarino Guarini and became famous at about the same time as the *Actio Gratiarum*.[35] In a letter to Vettenius Severus, Pliny admitted that he had been wary of 'the many tributes paid to the worst of [Trajan's] predecessors' when writing his panegyric; in another letter, the statesman explained that he hoped

> to encourage our Emperor in his virtues by a sincere tribute, and, secondly, to show his successors what path to follow to win the same renown, not by offering instruction but by setting his example before them. To proffer advice on an Emperor's duties might be a noble enterprise, but it would be a heavy responsibility verging on insolence, whereas to praise an excellent ruler and thereby shine a beacon on the path posterity should follow would be equally effective without appearing presumptuous.[36]

Pliny's declarations, taken alongside the overtly didactic panegyrics of Isocrates and Claudian (which also received recognition in Europe from the late fifteenth century), inspired Renaissance readers to associate panegyric with *speculum principis* (or, mirror for princes) literature. Based on Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* or

---

> Nusquam ut deo, nusquam ut numina blandiamur: non enim de tyranno sed de cive […] loquimur; […] cogitemus, quam sit indignum, si maius principibus praestemus obsequium, qui servitude civium quam qui libertate laetantur.

[35] E. B. Fryde, *Humanism and Renaissance Historiography* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), p. 56; Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, Salvatore Settis (eds.), *The Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2010), p. 521.

[36] Pliny, *Letters I*, Book VI Letter XXVII, p. 460 ('Recordabar etiam plurimos honores pessimo cuique delatos'), and Book III Letter XVIII (To Vibius Severus), pp. 224-25:

> ut imperatori nostro virtutes suae veris laudibus commendarentur, deinde ut futuri principes non quasi a magistro sed tamen sub exemplo praemonerentur, qua potissimum via possent ad eandem gloriam niti. Nam praecipere quails esse debeat princeps, pulchrum quidem sed onerosum ac prope superbum est; laudare vero optimum principem ac per hoc posteris velut e specula lumen quod sequantur ostendere, idem utilitatis habet adrogantiae nihil.

The Education of Cyrus (which, David Rundle points out, was extensively referenced by the editor in the first complete printed edition of Pliny) these advisory texts sought to instruct leaders using good and bad examples of rule and behaviour.[37] They had been unfalteringly popular, and were very numerous. Humanists consequently began to recognize that, as James D. Garrison explains, '[p]anegyric, unlike encomium, touches a political nerve.'[38]

It was Desiderus Erasmus in particular however who guided and defined the complex emerging Renaissance understanding of panegyric.[39] Indeed, David Rundle argues that 'what Erasmus is doing' in his 1504 *Panegyric* to Archduke Philip of Austria (published in 1516 with his own *speculum principis* for Philip's son, *The Education of a Christian Prince*) 'is nothing less than redefining the panegyric' entirely.[40] Erasmus explains:

> there is no such efficacious mode of making a prince better, as that of setting before him, under the guise of praise, the example of a good sovereign, provided you so attribute virtues and deny vices, as to persuade him to the former and deter him from the latter.[41]

Learning from Salutati, Pliny, and Isocrates, a 'guise of praise' is Erasmus's extraordinary way of avoiding what Pliny had called 'insolence' and 'presumpt[ion]'. Unlike Pliny's 'advice', however, its 'effect' can be immediate

[37] Rundle, 'Erasmus, panegyric, and the Renaissance art of teaching princes', *Pedagogy and Power*, p.150; Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, pp. 9, 26.

[38] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, p. 59.

[39] Pliny's *Letters* for example provide many of the key models in Erasmus's *De Conscribendis Epistolis*.

[40] Rundle, 'Erasmus, panegyric, and the Renaissance art of teaching princes', *Pedagogy and Power*, p. 163.

[41] Erasmus, 'Epistle 176', *The Epistles of Erasmus,* trans. Francis Morgan Nichols, 3 vols. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963), I.364.

rather than aiming merely to 'shine a beacon on the path posterity should follow […] by setting [an] example before them'. (Erasmus himself, however, presents Pliny's advice as diplomatic and even disingenuous, interpreting *Actio Gratiarum* as a precursor of his own ideas.) As Erasmus sees it, Rundle writes, '[t]he panegyric is pedagogy's means of overcoming censorship', and indeed,

> what makes [Erasmus's panegyric] particularly remarkable is the insertion of a critical element. Erasmus, as it were, does not just teach his royal pupil, he also berates him.[42]

Garrison agrees that, following Erasmus's lead, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century panegyrics became texts of firm education. He gives as an example the description of 'Greek and Latyn *panegyricae*' given by a Recorder of Warwick, in public and in the presence of Elizabeth I, which demonstrates this interface between the Classical and developing Renaissance understanding of the genre. The Recorder stated that 'theis' had aimed to 'put in mynde' both good and bad princes 'of their office and government'; the Queen perceptively and cordially replied, 'I thank you for putting me in mynd of my duety'.

Garrison further argues that the didactic elements of panegyric tend to be expressed in 'twin themes' of 'restoration and limitation':

> The demonstrative theme of restoration creates a vision of an ideal world, a golden age, whereas the deliberative theme of limitation concerns the actual world of political realities. […] The panegyricist's problem is to bridge the gap between these two worlds without acknowledging that such a gap exists.[43]

---

[42] Rundle, 'Erasmus, panegyric, and the Renaissance art of teaching princes', *Pedagogy and Power*, pp. 159, 163.

[43] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, pp. 20, 129, quoting John Nichols, *The Progresses, Public Processions, &c. of Queen Elizabeth* 3 vols. (London: John Nichols, 1823), I.311, 315-16.

While the subject might be celebrated as bringing 'restoration', his ideal actions prudently 'limit' the extent of his power to maintain this 'golden age' in the shadow of a history of tyranny. Garrison adds moreover that, in this context, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century panegyrics begin to be 'addressed not only to the monarch, but also to his subjects', in imitation of the 'admonitions to the people as well as instructions to the prince' found in the five panegyrics of Claudian, especially those to the Emperor Honorius.[44] As Catherine Ware summarizes, 'If the people expected certain virtues from their emperor, by the very performance of the panegyric they in turn promised him their loyalty as good Romans'; and Claudian told them 'exactly what is expected from a Roman.'[45] Hence, Garrison explains, two schemes emerge – 'propaganda and instruction' – directed at 'two audiences' (although crucially not one for each). One form of 'propaganda' is largely for 'the people':

> [b]y celebrating the current monarch in relation to a historical pattern that is made to seem inevitable or providential, the orator solicits the obedience of the people.

In doing so, it also offers them 'instruction' in how to behave to their king. 'Instruction', in the form of both 'propaganda' and 'limitation', is 'directed toward the king'. At the same time, 'propaganda' does to some extent constitute 'instruction' for the people.[46]

---

[44] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, p. 24. See also Alan Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).

[45] Catherine Ware, *Claudian and the Roman Epic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 26, 28.

[46] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, p. 59.

The Plinian and Erasmian features of panegyric can be applied to most of the accession poetry of 1603-4, given their use of recognisable strategies to ensure King James represents, rather than threatens, hope and promise for national strength, Protestant progress, moral and cultural renewal. They are, in that clear sense, panegyrics to King James. However, there are two key reasons why it remains necessary to be cautious with the use of the term. Firstly, Garrison makes plains that

> [a]lthough Renaissance commentators from Erasmus to Dryden provide a convincing defence of panegyric, they do not prescribe any 'laws' governing the genre.[47]

This means that, while panegyrical features in the accession poetry are recognizable, they cannot be discussed as a conscious grouping adhering to an established generic structure and principle. Secondly, and in a development of the first caveat, it is unlikely that the poets themselves, with the exception of Daniel and Jonson, recognised their work as panegyric but rather as encomia more generally. For one reason, much of the poetry follows a specifically *demonstrative* (rather than *deliberative*) rhetorical structure as defined by Cicero and Quintilian: external circumstances (including ancestry, upbringing and education, titles, and sources of power); physical attributes (including strength, health, and children); and character (including wisdom, fortitude, temperance, and justice) – or 'fortune', 'body', and 'character' as Wilson terms them. This is, for Wilson, the structure for the praise of a 'noble personage', not nominally panegyric, as Garrison explains:

[47] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, p. 38.

> Wilson does not use the term, nor does he offer any details that would suggest interest in or knowledge of this particular type of speech.[48]

Another reason was that, when panegyric was recognized, it was rarely in poetic form. Examples of verse panegyrics (exclusively in Latin) were known to some extent in early seventeenth-century England, although prose examples were overwhelmingly more common. Only a handful of prominent examples can be found in English publications extant at the time: the panegyric poems of Claudian (who had first 'replac[ed] the expected prose with verse'), Thomas More's *Carmen Gratulatorium* (which celebrated the coronation of Henry VIII in 1509), and Erasmus's 'Gratulatorium Carmen' (published alongside *Panegyricus* as, he claimed, they were 'of the same texture').[49] Only Claudian's panegyrics are explicitly named as such. Finally, in Garrison's detailed history of panegyric, a survey of definitions clearly shows that the English understanding of the term before and at the accession of James I always denoted a speech, whether in verse or prose. He explicitly concludes, '"Panegyric" for early Stuart poets means an address to a monarch on some public, ceremonial occasion' with 'oratorical significance'.[50] It is, after all, 'a kinde of speaking or oration' for Thomas in 1587; a 'publick Oracion' for

---

[48] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, p. 41-2; Wilson, *Arte of Rhetorique*, 6r.

[49] Ware, *Claudian*, p. 19; Erasmus, 'Epistle 177', *The Epistles of Erasmus*, I.366; Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, p. 59; Rundle, 'Erasmus, panegyric, and the Renaissance art of teaching princes', *Pedagogy and Power*, p. 150; E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton and Oxford, 2013), pp. 154-66; Whitby, *The Propaganda of Power*, p. 3. See Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, pp. 22-23, 69, and 91 on the evidence for sixteenth-century reception of Claudian's panegyrics, including by James VI himself.

[50] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, pp. 13, 15.

the Recorder of Warwick in 1572; and the Classical and Renaissance examples given so far were all initially delivered as such.

In the sense it was understood at the time of James I's accession, therefore, an example of panegyric to the King would be Richard Martin's *Speach* (given by Martin as Recorder of London on the new King's arrival at Stamford Hill on 7 May), which continues a tradition of the English panegyrics that had greeted all the Tudor monarchs on their progresses, royal entries, and coronations.[51] Daniel's *Panegyricke Congratulatorie* is, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (and Garrison's further research), the first example of 'panegyric' as a noun and the first application of the term in any language to an English poem.[52] (Indeed, '[i]t was not until the 1590s that the English vocabulary contained an equivalent of [even] *oratio panegyrica*', in the Cambridge scholar Gabriel Harvey's description of 'a Panegyricall Oration'.[53]) However, the difference between Martin's conventional *Speach* and Daniel's innovative *Panegyricke* is not as marked as might be assumed. The poem was 'delivered to the King' (exactly the same words used by Martin) not only as a presentation manuscript but as a speech at the house of Lord and Lady Harington of Exton in Burley, Rutland on 23 April 1603.

---

[51] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, pp. 10-11; Pauline Croft, *King James* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p.50. The panegyric was printed as Richard Martin, *A Speech Delivered, To the Kings Most Excellent Majestie in the Name of the Sheriffes of London and Middlesex* (London: Thomas Thorpe, 1603).

[52] 'panegyric', *OED Online*; Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, pp.12-13.

[53] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, pp. 83, 11; Gabriel Harvey, *Pierce's supererogation*, in *The Works of Gabriel Harvey*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart, 3 vols. (London: privately printed, 1884), II.326.

By contrast, there is no conclusive evidence that Jonson's 'Brief Panegyre' was delivered to the King (although the ambiguous wording in Jonson's 1604 printed edition and 1616 Folio suggests that Jonson hoped to obfuscate that point). Percy Simpson speculates that he may have provided a royal presentation copy, now lost (as he did with many later masques and entertainments), arguing that the title page may be found in an enigmatically-worded scribal leaf bound (ca. 1604) with, but separate from, the presentation copy of Jonson's *Masque of Blackness* in British Library Royal MS 17 B.XXXI. Martin Butler, however, identifies 'significant difficulties with this suggestion', most powerfully that '[t]he heading does not correspond to the poem', a particularly unlikely situation given the exceptional authorial care apparent in the printing of 'Panegyre'. (The text of 'Panegyre' is the only sheet lacking the three hundred identifiable variants marring the rest of the volume in which it appears – although it could equally be argued that 'Panegyre' was therefore printed from a perfect manuscript, adding weight to Simpson's speculation.)[54]

'Panegyre' may therefore be seen as an innovation in the genre of English panegyric, as the first example not delivered directly to its subject in spoken or physical form. However, the 'Panegyre' still possesses 'oratorical significance'. It was published as part of *B. Jon: His Part of King James His Royall and Magnificent*

[54] C. H. Herford, Percy Simpson and Evelyn Simpson, *Ben Jonson* 11 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012), VII.69; Martin Butler, 'The King's Entertainment, A Panegyre, and The Entertainment at Althorp: Textual Essay', *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson: Online*, ed. Martin Butler et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2015), http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson [accessed 05 August 2015].

Entertainement through His Honorable Cittie of London, as the celebration of 'the happie entrance of James *our Soveraigne to his first high* Session of parliament in this his Kingdom the 19. of March. 1603'. Jonson's is thus emulating the Classical panegyrics of Pliny and Claudian, presented to their Emperors at the start of a new session of the Senate following the Consular elections. That 'His Panegyre' may not have been presented to the King himself may therefore be a less momentous change to Jonson than it seems to modern readers. Arguably, the 'Panegyre' is part of Jonson's personal campaign to impose neo-Roman cultural practices and iconography upon England, and (with this) receive recognition as a poet laureate. That is, this is the 'Panegyre' that should have been delivered at James's first parliament; hence the obscure wording of the title that can been observed in the printed editions.[55] Indeed, such a strategy is also seen in the prose panegyric *England and Scotlands Happinesse*, subtitled 'A Panegyrique of Congratulation for the concord of the realms of great Brittaine' by Doctor John Gordon (the English reprint of a pamphlet published in France on the accession).[56]

The noun panegyric will therefore not be used widely in this thesis, while at the same time recognizing the unmistakable significance of 1603-4 in the development of English verse panegyric as it is understood by modern critics, and its mixture of admonition, warning, guidance, and celebration for both subjects

[55] Ben Jonson, *B. Jon: his part of King James his royall and magnificent entertainement through his honorable cittie of London, Thurseday the 15. of March. 1603.* (London: V[alentine] S[immes and George Eld] for Edward Blount, 1604), E2r; *The Works of Benjamin Jonson* (London: Will Stansby, 1616), p. 863.

[56] John Gordon, *England and Scotlands Happinesse* (London: V[alentine] Simmes for William Aspley, 1604), B1r; a translation of his *Panégyrique de congratulation pour la concorde des royaumes de la Grande Bretagne* (La Rochelle: J. Le Fevre, 1603). (The panegyric is often confused with Gordon's 1604 Court sermon *Enotikon*).

and King. The accession poems are part of its emerging culture of English panegyric, although they do not follow an established genre of English panegyric verse, in which they represent instead a moment of transformation. After all, while the poets may not be writing panegyric as they understand it, from a modern critical perspective it is arguable that they are fulfilling at least half of Garrison's definition of panegyric, in 'address[ing] a monarch on some public, ceremonial occasion' – albeit the 'public, ceremonial occasion' of his accession as a whole, rather than severally his actual entrance into London, coronation, first Parliament, and so on. As regards the remainder of Garrison's definition, English panegyric verse for printed, rather than oratorical, significance would be recognized as a sub-genre in its own right by 1617 and, since they were usually focused on the 'return' of the subject, they came into their own in 1660, on the restoration of Charles II.[57]

3: THE AUDIENCE.

In *shaping perception* through *deliberative* and *demonstrative* writing, rhetorical strategies, and *anchors*, Jacobean accession verse demonstrates (variously) *response shaping*, *response reinforcing*, and *response changing*. *Response reinforcing* occurs, Garth S. Jowett and Victoria J. O'Donnell explain, 'If the people in the audience already have positive attitudes towards a subject'; that is:

> the persuader reminds them about the positive attitudes and stimulates them to feel even more strongly by demonstrating their attitudes through specified forms of behaviour.

To explain the purpose of such an address, they offer the simple modern example of blood donation drives: the propaganda's recipient might be an experienced and

[57] Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, p. 94-5.

supportive donor but 'people have to be motivated to go out and do these things.' In contrast, *response changing* (if the recipient has a negative attitude to the subject) requires 'the persuader […] to relate the change to something in which the persuadee already believes', in order to inspire an alteration in their perception of the subject through the positive connection. Finally, *response shaping* occupies a middle ground, wherein

> [t]he audience has a need for positive reinforcement filled, and the persuader has a need for a desired response from the audience filled.[58]

The presence of these distinct persuasive approaches strongly indicates that the poems are aimed at – and appealed to – readers across the spectrum of opinion.

This contention is collaterally supported by circumstantial and bibliographic evidence indicating that the audience was not a socially homogenous group, but crossed both class and geographical boundaries. For example, in September 1867 eight accession poems of 1603 were discovered at Lamport Hall, Northampton, by a Willis and Southeran employee name Charles Edmonds.[59] The

---

[58] Jowett and O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion*, pp. 33-4, 38-40.

[59] The pamphlets were: Anon. *The Poores Lamentation* (London: Thomas Pavier, 1603); Michael Drayton, *A Gratulatorie Poem* (London: James Roberts for T[homas] M[illington] and H[umphrey] L[ownes], 1603); J[ohn] F[enton], *King James His Welcome to London. With Elizaes Tombe and Epitaph* (London: [Richard Read for] Thomas Pavier, 1603); Thomas Greene, *A Poets Vision and a Princes Glorie* (London: [Richard Braddock for] William Leake, 1603); Thomas Newton, *Atropoïon Delion: Or, The Death of Delia* (London: [William White for] W[illiam] Johnes, 1603); Henry Petowe, *Elizabetha quasi vivens* (London: E[dward] Allde for M[atthew] Lawe, 1603); Samuel Rowlands, *Ave Cæsar. God save the King* (London: [William White] for W[illiam] F[erbrand] and G[eorge] L[oftus], 1603); and T. W., *The Lamentation of Melpomene of the Death of Belphaebe* (London: W[illiam] White for C[lement] Knight, 1603). (Now found as: Bodleian Library J-J Drayton e.47 (*Gratulatorie Poem*); Folger Shakespeare Library HH164/39 (*Elizabetha quasi vivens*), cs0361 (*King James His Welcome*); Huntington Library 31751 (*Poores Lamentation*), 16976 *(cont.)*

Isham Find (as it was known) indicates that a seventeenth-century collection of accession verse had been made by a gentle audience outside London. Thomas Isham (1555-1605) and his son John (1582-1651), who both lived at Lamport Hall, are known to have assembled an impressive library. It seems likely that one or both of them gathered the poems, as 'the book room' in which they were kept was known to Sir Charles Isham (who commissioned the 1867 survey) as the place containing their uncatalogued acquisitions volumes, and the items found alongside the accession pamphlets were roughly contemporaneous.[60] As Edmonds's investigation concluded:

> There is every evidence to show that the books have remained in the house from a very remote period, and that no additions of any moment have been made to the library for the last 150 years.[61]

The readership of this small contemporary collection of Jacobean accession verse may have extended beyond Thomas and John Isham. According to Kate Aughterson's biography of diarist Elizabeth Isham (daughter of John), female

(*Melpomene*), 31410 (*Poet's Vision*), 49048 (*Ave Cæsar*); Newberry Library 4A911 (*Atropoïon Delion*). Robert Edmund Graves, 'The Isham Books', *Bibliographica* 3 (1897), pp. 418-429, and Frederick Hard, 'Two Spenserian Imitations, By "T. W."', *English Literary History* 5 (1938), pp. 113-26, give detailed descriptions of the contents of the Isham Find.

[60] In a letter to *The Times* on 3 October 1867, Edmonds referred to the room in which the pamphlets were found as the 'back lumber room', and his phrase is usually used in modern accounts. However, other contemporary reports record that it was known to the Ishams themselves as 'the book room' – and so Edmonds's supposedly astounding 'discovery' comes as less of a surprise. ('Editorial', *Northampton Mercury*, Issue 35 [Saturday 12 October 1867], p. 3; 'Gossip about Books and the Arts', *Northampton Mercury*, Issue 49 [Saturday 18 January 1868], p. 3 [*British Newspapers, Part III: 1780-1950* (Gale Cengage, online edn. 2015)].)

[61] 'Gossip about Books and the Arts', *Northampton Mercury*, Issue 42 (Saturday 30 November 1867), p. 8 (*British Newspapers, Part III: 1780-1950*).

family members also had 'free access' to the Lamport books. (Isham's writing also suggests that, at this point at least, the family had Puritan leanings.)[62]

Elsewhere, the diverse readership of accession verse is manifested through markings of ownership. For example, a copy of Thomas Newton's *Atropoïon Delion* is inscribed 'An*ne* Savils Booke', providing more concrete evidence for an audience among landed country gentry and among women. The seventeenth-century italic subscription may post-date the accession, but the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* records several members of the Savile family (loyal gentry often active in Parliament and local government, and known as being 'of sound religion') alive at the time named Anne. These include a second wife of the George Savile to whom John Savile had dedicated *Entertainment at Theobalds* and so, perhaps, a relatively likely reader of other accession texts.[63] In a very different milieu, a copy of Robert Pricket's *A Souldiers Wish* is marked 'John White fishmonger ow*n*eth this Booke May the 12th 1603'.[64] Probate records show that White lived in the parish of St Mildred, Bread Street in the City of London. He was dead by Christmas Eve 1603, an intimate human trace in this analysis of audience. In these specific cases it is of course impossible to establish whether the copies texts were purchased in London or from a regional bookseller (in large

[62] Kate Aughterson, 'Isham, Elizabeth (d. 1654)', *ODNB* (online edn. 2013), www.oxforddnb.com/index/101068093/Elizabeth-Isham [accessed 1 May 2013].

[63] Kirby, 'Savile Family', *ODNB*. The copy is Huntington Library 62756, A1v.

[64] Robert Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish unto his Soveraigne Lord King James* (London: John Harrison, 1603); the copy is British Library 8122.aa 50, A1v; Will of John White, Fishmonger of Saint Mildred Bread Street, City of London, 24 December 1603 (The National Archives (TNA): PROB 11/102/746).

towns, at fairs, and along pedlar, carrier, and shipping routes).[65] The evidence of readership nonetheless indicates that accession pamphlets reached an audience that was not socially or geographically homogenous.

The texts acknowledge their varied readership. Most are nominally dedicated to the customary audience of elegy (and indeed panegyric), the Royal Family and powerful figures of the Court or Government. *A Souldiers Wish* is indicative of the fashion. It addresses itself, in the title, *Unto His Soveraigne Lord King James* and the poem is filled with apostrophes to the monarch. However, Pricket hedges his bets with a second and third dedication, 'To the right honorable the Lords and others of her late Majesties privie Counsell' and 'to the Lord Maior of London and his brethren', widening the net for potential patrons (and suggesting, incidentally, that it may have been composed before 5 April 1603, when James's ratification publicly confirmed them as his Privy Council as well).[66] Within the poem itself Pricket directly addresses 'London' and 'England', and many further references to 'the people' (although in the third person or first person plural) acknowledge the wide readership in the manner of the Claudian public instruction.[67] The majority of extant published accession poetry from 1603-4 follows roughly this pattern, although the style and manner of the

[65] James Raven, *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), p. 60; H. S. Bennett, *English Books and Readers Vol. 3: 1603-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 2; Huburt Meeus, 'Printing in the Shadow of a Metropolis', *Print Culture and Peripheries in Early Modern Europe: A Contribution to the History of Printing and the Book Trade in Small European and Spanish Cities*, ed. Benito Rial Costas (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013), p. 162.

[66] Croft, *King James*, p.51; Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish*, A3rv, C3r.

[67] Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish*, C3r, C4v.

acknowledgements varies between titular dedications, prose epistles and/or prefatory verses (either to specific patrons to 'To the Reader'), and apostrophe within the body of the text. Daniel's *Panegyrike Congratulatorie* offers the most explicit example of an accession poet's accommodation of different audiences, in both practical bibliographic and literary terms. Written under the Haringtons' patronage for delivery to James at their house on 23 April 1603, as has been mentioned, Daniel also presented the King with a scribal copy.[68] Later in the year, however, Daniel published the poem for popular consumption, adding fifteen additional stanzas containing a message of reassurance and instruction for the wider audience (discussed in detail in PART 2). Between stanzas 1 and 58 (the manuscript stanzas), both the 'Sov'raigne' and (more rarely) 'thou [who] art all great *Brittaine*, and no more, | No Scot, no English' are both spoken to in the second person; but from stanza 59 to the end, James becomes 'he' and the subjects, 'we'.[69]

The competing influences of patronage culture and commercial print culture are plainly apparent in the plurality of address and direction within most individual accession poems. The textual evidence that poets were writing for the markets of both traditional patronage and the book trade, and that these markets were invigorated, is incontrovertible. This illustrates what John F. Danby and David Norbrook have called the '"mixed" literary economy' of Renaissance England,

[68] British Library Royal MS 18 A.LXXII.

[69] Samuel Daniel, *A Panegyricke Congratulatorie Delivered to the Kings Most Excellent Majestie* (London: Edward Blount, 1603), A3r.

> in which aristocratic patronage was being supplemented by production for the market, and some writers were beginning to earn their living by writing pamphlets and plays.[70]

Arthur F. Marotti specifically identifies the coincident presence in early seventeenth-century texts of '[m]ultiple dedications', 'presentation copies', 'differing preliminary matter tailored to different patrons', alongside the 'displacement of part of the authorizing function on to commendatory poems' to the reader, as a 'signal [of] the breakdown of the old system of artistic clientage'.[71] In these paratexts, which Julie Stone Peters terms letters of commerce (designed, David M. Bergeron clarifies, to 'set in motion an exchange between writer and reader/patron, a social and literary exchange'), Marotti identifies 'friction between the two kinds of patronage', that is, between 'old-style socially superior protectors or benefactors and new-style commercial purchases of printed works'.[72] Many varied studies have together advanced modern understanding of patronage culture and the book trade (with particularly significant work by – alongside those three already mentioned – H. S. Bennett, Peter Blayney, Michael Brennan, Colin Clair, A. S. G. Edwards, Lukas Erne, John Hinks, Adrian Johns, Ian Maxted, Carol M. Meale, Huburt Meeus, James Raven, Pablo Sánchez León, Jennifer Summit, and David Zaret). A brief overview of this productive field explains how such

---

[70] David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, Revised Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 11; John F. Danby, *Elizabethan and Jacobean Poets: Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont & Fletcher* (London: Faber & Faber, 1965), p. 16.

[71] Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 322.

[72] Julie Stone Peters, *Theatre of the Book 1480-1880: Print, Text, and Performance in Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 201; David M. Bergeron, *Textual Patronage in English Drama*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 15; Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, p. xv.

competing influences affected the production and content of the accession verse in 1603-4.

On the one hand, 'the medieval and early Renaissance pattern of courtly and aristocratic patronage' was established and (for the most part) functioning. 'There were', Marotti claims, 'some real social and political benefits to hope for from the patronage system'.[73] Patrons were not only found among the nobility, as is often assumed, but also among merchants, gentlemen, the secular and regular clergy, and establishments like guilds, universities, and colleges.[74] Patronage offered what Bennett calls 'mutual benefits' and Marotti 'gift-exchange': 'the writers were protected and perhaps rewarded' while 'praise and idealization […] supposedly enhanced the patron's current and future esteem and reputation'.[75] Beyond general 'favours and aid', a patron could offer (Bennett summarizes) 'protection against unfriendly critics' (whether literary or political), 'support for causes and opinions', and ideally 'some office or position'.[76] They might pay for printing or research which, in turn, might lead to more beautiful and accomplished work by the client and, consequently, increased fame and better commercial

[73] Bergeron, *Textual Patronage*, p. 142; Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, p. 321.

[74] See *A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain 1476-1558*, ed. Vincent Gillespie and Susan Powell (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2014), pp. 127-225.

[75] H. S. Bennett, *English Books and Readers Vol. 2: 1558-1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), p. 33; Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, p. 292.

[76] Bennett, *English Books and Readers*, II.34, 44. See Elizabeth Goldring on the Leicester-Sidney circle for a specific example from the final decades of Elizabeth's reign (*Robert Dudley Earl of Leicester, and the World of Elizabethan Art: Painting and Patronage at the Court of Elizabeth I* [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014], pp. 17, 21).

sales.[77] In addition, the connection of a text with an influential named patron 'helped to legitimate printed texts', to 'get them into print', and to 'promote them to potential buyers'.[78] Yet by the early seventeenth century, patronage rarely actually offered (as it had in an age of manuscript culture) access to positions, residence in great houses, or even some degree of 'intimacy' with the patron.[79] Bennett argues that few writers even expected patronage to provide 'large sums or annual pensions' (albeit resentfully).[80] Moreover, a writer had to establish a 'status of clientage' to benefit from the system at all; they 'could normally hope for little in the way of immediate financial reward in return for dedications' that were unsolicited.[81] Alistair Fox concludes that

> by the 1590s very few [writers] were getting the rewards from patronage that they thought they deserved, and once would have had a right to expect.

Traditional literary patronage was becoming increasingly hard to get.[82]

---

[77] Bennett, *English Books and Readers*, II.31; Paul F. Gehl, 'Advertising or *Fama*? Local Markets for Schoolbooks', *Print Culture and Peripheries in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Benito Rial Costas (Brill: Leiden and Boston, 2013), pp. 78-9.

[78] Gehl, 'Advertising or *Fama*?', *Print Cultures*, p. 97; David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), p. 135; see also, Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the Renaissance Lyric*, pp. 294-96.

[79] Bergeron, *Textual Patronage*, p. 142; James Knowles, '"To raise a house of better frame": Jonson's Cecilian Entertainments', *Patronage, Power, and Culture: The Early Cecils, 1558-1612*, ed. Pauline Croft (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 192.

[80] Bennett, *English Books and Readers*, II.45-6.

[81] Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, p. 321.

[82] Alistair Fox, 'The complaint of poetry for the death of liberality: the decline of literary patronage in the 1590s', *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 240.

On the other hand, commercial print culture could 'liberate writers from the constraints of aristocrats' (and the 'exploitative practices' of patronage identified by Lorna Hutson, 'that operate to the disadvantage of the author'), by increasing 'the economic and interpretative importance of the reader'.[83] First, rather than relying on the artistic, political, or economic whims of a single patron, it offered an 'assured market' to those 'who were able to judge its needs'.[84] Second, it offered greater authorial control over content, and transmission of content. Writers freed from the 'gift/patronage cycle' could – and did – state their own opinions, anonymously if necessary.[85] Discussing the 'radical potential' of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Utopian fiction, Norbrook contends:

> The conscious intentions of some poets may in fact have been less conservative than has often been assumed. [Sir Thomas] More's independence from received ideas was facilitated by the fact that he was writing not for a patron but for the growing European audience for printed books.

He stresses, however, that it must also be recognized that patronage itself sometimes offered the opportunity for radicalism, on behalf and under the protection of a patron:

> a number of noble patrons in the period were more receptive to new ideas than most of the popular audience for printed books; and

[83] Bergeron, *Textual Patronage*, p. 142; Marotti, 'Patronage, Poetry, and Print', *Politics, Patronage and Literature in England 1558-1658*, The Yearbook of English Studies Vol. 21, Special Number (1991), p. 2; Lorna Hutson, *Thomas Nashe in Context*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 255.

[84] Colin Clair, *A History of Printing in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 7.

[85] Wendy Wall, 'Isabella Whitney and the Female Legacy', *English Literary History* 58 (1991), p. 47.

> poets could try to mould their patrons' opinions instead of simply becoming their mouthpieces.[86]

For this, however, one had to have the right patron in increasingly parsimonious times, and even then it does not affect the conclusion that (according to Roger Luckhurst)

> As publishing moved from models of private patronage to public commercial enterprises, print culture generated an ever-wider circulation of opinions about politics, ethics, art and culture. Commentary was exploratory, but also normative: it provided the means to debate and then influence public mores.[87]

Yet the 'assured market' and artistic freedom of the book trade added a new pressure: the need to produce work that would sell. Writing in this context became 'a public and commercial venture, rather than a private and personal one'; authors, publishers, and booksellers had to become 'attuned to the economics of text production' and to the 'clamorous demands of a very varied public' in what was 'an environment of ruthless competition'.[88] Peter W. M. Blayney has surveyed the financial costs and risks of the trade. He explains:

> Most books were published by stationers whose daily trade was bookselling; a few were published by stationers who were also printers.

---

[86] Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 11.

[87] Roger Luckhurst, 'The public sphere, popular culture and the true meaning of the zombie apocalypse', *The Cambridge Companion to Popular Fiction* ed. David Glover and Scott McCracken (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 70-1.

[88] Jennifer Summit, *Lost Property: The Woman Writer and English Literary History, 1380-1589* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 82; Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture*, p. 135; Harold Jenkins, *The Life and Work of Henry Chettle* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1934), p. 19; Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), p. 258.

(The publisher was, simply, anyone who first 'acquired the text' and 'paid for several hundred copies of it to be manufactured'.) While 'the amount of money a printer earned' (if he was not also the publisher or bookseller) was 'a previously agreed sum', the publisher and the bookseller (and, depending on the publishing deal, the author) 'depended on the book's success to make money.' All three figures hoped for sell-out texts, not only on account of their immediate sales and profiles, but because the profit margin increased dramatically on a second edition.[89] 'If' the publisher, Blayney concludes,

> correctly anticipated consumer demand for a certain book at a certain time, he could make considerable money; if he wrongly anticipated it, he lost money.

This statement can be extended to the author who, although not necessarily funding an edition to market himself, relied equally on his judgement of 'consumer demand' to choose a subject.

Even the concept of traditional patronage itself was manipulated as part of the drive to create saleable commodities. According to Marotti, by the early seventeenth century:

> [c]ertain publishers were more apt to use patrons' names for the purpose of promoting sales of books to a general readership than as signs of an actual clientage in the old sense.

It was not rare for their 'connexion [sic] with the authors or publishers [to be] slight or non-existent'; 'their names mainly functioned as (misleading) signs of

[89] Peter W. M. Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks', *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 141-3, 391. See also Bennett, *English Books and Readers*, II.274-76.

celebrity-endorsement.'[90] Yet, in this underhand way as well as in the more traditional sense, Bergeron and others make clear that the 'system of aristocratic patronage [did] persist alongside commercial support of readers' – patrons of the work in a modern sense.[91] In the context of 1603-4, their subscription to the 'mixed literary economy' has clear advantages for the poems' central concerns discussed in PART 1 and PART 2 of this thesis: the opportunity for personal profit and/or advancement and for broader *integration propaganda*. Both patronage and commercial print culture offer the poets different paths to political and cultural influence and economic gain (via either top-down, or lateral and popular, modes of influence). In appealing to both, they are hedging their bets but also revealing something more of their purpose. The competing influences of patronage culture and commercial print culture are seen in these modes of address and transmission, what Marotti identifies as 'negotiations' with 'readers of various social ranks', for:

> [a]t issue were the ownership of texts, the control of interpretation, the authority for public literary utterance, [and] the socioeconomic well-being of writers and publishers.[92]

In the context of precarious moment of the succession, such 'control', 'interpretation', 'authority', and 'well-being' were intensely important.

4: THE POETS.

Comparable diversity is found among the poets as among the readers. Earlier accession verse seems to have been written exclusively by gentlemen, often clergymen. In 1603-4, however, although many of the published poets were

[90] Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, p. 292.
[91] Linda Woodbridge in Bergeron, *Textual Patronage*, paratext.
[92] Marotti, 'Patronage, Poetry, and Print', *Politics, Patronage and Literature*, p. 2.

educated at the Universities or the Inns of Court and almost all had experience of London, the variety was considerable: antiquaries and balladeers, actors and clergymen, courtiers, dramatists, gentlemen, guildsmen, hacks and lawyers and soldiers. Often, one author belongs to several of these categories, and there are almost as many novices as experienced poets among their number. A few contrasting examples illustrate the range. The West Country-born Daniel was (according to Norbrook) 'widely seen on [Edmund] Spenser's death [in 1599] as the most eminent living poet'. He had attended Magdalen Hall, Oxford in the early 1580s, and travelled in different retinues to Paris in 1586 and Northern Italy 1590. By 1603, he was a published poet enjoying the patronage of major aristocrats (including Sir Thomas Egerton, Sir Charles Blount, and three Countesses: Margaret, of Cumberland, Mary, of Pembroke, and Lucy, of Bedford). Their support would bring him to the direct attention of the new Royal Family – the Countess of Bedford was the daughter of Lord and Lady Harington.[93] Michael Drayton had more humble origins (most likely born the son of a Warwickshire tanner, and in service to Thomas Goodere during 1584-5) and less success with patrons, but was still a popular London author by 1603. By contrast, one 'I. F.' is among several poets who 'confesse' that 'my Pen hath tooke a nap, | But newly in the Muses sugared lap', while elsewhere novice poets are experienced in various other forms of writing.[94] For example, the Cambridge-educated clergyman Thomas Newton (based in Little Ilford, Essex, where he was Rector) was a celebrated published translator of both

[93] Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 157; John Pitcher, 'Daniel, Samuel (1562/3-1619)', *ODNB*, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7120 [accessed 15 May 2014].
[94] I. F., *King James His Welcome to London. With Elizaes Tombe and Epitaph* (London: [Richard Read for] Thomas Pavier, 1603), C4v.

Classical and Renaissance European texts. Anthony Nixon was a hack with at least thirteen pamphlets to his name, and the sometime-printer Henry Chettle contributed to forty-nine plays for Philip Henslowe between 1598-1603.[95]

The biographical evidence available for named poets, and some further textual evidence, suggests that they are a little less diverse in terms of religion: with the notable exception of Ben Jonson, their Christianity comprises an adherence to the broad spectrum of Protestantism.[96] Likewise, although the texts themselves seem to travel quite widely, most but not all of the identifiable poets are based in the south of England at the time of writing. This conclusion seems to be supported by an anonymous 1604 anthology which emphatically defies the trend, *Northerne Poems congratulating the Kings Majesties most happy and peaceable entrance to the crowne of England*. The collection claims to be the solitary northern contribution to the accession poems, 'published to the common view by printing' on the insistence of 'welwilling friends', among whom it had circulated 'by written Copies' during 1603. These 'friends' insist because

England seemes fertile onely in the South,

[95] The following *ODNB* entries [accessed 1 May 2011]: Gordon Braden, 'Newton, Thomas (1544/5–1607)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20069; Anne Lake Prescott, 'Drayton, Michael (1563–1631)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8042; Anthony Parr, 'Nixon, Anthony (fl. 1592-1616)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20206; Emma Smith, 'Chettle, Henry (d. 1603x7)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5245.

[96] Ian Donaldson, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p.142-43. For discussion of the enigmatic distinctions between conservative, moderate, and radical Protestants in Elizabethan and early Jacobean England, see Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982); Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982) and Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church 1603-1642* (Basingstoke: Stanford University Press, 1993).

> These North parts yeelde but few things that are good.
> The learned Schools have filde their flowing mouth
> With *James* his prayse, in verse and pleasant moode.
> Unlearnd with learnd have sundry poems wrote,
> From Norths cold clime the muses have sent nought.[97]

This assertion must of course be read with caution. The poet seeks to redress the balance and expresses pride in the text's northern origin – as well as the above statements in the prefatory epistle and opening poem, it is dedicated to Lord Sheffield, the new Jacobean President of the Northern Council. But *Northerne Poems* was published in London, so no firm conclusion can be reached about where the poet was actually based. The dedication and expressions that acknowledging the north may simply be a strategic bid for some kind of reward for local as well as national loyalty; a cunning identification of a neglected market rather than a regretful identification of a neglectful region. There is, of course, no reason to believe that it does not serve both purposes.

Finally, there are no named female accession poets in 1603-4 although many of the texts are anonymous, or identified only by initials. Some of these can be attributed with a degree of confidence. For instance, 'I. F.' seems likely to be John Ferrers. *The English Short Title Catalogue* records that *King James His Welcome* is often attributed to John Fenton or John Ferrers on account of the research of John Nichols; modern criticism generally tends to attribute the poem to Fenton. However, a further search for Fenton's records of turns up only a burial registered at St Dunstan in the East, London in 1603. Meanwhile, in 1603 John Ferrours petitioned the new King for 'letters of grace on my behalf to the Lo[rd]

[97] Anon., *Northerne Poems congratulating the Kings Majesties most happy and peaceable entrance to the crowne of England* (London: John Windet for Edmund Weaver, 1604), A2r, A3r.

Chauncellor & Judges', referring to himself an 'utter-barry[s]ter'. A John *Ferrers* can be found in the contemporaneous records of Lincoln's Inn (matriculating in 1584 having left Trinity College, Oxford); he had twice been MP for Tamworth (and would be re-elected in 1604), and was knighted by the King on 7 May 1603. It seems probable (though of course it cannot be proved) that Ferrours/Ferrers are the same man, and that if I. F. is indeed either Fenton or Ferrers, he is more likely to be the Oxford-educated barrister and MP who was actively and successfully seeking royal attention.[98] Many of the anonymous texts, however, remain so. It is, as ever, tempting to wonder with Virginia Woolf whether 'Anon, who wrote so many poems without signing them, was [ever] a woman.'[99]

5: THE POETRY: VOLUME, DATES, AND PRECEDENT.

The disparate group published a flood of poetry about King James's accession between Queen Elizabeth's death on 24 March 1603 and mid-May 1604, when, following a Stationers' Company judgment on 14 May, the last contemporary account of the King's official Royal Entry into London was published.[100] The first

[98] John Nichols (ed.), *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 4 vols. (London: J. B. Nichols, 1828), I.40; Edmund Lodge, *Illustrations of British History*, 3 vols. (London: Mitcham, 1838), III.158-9; Joseph Foster (ed.), *Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1891), 'Faber-Flood', www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=117058 [accessed 10 April 2014]; Percival Boyd (ed.), *Pedigrees with Index of London Citizens, abt. 1600-1800* (Salt Lake City: Genealogical Society of Utah, 1954), Vol. 493, No. 49501, S86.

[99] Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas*, ed. Anna Snaith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 38.

[100] The 'controv*er*sie' was between Edward Blount's edition of Ben Jonson's *B. Jon: His Part of King James his Royall and Magnificent Entertainement* and Thomas Man's edition of Thomas Dekker's *The Magnificent Entertainment* (both 1604). The Stationers ruled in favour of Man and Dekker and, 'for th*e* ending of the controv*er*sie between them about the booke of the pageant*es*', Blount was required *(cont.)*

examples appeared in the first week of April 1603. During this period the Stationers' Register records forty-five texts containing significant original verse about the succession. In the course of research for this thesis, I have documented a further twenty-three extant texts which satisfy the same criterion but were not registered.[101] Therefore, during a fourteen-month period at least sixty-five poetic or largely-poetic texts were printed which took the English accession of King James as their subject; it is likely that still more examples will emerge during the course of the AHRC Stuart Successions Project. (To put this in context, H. S. Bennett proposes, based on a survey of 1600, that approximately 250 commercial books of might be published in a typical year.[102] While this was not a plague year, like 1603, it was also not an accession year so the figure is probably applicable. Given that his estimate include publications of all kinds, the proportion is high.) Preliminary investigations of contemporary manuscript poetry do not suggest that original manuscript accession verse was equally prolific; however, significant evidence does exist for manuscript copies of printed accession verse. The asserted manuscript circulation of *Northerne Poems* is one, albeit unproven, example. More conclusively, Thomas Dekker's poem 'The Queen was brought by water to

to 'delyv*er* all his Remaynor thereof, (*whi*ch he saieth are 400) to Tho*mas* Man'. Man published the smugly-titled *The Whole Magnifycent Entertainement* shortly afterwards. For a transcript of the ruling, see W. A. Jackson (ed.), *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company: 1602 to 1640* (London: Stationers Company, 1957). For a detailed examination of the rivalry between the two editions, see Jessica Lazar, *'Heare, and Record it': notes on aspects of the publication of Jonson's and Dekker's 1604 pageant for James I* (University of Oxford, M.St. dissertation, 2010), and Butler, 'The King's Entertainment […]: Textual Essay', *Ben Jonson: Online*.

[101] Edward Arber (ed.), *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, 5 vols. (London: [privately printed,] 1875), III.245.

[102] Bennett, *English Books and Readers*, III.1.

Whitehall' (from the pamphlet, *1603: The Wonderfull Yeare*) appears in at least twenty-three contemporary (or roughly contemporary) manuscripts, with several branches of variation, indicating manuscript transmission of the printed text.[103]

It is also possible, as James Doelman has suggested, that some poets' intentions 'to publish similar works in response to the new reign' were 'frustrated by the ravages of the plague', which devastated London from March 1603 to February 1604. (Doelman makes this suggestion while lamenting that so little poetry was written during the period, which, given the exceptional numbers just discussed, is a puzzling complaint.[104]) In a similar vein, in a general note to his transcripts of the Stationers' Register Edward Arber proposes that the scarcity of entries in mid- to late-1603 may well be on account of the plague.[105] In an estimated population of 141 000, the plague killed between 24 045 and 30 578 people. Almost a fifth of the country's parishes were affected. Contemporary reports are deeply moving, describing how hysterical people had to be locked in their houses, multitudes fled infected places, and (according to a Privy Councillor) in Hampstead

[103] Thomas Dekker, *1603. The Wonderful Yeare* (London: Thomas Creede, 1604), B4v. Versions of the poem appear in: Bodleian Library MSS Add. A. 368 f.45v, Eng. poet. e. 40 f.124, Rawlinson C.886, Rawl. poet. 117 f.163, Rawl. poet. 153 f.8v; British Library MSS Egerton 923 f.15, Eg. 2421 f.45v, Eg. 2877 f. 16v, Add. 15227 f.2v, Add. 27406 f.74v, Add. 30982 f.23v, Add. 47111 f.11v; Corpus Christi College, Oxford MS 328 f.49v; Folger Shakespeare Library MSS V.a.97 p.9, V.a.262 p.137, V.a.162 f.83, V.a.311 f.27, V.a.319 f.3, V.a.345 p.111; Huntington Library MS HM116 p.37; Yale University MSS c.152 p.43, c.81/1 no. 445, b.208 p.57.

[104] James Doelman, 'The accession of King James I and English Religious Poetry', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 34:1 (1994), p. 21. This article focuses on Joshua Sylvester, John Davies, and John Harington and proposes that the 'outpouring of religious verse in the years 1603 to 1605' was a result of the new King's accession.

[105] Arber, *Registers of the Company of Stationers*, III.245.

> the streets [were] strawed with flowers when maids of any sort are buried, which gathereth people together, and for bachelors they wear rosemary, as if it were at marriages.

Meanwhile, the Lord Mayor complained,

> the people infected and whose houses are infected (against all honesty, human Civility and good conscience […]) do daily intrude themselves into all Companies both private and public as well at sermons as elsewhere.[106]

The accession publications are beginning to seem quite remarkable.

Indeed, the quantity of printed Jacobean accession verse was unprecedented (both in number and proportion of overall commercial printing). Charles Bazerman, in the only critical work to treat all Jacobean accession verse as a group, documents only two contemporary poems in the year following the death of Henry VII and the coronation of Henry VIII in 1509. He records two poems on Henry VIII's death in 1547, and states that he was unable to discover any verse on the death of Mary I and accession of Elizabeth in the year from November 1558.[107] My research in both the Stationers' Register and library collections has corroborated that, before 1603, the transfer of power between two rulers is scarcely discussed in any publications, verse or prose, apart from legal and

---

[106] Paul Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 58; F. P. Wilson, *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 32, 41, 94-5, 114. Wilson quotes Sir William Waad to Lord Cecil, 31 August 1603, TNA Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, SP 14/3 f. 76, and Proclamation of 17 September 1603, J.XXVI.127 (*State Papers Online: The Government of Britain, 1509-1714* [Gale Cengage Learning, 2015]).

[107] Charles Bazerman, 'Verse Occasioned by the Death of Queen Elizabeth I and the Accession of King James I' (Brandeis University USA: Ph.D. thesis, 1971), p. 105, pp. 108-113. These poems are: Anon., *All Wrapped in Wretchedness* and Stephen Hawes, *A Joyfull medytacyon to all Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall soverayne lorde Kynge Henry the eyght* (1509); Anon., *A lamentation of the death of the moost victorious Prynce Henry the eyght* (1547).

religious documents. A few more poems published at the accessions of Henry VIII's children, Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth, have come to light, but they are almost exclusively concerned with the religious changes that (might) accompany the new monarchs.[108]

William Birch's broadside ballad 'Come Over the Born, Bessy' (following the accession of Elizabeth) is in several ways an exception that foreshadows the panegyrical poetry of 1603-4: a romantic duet between 'Bessy' and 'mery Englande' (or, in the words of title, explicitly *A songe betwene the quenes majestie and Englande*). Birch adapts a popular ballad to figure the security and mutual devotion of the new reign by celebrating it as a marriage. Englande, a 'lover fair', begs 'Swete Bessie! Give me thy hande'; she replies:

[108] At the accession of Mary in 1553, for example, an ill-judged Protestant counsel by clergyman Richard Beeard, *A Godly Psalme of Marye Queen*, appeared alongside *A Godly Psalme in Meetre* by Thomas Bownell, and a broadside ballad called *An Ave Maria in commendation of our most vertuous Queen* (by Roman Catholic priest, Leonard Stopes). Alongside these celebratory works, oppositional prose against the restoration of Roman Catholicism as the state religion appears in the Stationers' Register.

At the accession of Elizabeth in 1558, 'Rychard Lante was sente to warde for the pryntynge of an Epithaphi [sic] of quene MARY with out lycense' (Arber, *Transcript of the Stationers' Registers*, I.101). Lante's broadside ballad mourns the loss of Mary but also commends her successor, hoping that she will look kindly on her Roman Catholic subjects; this too has been attributed to Stopes (S. E. Wall, 'Stopes, Leonard (d.1608)', *ODNB*, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26584 [accessed 15 June 2011]). However, most of the published 1558-9 accession verse was virulently Protestant, such as John Awdelay's *The Wonders of England* and Thomas Brice's *A Compendious Register*, about the Marian persecutions, and Richard Mulcaster's *A Newe Ballade*, which warned Elizabeth 'against the hostile designs of the Catholic party' (Elkin Calhoun Wilson, *England's Eliza* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939], p. 7). Mulcaster's account of Elizabeth's London Coronation Entry was also published in 1559, *The passage of our most drad Soueraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to westminster the daye before her coronacion*.

> Here is my hand,
> My dere lover Englande
> […]
> Untill death us two do part.

As an unmarried young woman, Elizabeth can be represented as a 'lover' to her country, in striking and meaningful contrast with her married sister. Yet the ballad also reminds the new Queen that Englande 'ha[s] chose thé to mine heir', an ambiguous remark that is at once admonitory and flattering. England, not Elizabeth, is placed in the position of power.

Yet even this 'testimony […] to the understanding between queen and people' is, as E. C. Wilson explains, still strongly 'identified with the Protestant faith' and strikes the familiar hagiographic notes of the suffering imposed upon them by the Catholic Mary. Edward Wilson-Lee takes this further, suggesting that Birch's ballad 'may have been intended to sound a conciliatory note in the first months of Elizabeth's reign', by dramatizing her people's personal and religious loyalty when (he argues) they could be accused of having deserted her and her religion for so long.[109] Verse to mark earlier accessions is rare, largely concerned with religious change, and in great contrast to 1603-4 does not directly discuss the change of power – with the arguable exception of the popular *Songe*, the precursor of Jacobean accession verse.

[109] Wilson, *England's Eliza*, p. 6; Edward Wilson-Lee, 'Birch, William', *The Encyclopedia of English Renaissance Literature Vol. 1: A-F*, ed. Garrett A. Sullivan and Alan Stewart (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), p. 78. Wilson-Lee suggests that (on account of detailed scriptural references in some of his other work) Birch may have been a Cambridge-educated senior clergyman (Corpus Christi, MA 1551; Deacon, London 1552; Prebendary, Durham 1562-7; Warden of Manchester College 1560). See *Alumni Cantabrigienses […] Part 1: From the Earliest Times to 1751, Vol. 1 Abbas-Cutts*, ed. John Venn and J. A. Venn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), p. 154.

6: THE POEMS: FOUR POSSIBLE CAUSES *(INCLUDING A BRIEF SURVEY OF POLITICAL AND CULTURAL CONDITIONS AT THE ACCESSION OF JAMES I).*

While PARTS 1 and 2 of this thesis will focus on ideological and political incentives specifically related to the accession of James I, at least four other factors of general relevance presumably helped to provoke this enormous increase in published accession verse in 1603-4. These are the development of mourning literature, the plague, optimism and opportunism about the new reign – but each of these factors requires moderation.

First, Bazerman argues that public mourning as a whole had changed during the fifty years of Elizabeth's reign, pointing to the impressive outpouring of verse between 1586-88 that answered the death of the English Protestant hero Sir Philip Sidney.[110] Sidney was mourned by Nicholas Breton, Thomas Churchyard, Henry Constable, Samuel Daniel, John Day, Michael Drayton, William Gager, Sir Arthur Gorges, Gabriel Harvey, Ben Jonson, Alexander Neville, Walter Ralegh, Edmund Spenser, and George Whetstone (several of whom would write in 1603-4). Memorial volumes were published by the universities of Leiden, Oxford (and, separately, New College), and Cambridge. James VI himself, and several poets of the Scottish Court, contributed to the latter volume. However, Bazerman's interpretation must be tempered by the understanding that Sidney had been a generous literary patron, related to many other powerful patrons of the Sidney Circle who were now grieving and might reward the literature, and moreover that to mourn Sidney in the late 1580s had political as well as artistic (and financial)

[110] Bazerman, 'Verse Occasioned by the Death of Queen Elizabeth', pp. 105, 111.

relevance.[111] Simply put, the bulk of Sidneian elegies were patriotic, their publications (in 1586 and 1588) coinciding with the unmasking of the Babington Plot and the defeat of the Spanish Armada. They could also express support for the faction surrounding his uncle Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester and their 'political cause which Sidney had espoused, of aggressively confronting Spanish power in defence of Protestantism on the Continent.'[112] In another point, the 1603-4 poems do not imitate the form of the Sidneian elegies: many do elegize the late Queen, but unlike in 1586 and 1588 the overall movement is one of relief and celebration at the arrival of the new King. These are as much poems of celebration as of mourning.

Second, the plague may provide another explanation for the unusually vigorous accession verse market in 1603-4, even given the apparent contradiction of Doelman and Arber's proposals that it temporarily suppressed the book trade. Along with the timing of Lent and the Queen's death, the epidemic closed the theatres for almost a year (intermittently March–May 1603, then entirely until April 1604) and led to an exodus from London. This may have increased production of poems by bored exiles and jobless playwrights, and the market among those who were pining for the outlawed entertainments or simply escapism. Again, however, this explanation must be moderated by the fact that the texts are

[111] H. R. Woudhuysen, 'Sidney, Sir Philip (1554–1586)', *ODNB* www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25522 [accessed 7 April 2015]; Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney: Courtier Poet* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).

[112] Paul E. J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 54.

published in London without interruption throughout the year, rather than appearing in a glut after the plague receded – and most of the poets are not dramatists. In fact, as is discussed later in the thesis, with the exception of Henry Chettle dramatists constitute the notable absences among the accession poets, perhaps because the professional performance of plays undeniably continued at Court (and in some major houses) throughout the period. Thomas Dekker, William Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, John Marston, and John Webster for example all seem to have written new plays that year, and had work staged at Court over the Christmas and Shrovetide periods. Thomas Middleton even wrote his first play in for performance at Court, *The Phoenix*.[113] If the purpose of writing poetry was at least in part to gain royal attention, they had achieved it. And, moreover, Dekker, Jonson, and Middleton cannot accurately be described as avoiding the topic of the accession. They would all eventually produce complex commissioned texts for the King's Royal Entry into London, planned for May 1603 but postponed to March 1604. (For Shakespeare, Marston, and Webster, on the other hand, see the CONCLUSION.)

Third, optimism about the new reign (and relief about its beginning) may also have affected the production of Jacobean accession verse, particularly given the political and cultural conditions of the last years of Elizabeth's reign. Although there is significant critical disagreement about this period, the dominant view is

[113] Wilson, *Plague*, p. 110-11; John H. Astington, 'The Globe, The Court and *Measure for Measure*', *Shakespeare Survey 52: Shakespeare and the Globe*, ed. Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 134-36, and John H. Astington, *English Court Theatre, 1558-1643* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 197-98.

that, in Patrick Collinson's words, it was 'a rather ugly decade, when the going got tough and unpleasant for all parties.'[114] According to John Guy, these were years 'charged […] with ambition, apprehension, expectation, insecurity, authoritarianism, self-interrogation'.[115] Undeniably, England faced numerous problems and instabilities in the late 1590s and early 1600s. The on-going campaign in Ireland and wider war with Spain (especially action in the Netherlands in the 1580s) had severely taxed the nation's finances, literally and metaphorically. On top of this, from 1594 to 1598 and again in 1600, English harvests were poor, resulting in large increases in food prices against a fall in real wages.[116] (For example, according to F. P. Wilson, '[c]orn which in 1594 and 1595 was quoted at 53*s.* 4*d.* to 56*s*. a quarter rose in 1596 to 80*s.* and later to 120*s*.'[117]) Poverty and food shortages led to poor general health (which greatly worsened the effect of several outbreaks of plague and influenza), and food riots in south west and south east England (including London) in 1595 and in East Anglia, Kent, Sussex, and the south west again in 1596. In response, new Poor Laws were passed in 1597-8, but Guy calls these 'vastly overrated' and instead identifies

[114] Patrick Collinson, 'Ecclesiastical vitriol: religious satire in the 1590s and the invention of Puritanism', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, ed. Guy, p. 153.

[115] John Guy, 'The 1590s: The second reign of Elizabeth I?', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, pp. 7-8; see also Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, 2nd Edition (Harlow: Longman, 1998), p. 170.

[116] Katherine Duncan-Jones, '"Almost always smiling": Elizabeth's Last Two Years', *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007), p. 44; Carole Levin, *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), p. 21; Guy, 'The 1590s', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, pp. 9-10.

[117] Wilson, *Plague*, p. 107.

almost overwhelming 'discord' and 'aggression' in the parliamentary debates of 1597-8 and 1601, especially regarding purveyance, taxation and monopolies.[118]

On account of the Crown's limited finances, Lord Burghley and the Privy Council had begun a 'fundamental reconstruction of royal patronage' a decade earlier, moving from grants of land, leases, and positions, to customs revenues, monopolies, and concessionary interests.[119] These were highly unpopular, greatly rewarding very few at the expense of the many and 'shifting the costs of such rewards from crown to commonwealth.' Moreover, this regime was known to be riddled with corruption at all levels; as Guy summarizes, 'nominations to offices were overtly traded' (about £200 for a minor post, and up to £4 000 for a major and lucrative office) and the Household, Exchequer, and the Court of Wards 'were all the subject of spectacular scandals.'[120] The crown's limited finances ironically meant that, in spite of this black market for posts, in the 1590s fewer peerages were created, fewer knighthoods given, and many Lord Lieutenancies were allowed to fall vacant. (According to Guy, 'sixteen were left unfilled for as long as three years, seven for as long as ten years, and thirteen were vacant in 1603.') At the same time and for the same reasons, in a reflection of the general situation

[118] Guy, 'The 1590s', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 8.

[119] See also Simon Adams, 'The patronage of the crown in Elizabethan politics: the 1590s in perspective', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, ed. Guy, pp. 20-45.

[120] Guy, 'The 1590s', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 8.

discussed earlier, literary patronage from the Queen and her officials was seen to be almost extinct.[121]

The problem with this was that loyal and diligent subjects working for the stability of the realm went largely unrewarded, and ambitions went unfulfilled. Moreover, the lack of Lord Lieutenants weakened county government in a particularly difficult period, as they were often in charge of 'law and order, management of food supplies, detection of recusants, and enforcement of economic regulations.' [122] More generally, by 1598 the country had also lost several major figures of central government, with the deaths of Robert Dudley Earl of Leicester in 1588, Sir Walter Mildmay in 1589, Leicester's brother Ambrose Earl of Warwick and Sir Francis Walsingham in 1590, Sir Christopher Hatton in 1591, and Lord Burghley himself in 1598.[123] The loss of such important figures provoked power struggles as (alongside those competing for the remaining socio-political patronage) politicians sought control of the Privy Council, royal policy – and the succession.[124]

The long-standing succession question had become acute by the late 1590s. The Queen was nearly seventy, and moreover seemed to remain under

[121] Anna Bayman, *Thomas Dekker and the Culture of Pamphleteering in Early Modern London* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), p. 61; Fox, 'The Decline of Literary Patronage', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, ed. Guy, p. 240.

[122] Guy, 'The 1590s', *The Reign of Elizabeth*, p. 5.

[123] Duncan-Jones, 'Elizabeth's Last Two Years', *Resurrecting Elizabeth*, p. 44; Levin, *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 20; J. E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1934), p. 331.

[124] Levin, *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 21; Paul E. J. Hammer, 'Patronage at Court, faction and the earl of Essex', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, ed. Guy, p. 66; Guy, 'The 1590s', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 7-8.

threat from what Sir John Harington had called in 1601 'the many evil plots and designs'; or, at least, as Susan Frye puts it:

> Apparently the number of plots on Elizabeth's life increased as she aged; certainly, the suspicion of such plots increased.[125]

To give some indication of the extent of threat or paranoia, at least six alleged plots leading to treason trials were publicly acknowledged by the government in the last decade of Elizabeth's reign (namely: the Hesketh Plot in 1593; an attempt by Spanish-backed English exiles Edmund Yorke, Richard Williams, and Henry Young, and separately by the Irishmen Patrick O'Collun, John Annias, and William Polwhele, and the Lopez Plot, all in 1594; in 1597, another supposed Spanish/exiled English Catholic plot by Edward Squire; and, in 1601, the Essex Rebellion).[126]

Yet the Queen continued to refuse to name an heir. According to her godson and favourite, she had long been convinced

> that if she should allow and permit men to examine, discuss and publish whose was the best title after her, some would be ready to affirm that title to be good afore hers.[127]

Moreover, in 1561 she had explained to the Scottish ambassador William Maitland of Lethington (who hoped to convince her to name Mary Queen of Scots her heir):

---

[125] *The Letters and Epigrams of Sir John Harington*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930), p. 389; Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 104.

[126] See Francis Edwards, *Plots and Plotters in the Reign of Elizabeth I* (Dublin and Portland, OR: Four Courts, 2002).

[127] John Harington, *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown (AD 1602)*, ed. Clements R. Markham (London: J. B. Nichols, 1880), p. 40; Leanda De Lisle, *After Elizabeth: How James King of Scots Won the Crown of England in 1603* (London: Harper Collins, 2005), p. 5.

> I know the inconstancy of the people of England, how they ever mislike the present government and has their eye fixed upon that person that is next to succeed. […] I have good experience of myself in my sister's [reign] how desirous men were that I should be in place, and earnest to set me up. And if I would have consented, I know what enterprises would have been attempted to bring it to pass, and now perhaps affections of some are altered.[128]

Even un-nominated, the Scottish Queen would go on to fulfil these fears in the 1580s, by which time Elizabeth had still more reason to stand by her stated opinion. The intervening years had witnessed extreme tensions between Philip II of Spain and his eldest son Don Carlos (who died in prison, accused of plotting against his father) in the 1560s; the 1568 deposition and assassination of Erik XIV of Sweden by his brother Duke John of Finland; between Charles IX of France and the Duke of Anjou and, when Anjou legitimately succeeded his brother, between the new Henri III and the Duke of Alençon in the 1570s.[129] In 1571, a parliamentary statute 13 Elizabeth I c.1 made it treason to discuss the succession.

While silence may have been an understandable political move on the part of the Queen in terms of her own safety, it left her subjects fearful, combative, and seeking both reassurance and knowledge. As PART 1 discusses in detail, from the 1590s until the Queen's death a vicious and illegal pamphlet war raged on the subject of the succession and its many potential claimants, serving only to increase popular and elite anxiety.[130] One of the most prominent authors, the Puritan MP

---

[128] Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. Leah S. Marcus, Janel M. Mueller, Mary Beth Rose (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002), p. 66.

[129] Levin, *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 82; De Lisle, *After Elizabeth*, p. 5.

[130] Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977), p. 95; Mortimer Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question, 1558-1568* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966), pp. 89-90. See also Lisa Hopkins, *Drama and the Succession to the Crown, (cont.)*

Peter Wentworth, was sent to the Tower for openly petitioning Elizabeth in Parliament to name her heir.[131] At the same time, Alexandra Gajda has demonstrated that popular literature on civil war and disordered succession became intensely popular, while the Queen herself (as most studies of late Elizabethan representations show) was increasingly presented as an immortal, immutable figure who would not therefore abandon her subjects to conflict.[132] A fictional comfort, if not a practical one.

Central to both the main political issues threatening to destabilize the realm (the succession question and the power struggles within government) was the momentous rivalry between Sir Robert Cecil and Robert Devereux Earl of Essex. While there is considerable debate about the extent of factionalism in the late Elizabethan court more widely – whether '[t]he politics of collegiality were replaced by the politics of competition', in Simon Adams' phrase – this contest is indisputable.[133] Theirs was an ideological battle as well as a personal one. Essex

1561-1633 (Farnham: Ashgate: 2011) and Jean-Christophe Mayer (ed.), *The Struggle for the Succession in Late Elizabethan England: Politics, Polemics and Cultural Representations* (Montpellier: Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, 2004).

[131] Peter Lake, 'The King (The Queen) and the Jesuit: James Stuart's *True Law of Free Monarchies* in context/s', *Transactions of the Royal Historical* Society, 6th Series, 14 (2004), p. 247; John E. Neale, 'Peter Wentworth', *English Historical Review* 39 (1924), pp. 185-7, 195-8.

[132] Alexandra Gajda, 'The Earl of Essex and "politic history"', *Essex: The Cultural Impact of an Elizabethan Courtier*, ed. Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 237-259.

[133] Simon Adams, *Leicester and the Court: Essays on Elizabethan Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p.45. On the one hand (following J. E. Neale) John Guy, Carole Levin, Simon Adams, Paul Hammer argue for pervasive faction; on the other Janet Dickinson, who believes that Essex and a small circle became increasingly alienated from the mainstream of the Court and *(cont.)*

wanted to draw England into a new, aggressive international military strategy, while Cecil (and the Queen) believed in remaining primarily defensive (engaging only in what was necessary, John Guy explains, 'to keep the power of Philip II at bay and prevent Spain from seizing control of the French Channel ports or intervening in Ireland').[134] Between about 1594 and 1601 Essex was in secret communication with King James in Scotland, seeking to help secure a Jacobean succession and consequently to guarantee his own precedence in the new regime – and with it (he assumed) the fulfilment of his strategic ends.[135] If we take him at his word, he seems to have believed that Cecil on the other hand was intriguing for another claimant: first, he assumed, Lady Arbella Stuart; then, he believed, the Spanish Infanta.[136]

The rivalry culminated in Essex's rebellion on 8 February 1601 (and his trial and execution the same month), a tragicomedy well enough known to need no extensive repetition here (but evocatively narrated with great detail by Janet Dickinson in *Court Politics and The Earl of Essex, 1598-1601*).[137] In short: after a tense month during which Essex 'summoned his friends and followers' to his London residence, and refused 'to appear before the [Privy] Council and explain himself', on 8 February

Government (*Court Politics and the Earl of Essex, 1589-1601* [London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011], p. 78).

[134] Guy, 'The 1590s', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 7.

[135] De Lisle, *After Elizabeth*, pp. 30-1; Croft, *King James*, p. 45.

[136] Gajda, 'The Earl of Essex and "politic history"', *Essex*, p. 242, and *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 203.

[137] Dickinson, *Court Politics*, pp. 43-64.

> Essex and a group of between 100 and 200 of his friends and followers left Essex House and went into the city, apparently intending to mount an attempt to take control of the Tower and the Court and to force their way to the Queen.

In the City, receiving none of the support (armed or otherwise) they had expected, and confronted instead by the troops of Lord Burghley at Gracechurch Street and Sir John Leveson at Ludgate, most of the rebels fled. The remainder were driven back to Essex House where, after a few hours, they surrendered. During the subsequent investigation, the conspirators consistently argued that (as Francis Bacon explained in his official *Declaration of the Practises and Treasons Attempted and Committed by Robert, Late Earle of Essex*) they had meant the Queen no harm:

> The second act [was to be] that my Lord should present himselfe to her Majestie as prostrating himselfe at her feete, and desire the remove of such persons, as he called his enemies, from about her.[138]

Yet some also admitted that Essex had planned to call a Parliament to reform the government and to settle the issue of the succession. They unanimously claimed that this would be in favour of James VI.[139] The official interpretation, however, was that (in the words of the attorney-general Sir Edward Coke) Essex '*affected to be* Robert *the first of that name King of England*' for 'How long liveth Richard the 2 after he was surprised in the same waie?'[140] Subjects all over the country were

---

[138] Francis Bacon, *A Declaration of the Practises & Treasons attempted and committed by Robert late Earle of Essex and his complices* (London: Robert Barker, 1601), E1v.

[139] Gajda, *The Earl of Essex*, p. 53 (discussing: TNA, SPD Elizabeth I, SP 12/278/125 f. 144v; SP 12/278/89 f.144v; SP 12/279/11 f.17v [*State Papers Online*]).

[140] William Camden, *Annales, or, The History of the most renowned and victorious Princesse Elizabeth, late Queen of England*, 3rd Edition (London: B. Fisher, 1635), p. 544; see also Andrew Hiscock, '"Achilles alter": the heroic lives and afterlives of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex', *Essex: The Cultural Impact*, p. 117.

informed in required sermons that Essex had aimed 'to sett the crowne of England uppon his owne head'.[141]

Modern critical opinion is divided as to what Essex's intentions at the start of 1601 had been. Christopher Haigh for example believes the government's official account to the letter, while Mervyn James reads the conspirators' actions as a 'last honour revolt […] aimed merely at forcing access to the Queen in order to present their grievances.'[142] Janet Dickinson, Alexandra Gajda, and Paul Hammer are more measured and ambivalent, arguing in general that, while it seems unlikely the Earl wanted the crown for himself, his actions on 8 February were manifestly treasonous in and of themselves even if the extent to which he hoped to usurp power (in forcing the Queen's hand to alter her government and declare the succession) is unknowable.[143]

In the context of the political conditions of the end of Elizabeth's reign, however, his true intentions are almost irrelevant. For England in 1601 the Essex Rebellion and its aftermath constituted a profoundly unsettling crisis that exposed the tensions, deception, and instability at the highest level of government. If the official line were believed, it revealed how exposed the state was to an attempted coup d'état by a powerful (if disgraced) subject. If it were seen as false, then faith in the Queen and her government were severely damaged. Essex and his followers

[141] 'A Direction for Preachers of the Privy Council of 14 February 1601', TNA SPD Elizabeth I, SP 12/278/63 f. 108r, quoted in Gajda, *The Earl of Essex*, p. 32, also through *State Papers Online*.

[142] Mervyn James, *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 416.

[143] Dickinson, *Court Politics*, pp. 44-5; for Gajda, Hammer, and Haigh, see BIBLIOGRAPHY.

had become increasingly alienated from the mainstream of the Court and government, but he seemed to remain popular with ordinary subjects (although Gajda has persuasively argued that this was far less prevalent than has been assumed). It was therefore profoundly important for the government to demonstrate the rebels' guilt. They aimed to do so in their decision to present Essex as a usurper at the trial, in the 'Directions for Preachers' which ordered this interpretation to be declaimed from every pulpit, and in its publication in accounts by William Barlow and Francis Bacon, to name a handful of core examples. Yet in the weeks following Essex's arrest, at least two attempts to free the Earl were made by ordinary subjects, one by a single soldier, but the other by a group of apprentices 'rumoured to be 5 000 strong'.[144] In the weeks following his execution, there were accounts of widespread popular anger. When Barlow delivered his account as a sermon at Paul's Cross on 1 March, for example, it was 'very offensively taken of the common sort' – forcing the clergyman, according to Leanda De Lisle, to 'fle[e] the pulpit in fear of his life.'[145] (Contextually, it is also worth bearing in mind that both France and Austria had seen 'major peasant rebellions' in the late sixteenth century, and '[s]eventeenth-century authorities were constantly worried by the "humours" of the populace'[146]). In any case, both

[144] Gajda, *The Earl of Essex*, p. 30-33, 45-47, 203-11.

[145] Duncan-Jones, 'Elizabeth's Last Two Years', *Resurrecting Elizabeth*, p. 42; De Lisle, *After Elizabeth*, p. 40 (quoting Historical Manuscripts Commission [HMC], Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, 2 vols., I.373).

[146] Joseph Bergin, 'Introduction: The Uncertain Prospect', *The Seventeenth Century: Europe 1598-1715*, ed. Joseph Bergin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 7-8.

readings were profoundly worrying and degraded trust in, and the popularity of, the Queen's government.

Essex himself may offer a personal measure of the national atmosphere in the these last Elizabethan years in his private writing. At Christmas 1600, he wrote to King James, describing a Cecilian plot to 'prepare a way for an unjust succession hereafter' and concluding, '[n]ow doth reason, honor and conscience command me to be active.'[147] Dickinson points out that, in the aftermath of his conviction, he was 'quick to withdraw the accusation, and plausibly argues that this

> suggests something of the intensity and paranoia that had gripped the earl and his followers [...] but which appears to have dissipated remarkably quickly.[148]

The last years of Elizabeth's reign were years of war, poverty, economic sanctions, scarcity, uncertain future, and a divided government under the leadership of an aging monarch. Even without the Essex Rebellion, the Queen's popularity with her younger subjects was failing.[149] There were reasons to be anxious and disconsolate.

However, it must also be acknowledged that these were tempered by many positive political and cultural aspects to Elizabeth's final years. Records show that while English economic growth did slow, it did – remarkably – continue at a time of Europe-wide agricultural and economic pressure.[150] With Essex gone,

[147] Gajda, *The Earl of Essex*, p. 39.
[148] Dickinson, *Court Politics*, p. 81.
[149] De Lisle, *After Elizabeth*, p. 12.
[150] Guy, 'The 1590s', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 10.

Cecil was able to consolidate control and stabilize the central government and move discreetly towards peace with Spain.[151] The last parliament of the reign, in October 1601, was the occasion of Elizabeth's famous Golden Speech, and promised that many of the unpopular monopolies would be revoked, alongside wider reforms.[152] The popular reactions to the threats to the Queen's life were dramatic, indicating her continued popularity (but also a fear for the unresolved issue of the succession). The 'mythic and rhetorical love affair between Elizabeth and her subjects' (first seen in Birch's *A songe* around 1558) is, Katherine Duncan-Jones points out, 'characteristic of this period.' Moreover, she convincingly argues that the two years from the Essex Rebellion to the Queen's death 'can be seen as possibly the richest, most inventive two-year period in the whole of late Elizabethan culture.' Yet Duncan-Jones also concludes that in these two years,

> divergent and contrasting literary genres compete for dominance in this period: bitter social satire, on the one hand, and hyperbolic royal panegyric, on the other.[153]

Satire and Panegyric: remarkably apt, given the ambivalent political and cultural conditions of the final years of Elizabeth's reign. In 1603-4, therefore, the peaceful resolution of the succession, and the arrival of a new and relatively young King with a growing family, the end of the foreign wars, the rehabilitation of popular

[151] Pauline Croft, 'Rex Pacificus, Robert Cecil, and the 1604 Peace with Spain', *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, ed. Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer, and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), pp. 140-154.
[152] Duncan-Jones, 'Elizabeth's Last Two Years', *Resurrecting Elizabeth*, p. 40.
[153] Duncan-Jones, 'Elizabeth's Last Two Years', *Resurrecting Elizabeth*, p. 34-5.

figures disgraced by Essex's Rebellion, and James's immediate liberality with peerages and knighthoods could easily have provoked optimism.[154]

Fourth, in this context straightforward opportunism may also have motivated the increased production of published accession verse, inspired by the possibilities for profit and advancement offered by a new government (especially one led by a monarch with an established interested in poetry), and the attendant major events. At the same time, however, as H. S. Bennett poetically concluded:

> an author was lucky if he got a few pounds for his work and a small number of copies which he could sell here and there. If men wrote books we are forced to believe that, by and large, it was not for money.[155]

(This is discussed in detail in PART 2.) Opportunism would be supported by the earlier discussion of the demands of the commercial book trade and audience, and is reflected in the fact that the publishers, printers, and booksellers (like the poets and readers) were drawn from across the spectrum for the London book trade. A handful of examples, according the *English Short Title Catalogue* and *British Book Traders' Index*, give some indication of this and are indicative of the whole. The printer of *A Souldier's Wish*, John Har[r]ison, was one of a family of printers, publishers, and booksellers who worked mainly on items of religious or historical interest – and who sold Pricket's pamphlet in their own shop. I. F.'s bookseller, Thomas Pavier, sold material like news pamphlets and popular treatises, relevant to contemporary life. Daniel, however, chose to have his *Panegyric* handled, like his earlier works, by Edward Blount and Valentine Simmes respectively. Blount

[154] Frederick Charles Dietz, *English Public Finance: 1558-1641*, 2nd Edition (London: Cass, 1964), p. 101.

[155] Bennett, *English Books and Readers*, III.2-3.

tended to stock writing about the Continent and translations, both Classical and modern (particularly interesting in the context of Daniel's choice of genre); Simmes was a master literary printer, with experience of major poetry, plays, sermons, and histories. In contrast, John Savile's *King James His Entertainment at Theobalds* seems to have been the first extant item sold by the T[homas] Este, until then a printer of music and handbooks.

Correspondingly, from the point of view of the readers, the popularity of the publications may indicate that they were being treated as souvenirs of a major national event, an antecedent of the tea towels and mugs of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, commemorating the perceived promise of the moment, comparable with what Marotti has called 'the commodification of cultural artefacts'.[156] This had happened once before, at the accession of Elizabeth, in the printed text of her Coronation pageant by Richard Mulcaster. Roy Strong has described this as 'a landmark':

> It ensured that those who had not been in the streets could relive the experience. Even those who were could […] understand what the pageants had said.[157]

Perhaps, for the Renaissance Protestant reader, these souvenirs might be most reassuring in the form of words as opposed to trinkets, reflecting theological dominance of the 'eternall word' of God over the impermanence and fragility of 'brittle crazie glasse', to borrow the words of George Herbert; although, as Roy Strong has shown, 'talisman[ic]' cameos, miniatures, woodcuts, and engravings of

[156] Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, p. 332. See p. 222 for his discussion of 'the commercial commodification of texts in print culture' specifically.

[157] Roy Strong, *Coronation* (London: Harper Collins, 2005), p. 222.

the royal image were very popular under both Elizabeth and James.[158] There is security in the possession of souvenirs. They offer tangible proof of the intangible, usually of a memory but in this case the secure transfer of power to a trustworthy but unknown ruler. Derived from pilgrimage relics, they are an article of faith, and yet the very desire to possess tangible evidence may expose an inherent lack of belief – just like the complex and revealing persuasive framework of the accession poetry itself. In this case, the perceived precariousness of the moment of Jacobean succession provokes some (the poets) to prove that the King, and therefore England, are secure by publishing that this is so, transforming an insecure figure into a great national strength through persuasive proof (*response shaping*, *response reinforcing*, and *response changing*). It provokes others to desire to read such proof, for reassurance; hence, the exceptionally vigorous market, the scope of its desired audience, the actual diversity and number of poets and readers – and, within the poetry itself, the complex strategies seeking to involve and convince the reader.

7: A SURVEY OF THE CRITICAL FIELD.

This aspect of Jacobean accession poetry exemplifies another condition identified in propaganda and communication theory, the *active audience*, which not only engages with the text but (crucially) 'seeks to have its needs fulfilled by the persuader'. In other words, this thesis will demonstrate that many Jacobean accession poems are a transaction between poet and reader, seeking to achieve a

[158] George Herbert, 'The Windows', *The English Poems of George Herbert*, ed. Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 246; Roy Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography, Vol. 2: Elizabethan* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995), p. 6.

mutually beneficial security through their perception of the figure of King James. As Jowett and O'Donnell continue:

> Persuasion is a reciprocal process in which both parties are dependent on one another. It is a [...] continuous and dynamic process of co-creating meaning. The persuader who understands that persuasion is interactive or a transaction in which both parties approach a message-event and use it to attempt to fulfill needs will never assume a passive audience.[159]

The use of persuasive modes and devices in Jacobean accession verse, alongside its wider content, the quantity, and speed with which it was produced, and the diversity of its authors and audience – all of which were unusual if not unprecedented in literature marking an accession – are facets of a hitherto unrecognized complexity responding to the promise and threat of the moment, which distinguishes it from conventional panegyric or encomia. However, the only discussion of this writing as a collection is Charles Bazerman's unpublished 1971 thesis, 'Verse Occasioned by the Death of Queen Elizabeth I and the Accession of King James I'. The dissertation takes the form of a bibliography, based largely on the Stationers' Register. While this was clearly a demanding piece of scholarship, its usefulness, even as a bibliography, has been superseded by the development of the international electronic catalogues and databases, and their arrival has shown Bazerman's findings to be incomplete (tracing about a third of the poems). His thesis recognises them as a collection of 'books about the change in crown', but does not extrapolate or draw further conclusions. In recognizing the value of grouping these texts but without analysing them together, Bazerman follows the eighteenth-century Shakespeare critic Edmund Malone, whose library contained a

[159] Jowett and O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion*, p. 32-3.

volume of twelve accession poems, bound together as *Old Poetry &c.*, and nineteenth-century antiquary John Nichols, compiler and editor of *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I* and *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court*.[160] Until relatively recently, Jacobean accession poetry seems only to have been of antiquarian and curio interest.

More recently, when they have been considered at all, literary critics have discussed the poems as part of a wider analysis of elegy (in the work of Dennis Kay, and others) or panegyric (in the work of Curtis Perry and David Norbrook), religious poetry (Daniel W. Doerksen and James Doelman), or Spenserian poetry (Matthew Woodcock).[161] However, looking at individual poems out of the context of the wider accession group leads critics to make inaccurate assumptions such as that, for example, 'The welcoming literature praised the new King for those attributes desired of any monarch' in 'idealized generalities'. Judith M. Richards also suggests that, due to the various national anxieties about James in poetry,

> the new King was welcomed in unexceptionably general terms, acclaimed most often for the promise he brought with him for a secure succession.[162]

Kevin Sharpe, Helen Hackett, and Catherine Loomis consider several of the poems, but from the Elizabethan aspect. In general relevance to all this criticism,

---

[160] J. O. Halliwell, *A Hand-list of the Early English Literature Preserved in the Malone Collection in the Bodleian Library* (London: [private circulation,] 1860), p. 294. Bodleian Library, Malone 294.

[161] See BIBLIOGRAPHY for details of these critical works.

[162] Judith M. Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender, and the Personal Monarchy of England', *English Historical Review* 117: 472 (2002), pp. 519-20.

analysing the poems as either elegy or panegyric robs them of much of their interest and complexity. The poems often mingle Elizabeth's death and James's accession, and are therefore neither purely elegy for Elizabeth, nor panegyric for James, although they have facets of both. Considering them out of context strips them of much of their meaning and complexity. More widely, few works on Elizabethan or Jacobean iconography consider the poems at all, or if they do it is again individually or in a very small selection.

The presentation of James I in 1603-4 is particularly interesting because, although we see the emergence of recognizable Jacobean imagery, it is more often remarkably different to his presentation in later Jacobean literature. Jonathan Goldberg's approach in *James I and the Politics of Literature* is representative of another problem in the reading of the accession poems: valid criticism on later Jacobean iconography is misleading in the context of the poetry of 1603-4. For example, Goldberg's James must always be the 'articulate and visible centre of society', whose 'characteristic discursive strategies are inevitably reproduced in the writings of his subjects.'[163] Yet in 1603-4, a key provocation and facet of the poems is the King's literal, noticeable, and unsettling absence and then, after he is established in London, his silence. Far too much agency is placed with the King, in the context of his literary presentation at the start of his English reign. Consequently, Goldberg's use of the several accession poems to illustrate an argument with which they are – interestingly – incompatible, leads to

[163] Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1983), p. xi; Curtis Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 15.

irresponsible and misleading selective quotation, often taken strikingly out of time and context, and entirely ignoring themes which do not fit with the wider argument. Ben Jonson's 'Panegyre' and scenes for the Royal Entry of March 1604, both printed in *B. Jon: His Part of King James his Royall and Magnificent Entertainement* at the very end of the accession verse period in April 1604, are taken as representative of the English presentation of the King at his accession. What becomes clear, as soon as the poems are considered more widely, however, is quite how unusual Jonson's presentation of King James was at the time – Jonson was helping to establish the later, dominant, Classical iconography of King James, while most poems of 1603-4 are more concerned with established Tudor medievalism and images of mythic Britain. But these striking differences are in themselves an indication that the accession poems deserve specific attention – more comprehensive understanding of the early development of the representation of the King only enriches the appreciation of the development of his later imagery and presentation. There is indeed a New Historicist collaboration between interests of rulers and the desires of the ruled.

In a similar way, in his work of Tudor and Stuart iconography and painting, Roy Strong tends to draw examples from after 1612 (the year of Prince Henry's death which, it is generally accepted, radically altered the tone of the Jacobean Court). The approach contributes to an overly simple view of the representation of James, which takes the King's iconography as a monolith that blends with the representation of his son Charles I. However, several aspects of Strong's work have been vital to the formulation and structuring of the idea of an early Jacobean iconography in this thesis. First, his wider concept of the royal 'icon' and,

developing the work of Frances Yates, the 'evolv[ing] Idea of monarchy' in which 'the cult of crowned heads' begins to emerge as 'the inherited attributes of the medieval *rois thaumaturges*', 'the virtues of the Erasmian Christian Prince, the role of the monarch as hero and Caesar', are combined with that of a 'messianic' figure. Second, the thoroughness of his approach to Elizabethan iconography, and recognition of the role of 'allegory and myth in sustaining and elaborating that Idea'. Third, the demonstration within his work of the national importance and 'talismanic' quality of the Queen's image from the 1580s to the end of her reign.[164]

The following studies of royal representations (Tudor and Stuart, as well as Elizabethan and Jacobean) have also been useful. In terms of critical support and wider thinking, John Watkins firmly challenges the widely held idea (put forward by critics including Patrick Collinson, Lisa Richardson, and Alexandra Walsingham) that 'Stuart writing about Elizabeth was nostalgic and oppositional'. Watkins also introduces the idea that a monarch like Elizabeth could come to 'epitomized the experience of the people.'[165] In terms of methodology, Jean Wilson's choice to view Elizabethan iconography through 'years of transition and establishment' when 'the nature of the Elizabethan regime was being formulated and accepted' was highly influential in terms of finding clarity in addressing a liminal period.[166] Louis Montrose's discussions of the mutual dependence of monarch and panegyrist, and of virginity tropes, were useful in terms of how to

[164] Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy*, pp. 5-6, 239.

[165] John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart Literature: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 6; Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, p. 78.

[166] Jean Wilson, *Entertainments for Elizabeth I* (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980), p. 2.

approach contrasting but complimentary strands of iconographic discussion. E. C. Wilson's study of 'the idealization of Queen Elizabeth in the poetry of her age' was particularly interesting in its arrangement of the verse into a narrative under different aspects of the Queen's imagery (an approach he originated), but also in his identification of the role of latent aspects in poems about the Queen. While this thesis does not follow such a structure exactly, the arrangement of PART ONE in particular and the lone treatment of James's 'poet' aspect are inspired by Wilson's approach.

Most influential, however, for both reference and methodology, however, was Helen Hackett's *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, as the start of this INTRODUCTION has explained; likewise Kevin Sharpe's *Selling the Tudors* and *Image Wars*. Sharpe has provided a useful ally in recognizing the value of understanding propaganda when approaching certain literature. Sharpe's ideas (themselves derived from Terry Eagleton) of 'ideology' and the 'fixing of meaning in literature and art' have been very useful in analysing the philosophy of the accession verse; likewise, his understanding of 'the concept of representation' and its problems, particularly with regard to reception, influenced the initial approach to the texts. As Sharpe explains

> Emphasis on the constructed nature of symbolic systems has brought with it a greater awareness of their artifice and vulnerability. [...] Few historians have read between the lines to consider the uncertainties and anxieties that Tudor images, in words or on canvas, were endeavouring to overcome. It is time to consider the vulnerabilities as well as the strengths of early modern polities and the processes deployed to manage that vulnerability.

Yet, where Sharp's iconographic work is monumental and wide-ranging, it is hoped that the particular strength of this thesis is in its focus and detail. It is possible to

do this in the context of the accession verse of 1603-4 only because – unlike Sharpe's studies – the thesis approaches monarchic representation from the side of popular representation rather than the more limited opportunities for analysing 'self-representation'.

On the other hand, the narrative of the days leading up to the death of Queen Elizabeth and proclamation of King James on 24 March 1603 has been vividly related by G. P. V. Akrigg in *Jacobean Pageant: The Court of King James*, Helen Hackett in *Virgin Mother,* Roy Strong in *The Cult of Elizabeth*, and Catherine Loomis in *The Death of Elizabeth*; the weeks after, from a Jacobean angle, by Pauline Croft in *King James I* (also the most objective biography of the King so far). Vivid contemporary accounts of James's first journey from Edinburgh to London can also be read in John Savile's *King James His Entertainment at Theobalds, with his Welcome to London* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1603) and T. M.'s *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Majestie, from the time of his Departure from Edenbrough, till his receiving at London* (London: Thomas Creede for Thomas Millington, 1603). In *After Elizabeth: How James King of Scots Won the Crown of England in 1603*, Leanda De Lisle provides a compelling and detailed overview of the social and political events of the accession year as a whole.

Similarly, analysis of the social and political preparation for, and consequences of, the accession of James I can be found in the work of the historians Akrigg, Croft, Rickard, Susan Doran, Michael Questier, Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer, and Jason Lawrence.

Likewise, in related criticism, Lori Ann Ferrell, Peter McCullough, and Mary Morrissey discuss sermons literature responding to the topic of the

Elizabethan Succession, and Jacobean Accession. David M. Bergeron, Graham Parry, Gabriel Heaton, Anne Lancashire, and Lawrence Manley have investigated (from a variety of disciplines) the Royal Entry pageants of March 1604; moreover, this thesis developed from a Masters dissertation on the presentation of King James in the pageants of Ben Jonson, Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton, and Stephen Harrison. Kevin Quarmby looks at 'Disguised Ruler' drama, and Andrew Hadfield, Lisa Hopkins and Janet Clare have looked more widely at Tudor and Stuart drama and the subject of succession. More widely, Jenny Womald has analysed the English reception of James's political tracts, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Lawe of Free Monarchies*. Wormald and Perry, along with Peter C. Herman, have discussed the writing of James VI and I itself. The independent (though related) topics of the genesis of the Union Project (which came to a head in 1606) and plague pamphlets of 1603-4 are beyond the scope of this thesis, but are discussed respectively by Bruce Galloway and Daniel Cadman. Later nostalgia for Elizabeth is discussed by Nicola Watson and Michael Dobson, Julia M. Walker, and John Watkins.

However, this thesis alters all of these established areas of research by adding a new facet to the understanding of sermon literature, political pamphlets, and drama of the first years of James's reign, and later pageant literature, through appreciation of the dominant and influential literary trend of 1603-4. (In recognition of the importance of accession literature more widely, the Arts and Humanities Research Council has now established a project based at the Universities of Oxford and Exeter, to create a database of all Stuart accession literature and thus encourage further research into the area.) The Scottish and

neo-Latin literary reaction to their King's accession to the English throne also warrants further attention. The Latin texts are now easily accessible, thanks to the translations in the 2014 edition *of John Nichols's The Progresses and Processions of Queen Elizabeth I*. More widely, Nichols's anthologies represent a useful starting point for the literature of the period. Other early reference points beyond the texts outlined above included *The English Short Title Catalogue*, *The Stationers' Register*, and the catalogues of the British Library, Oxford and Cambridge Universities, and the *Early English Books Online* database.

This thesis discusses the poems published to mark the accession of King James I in 1603. It breaks new ground in discussing these poems as a group and according them details attention. There has been considerably more attention to panegyric of Elizabeth I than to that of her successor, and the thesis makes a case that this must be redressed, because the volume of Jacobean accession verse was unprecedented and because this was a particularly complex cultural moment. The year of his accession forms a distinctive and fraught cultural moment that rewards examination in its own right.

8: THE STRUCTURE OF *1603. A WONDERFUL YEARE: LITERARY RESPONSES TO THE ACCESSION OF JAMES I.*

The scope of this thesis is printed poetry in English, published in England between March 1603 and mid-May 1604, which takes as its subject the accession of James VI of Scotland as James I of England. The structure and organization is determined by the two central persuasive interests in printed poetry of 1603-4, united by the expression of mingled hope and fear:

PART ONE is about hope and promise for the country. It explores how printed poetry of 1603-4 seeks to address the uncertainty and fragility, both social and political, that arose from popular fears about the accession; and to dissuade dissenters (and make secure and unassailable the throne, and thereby the state of England), through celebration of the new monarch. Perceived legal, political, and dynastic concerns were exacerbated by concrete difficulties when James was proclaimed King of England. An English Jacobean icon was configured to accommodate and address these threats and hazards, neutralizing fears surrounding the idea of the accession with confidence in the idea of the King it brings. In the texts that respond to James's accession we observe his appropriation as a figure of hope and promise. PART Two looks to more personal hopes and fears, albeit within the national context. It considers how the poets engage with the King's own established iconography and intentions, publicly available to view within his own writing. The image that is already established there has the potential either to obstruct or to enable national an personal causes and ambitions (whether political, religious, or cultural). The poetry therefore develops strategies to negotiate with and so appropriate the King's own self-fashioning. Together, using the only things that are concrete about their unknown new King, the poems shape perceptions and create and reinforce responses, in line with their own social, religious and political desires, both personal and national. They manipulate, often very skilfully, public and private perception and representation to forge real politics. In the precarious moment of succession, the poems seek to transform an insecure and undetermined figure into a symbol that represents – and so enables – promise and hope.

PART 1: 'HAILE KINGLY JAMES, FOES TERROR, ENGLANDS PRIDE': PROMISE, PROPAGANDA, AND THE PRESENTATION OF JAMES I.

When James VI of Scotland was proclaimed James I of England on 24 March 1603, the poetic pamphlets that greeted his accession presented him as a figure of hope and promise for the country now under his rule. He would, they suggested, fulfil Protestant Humanist desires: he was a heroic monarch who could lead the country to imperial glory as the bastion for Europe's faithful and elect – and he was, therefore, a model working within established English Protestant ideas. However, Lasswellian content analysis can provide a helpful bridge between the fields of propaganda theory and literary criticism, analysing the frequency with which particular symbols appear in a text, their direction, and their intensity.[1] In the case of accession poems, it reveals hitherto unrecognized concerns that the new King might also be a figure of threat to the very national strength and Protestant progress for which he was being touted as champion. In *1603. The Wonderfull Yeare*, Thomas Dekker even compares the mood in London with:

> that same terrible 88. which came sayling hither in the Spanish Armada, and made mens hearts colder than the frozen Zone.[2]

This chapter explores how printed poetry of 1603-4 seeks to address the uncertainty and fragility, both social and political, that arose from popular fears about the accession; and to dissuade dissenters (and make secure and unassailable the throne, and thereby the state of England), through celebration of the new monarch.

Perceived legal, political, and dynastic concerns about the accession of James Stuart were exacerbated by concrete difficulties: when James was proclaimed King of

---

[1] Harold Lasswell, 'Describing the Contents of Communication', *Propaganda, Communication, and Public Opinion*, ed. B. L. Smith, H. D. Lasswell, and R. D. Casey (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946), pp. 74-94.

[2] Dekker, *1603*, B4v.

England, he was more than fifty miles from the English border (only reaching London for the first time in early May); his absence was further prolonged by plague; this plague also deferred the immediate sanction of public festivities that should have accompanied his July coronation. Printed English accession poetry invented an English Jacobean icon to accommodate and address these hazards, neutralizing fears surrounding the idea of the accession with confidence in the idea of the king it brings. The King's appropriation as a figure of hope and promise can be seen in the poems that respond to the 1603 accession.

David Norbrook has written that 'Renaissance poetry seemed to show that artistic forms could resolve political problems'; the writing that responds to James's accession attempts a mutually beneficial *manufacture of consent*.[3] Their persuasive techniques correspond with the influential 'Collective Myths' posited by Jacques Ellul: of Work; of Happiness; of the Nation; of Youth, and lastly but most importantly, of the Hero. These 'myths' are, according to Ellul, based on 'great collective sociological presuppositions' that a society believes will lead them to 'happiness', 'development', 'progress', or conversely 'crisis'. Collective Myths 'are man's principal orientations'.[4] The ideas of Ellul, Lippmann, Lasswell, and their disciples can in fact be seen to codify the ideal of Sir Philip Sidney's 'right popular philosopher', who:

> doth not only show the way, but giveth so sweet a prospect into the way, as will entice any man to enter into it.[5]

[3] Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 3; for the *manufacture of consent*, see General Introduction.

[4] Jacques Ellul, *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*, trans. Konrad Kellen and Jean Lerner (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), pp. 38-41.

[5] Philip Sidney, 'The Defence of Poesy', *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Brian Vickers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 353, 358.

Readers were prepared to receive texts in this way, as Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker clearly explain:

> the ideology of humanism sought the textual production of the Christian commonwealth and virtuous subject, the practices of humanism, its curriculum of exegesis and rhetoric, opened the book to alternative interpretation. As well as directing and policing readers, that is, humanism educated and enabled readers to perform their own readings, and to construct their own, often dissenting, values and polities. […] The Protestant emphasis on individual conscience and personal scripturalism, on each godly man's reading and wrestling with Scripture, ultimately democratized the word.[6]

This chapter begins by outlining textual evidence for the fears surrounding the accession, in both poetry and contemporaneous sources. It then explains how the Jacobean icon evolves as a functioning persuasive device to address and counteract these fears: first, by confirming and publicizing the legitimacy of the king's claim to the throne and to Tudor mythology, alongside the promise he brings to the English royal line in the form of his heirs; second, by placing particular focus on his literary inheritance from Elizabeth; and thirdly by demonstrating national loyalty to James, encouraging his supporters, and disheartening his enemies. The chapter takes its title from the final line of the 1603 publication *King James His Welcome to London. With Elizaes Tombe and Epitaph*: 'Haile kingly James, foes terror, *Englands* pride'. It is the act of being 'haile[d]' by his subjects that allows James to assume his role as 'foes terror, *Englands* pride'; as the word order suggests, his power is the result, not the cause of this acclamation.[7] It comes from the support of his people; but it also secures their existence.

---

[6] Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker (eds.), *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 4.

[7] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, C4v.

1: 'THEN DID I FEAR THIS EARTH SHOULD DRENCHED LIE | WITH PURPLE STREAMES IN CIVILL TUMULTS SHED': PRESENTATION OF THREAT AND THE FIGURE OF KING JAMES.

This first subtitle is taken from Joseph Hall's 1603 ode *The Kings Prophecie: or Weeping Joy*. Over the course of the poem, Hall vividly contrasts the 'happy plight' of England, (Scotland,) and European Calvinism following James I's accession with the earlier 'terrour' and 'bold predictions' of what would ensue on 'that fearfull day | Which should succeed *Elizaes* latest night'.[8] He recalls his initial belief that a civil war might ensue:

> For then I fear'd to finde the frowning skie
> Cloathed in dismall black, and dreadfull red,
> Then did I feare this earth should drenched lie *3*
> With purple streames in civil tumults shed.[9]

These evocative lines allude to the Sybil's vision of 'Bella, horrida bella, | et Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine cerno' in Virgil's *Aeneid* VI (ll. 86-7), where the cause of the prophesied bloodshed is war between the rival factions of Turnus and Aeneas.[10] Hall expands on the theme of 'civil tumults' by invoking other civil wars, of late Republican Rome and the Wars of the Roses. The passage continues:

> Like when of yore in th'old Pharsalian downes, Cæsar &
> The two crosse Eagles grapled for the crowne. Pompey. *6*

[8] References in the text indicate that the poem seems to have been published in June or July 1603, but before the coronation on 25 July.

[9] Joseph Hall, *The Kings Prophecie: Or, Weeping Joy* (London: T. C[reede] for Symon Waterson, 1603), A4v.

[10] Literally: 'I foresee war, terrible war, and the Tiber foaming with much blood', or, in a contemporary translation:

> wars, dreadful wars uprising growes,
> And *Tyber* flood I see, with fomie blood how thick it flowes.

(*The Thirteene Bookes of Aeneidos*, trans. Thomas Phaër (Bks. 1-10) and Thomas Twyne (Bks. 10-12) (London: Thomas Creede, 1600), J3r.) Virgil's Sybil is herself transposing the war of *The Iliad*, foretelling its reprise in Italy.

> Or when the riper English Roses grew — Lanc. &
> On sundrie stalks, from one selfe roote ysprung, — Yorke.
> And strove so long for praise of fairer hew, *9*
> That millions of our Sires to death were stung
> With those sharp thornes that grew their sweets beside
> Or such, or worse I ween'd should now betide. *12*

Marginal glosses leave the reader in no doubt as to the allusions, and the message is plain: 'grapl[ing] for the crowne' causes the slaughter of 'millions'. Moreover, it is the 'thornes' of the 'English Roses' that causes the 'death' of the common people, demonstrating a frightening selfishness from the men who would be king.. The clergyman-satirist does not name the victor in either case; ordinary men like 'our Sires' never win in 'civil tumults'. They suffer, and they die.

However, there was one prospect even worse than violent succession. Hall (who had attended the 'Puritan stronghold' of Emmanuel College, Cambridge[11]) remembers fearing the return of Roman Catholicism to England in a frenzied and Apocalyptic vision:

> Waiting for flames of cruell Martyrdome,
> Alreadie might I see the stakes addrest,
> And that stale strumpet of imperious Rome, *3*
> Hie mounted on her seven-headed beast,
> Quaffing the bloud of Saints in boules of gold,
> Whiles all the surplus staines the guiltles mold. *6*

The vivid and horrifyingly diabolical episode seems torn straight from the Books of Revelation and the Prophets (with its imagery of the 'strumpet', 'beast', and 'Saints'), allusions intimately linked with the English Protestant struggle with Catholicism.

---

[11] The phrase is David Norbrook's, referring to the period from 1589 when Hall was first a student and then a Fellow (Norbrook, 'Panegyric of the Monarch and its Social Context under Elizabeth I and James I', University of Oxford DPhil thesis [1978], p. 129) at the college; see also Richard A. McCabe, 'Hall, Joseph (1574–1656)', *ODNB* (online edn. 2008) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11976 [accessed 18 September 2013].

Revelation was 'inextricably linked to reformation' from the sixteenth century, and a particular tradition emerged under Edward VI, that:

> The end would be characterized, as the Prophets and the Book of Revelation so vividly foretold, by wars and disasters and by a bitter struggle against Antichrist, whom most Protestants unhesitatingly identified with the Pope', and that this end was signalled by 'the reforming time of Christ's church, in these latter three hundred years.[12]

R. Malcolm Smuts expounds that John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* had:

> reinforced a tradition, already established in the writings of earlier English Protestants like John Dale [...who] interpreted contemporary history as part of the great eschatological struggle between the forces of Christ and Antichrist. Mary Stuart, the rebels of 1569, and the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572 soon took their place within the constantly unfolding story of conflicts between the chosen people and Satan's minions moving towards its apocalyptic climax. The defeat of the Armada – by the hand of God controlling winds and waves, according to the English – added a crowning touch to the legend.[13]

Hall's allusions engage with this tradition; he also calls to mind the 'cruell Martyrdome' of Protestants during Queen Mary's reign, when he continues:

> Now might I see those swarmes of Locusts sent,
> *Jesuites.* Hell's cursed off-spring, hyred slaves of *Spaine*,
> Till the world sawe, and scorned their intent,
> Of a sworne foe to make a Soveraigne;
> How could but terror with his cold affright
> Strike my weake brest upon so sad foresight?[14]

[12] Kevin Sharpe, 'Reading Revelations: Prophecy, Hermeneutics and Politics in Early Modern Britain', *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, p. 126. See also Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); George Parfitt, *English Poetry of the Seventeenth Century* (London and New York: Longman, 1985), p. 21; Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: the Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 262.

[13] R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of the Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), pp. 21-2.

[14] Hall, *The Kings Prophecie*, A4v-5v.

Almost paternalistic in its pedagogy, the marginal note ('Jesuites') again ensures that no reader misunderstands the sense. In the absence of an heir apparent, Hall explains, England was vulnerable not only to the competing claims of honourable rivals (like 'Cæsar & Pompey', 'Lancaster & York'), but to those of '*Spaine*', 'a sworne foe', and therefore what Hall sees as '*Englands* overthrow' (epitomized by the 'Locusts', the Bible's terminally destructive pest). Yet England steered between the two perils and, when '*Eliza* dyde', 'on that day':

> Began the fulnesse of our blisse appeare;
> Which dangers dimmed erst with fresh dismay.

The 'sweet hopes' brought by their new 'dreadest Soveraigne' and his 'princely sonne' trump the earlier 'leud hopes' of the traitors.[15]

Joseph Hall's *The Kings Prophecie* meets expectations of literature celebrating the happy resolution of any hazardous moment, in an extended example of paenismus (the expression of joy for blessings obtained and/or evils avoided), following the precedent, in particular, of responses to the 1588 defeat of the Armada.[16] It glorifies the success that had attended the immediate transfer of sovereignty from Elizabeth to James with a heightened retrospective of past dangers and how they were overcome. The text is peppered with stimulating and engaging allusions (to Classical epic and history, to the Prophetic Books, to recent English history and the current plague)

---

[15] Hall, *The Kings Prophecie*, A6-7r.

[16] For *paenismus*, see Gideon O. Burton (ed.), *Silva Rhetoricae* (Brigham Young University, 2007), http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/P/paenismus.htm [accessed 12 June 2014], and Gregory T. Howard, *Dictionary of Rhetorical Terms* ([n. p.]: Xlibris, 2010). (Burton's entries also collate references in Classical and Renaissance rhetoric books.) On the Armada literature, see Bertrand T. Whitehead, *Brags and Boasts: Propaganda in the Year of the Armada* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1994); Arthur Marotti and Stephen W. May, 'Two Lost Ballads of the Armada Thanksgiving Celebration', *English Literary Renaissance* 41:1 (Winter 2011), pp. 31-63; Curtis Perry, 'British Empire on the Eve of the Armada', *Studies in Philology* 108:4 (2011), pp. 508-537.

because Hall, an experienced author and enthusiastic Calvinist, is palpably excited by the promise the new King represented, and seeks to ignite similar excitement in his audience.

However, such unalloyed exaltation is unusual in 1603. William Leighton's panegyric 'Dedicated to the Kings Majestie', *Vertue Triumphant*, is comparable to *The Kings Prophecie* in terms of poetic character (including its direct address to the King), approximate publication date, and author's social status.[17] Yet the poems differ dramatically in their presentation of threats to the new King and to his country. Leighton's approach may seem surprising at first – but it is *Vertue Triumphant*, not *The Kings Prophecie*, that is representative of the literature responding to James's accession.

The following stanzas are taken from the beginning of Leighton's *Vertue Triumphant*:

> As Pharoes heart most deeply hard'ned was,
> And would not let Gods chosen people goe,
> Nor suffer them from yoking bondage passe,
> But sought their lives and hopes to overthrow:
> Through raging Sea without thought of despaire,
> God made their passage easie, drie and faire.
>
> Yet he with might and maine did still pursue
> Our Gods elected Nation to confound,
> Till in that Sea himselfe he overthrew,
> And all his host were in an instant drou'nd.
> The like, God works to those whose hate would bring
> Death to his elect, or his anointed King.

[17] References in the text indicate that both seem to have been published in June or July 1603, and both authors were provincial gentlemen and near-contemporaries. See *ODNB* (online edn. 2008) entries – Richard A. McCabe, 'Hall, Joseph (1574–1656)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11976 and Daniel Hahn, 'Leighton, William (c. 1565-1622)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16404 [accessed 18 September June 2011].

> Our state that liv'd so many months and yeeres,
> Odde weeks and daies, with fearfull thoughts of death,
> See how Gods power and mightinesse appeares,
> To give us life that gron'd and gaspt for breath!
> And doth defend our countrey, state and land
> (As those he loves) from cruell Pharoes hand!
>
> Yet some may seeke by envie and debate
> To sow sedition in our fields of peace,
> But they shall reape the sheaves of Pharoes hate
> That sunke in Seas, when they sought to increase.
> God grant all those that grudge our Regall power,
> The Sea may drowne, or earth may quicke devower.[18]

The opening of the poem is remarkably different in tone from the 221 ensuing stanzas that explain 'What best befitteth Rule and Emperie' in 'a lively Description of the foure Vertues Cardinall'. A typical later stanza reads:

> Beholde, the King doth come unto the milde,
> And with the gentle maketh his abode;
> But from th'obdurate he will be exiled,
> And shun the path where wicked people trode.
> From Clemencie this knowledge still doth spring,
> To know a Tyrant from a gracious King.[19]

The topic and approach are generic, offering guidance for king and subjects through the prism of the 'Vertues'. (It may be influenced by Medieval and Renaissance *speculum principis* [or, mirror for princes] literature based on Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, *The Education of Cyrus*, such as Desiderius Erasmus's *The Education of a Christian Prince* [1532], and James VI's own *Basilikon Doron* [1599]). However, literary advice on the 'Vertues Cardinall' has an independent history drawn from Plato's *Republic* and *Protagoras*, and the deuterocanonical Wisdom of Solomon. Later influential Classical precedents can be found in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Cicero's *De Inventione*

[18] William Leighton, *Vertue Triumphant, or a lively description of the foure vertues cardinall* (London: Melchisedech Bradwood for Matthew Lownes, 1603), A2v-3r.

[19] Leighton, *Vertue Triumphant*, D3v.

and *De Officiis*; while in the Christian tradition St Ambrose's *Commentary on Luke*, V.62), St Augustine of Hippo's *De Moribus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, and Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologica* contain further examples.) The opening of the Leighton verse, by contrast, negotiates between a burgeoning triumphalist mood (like that of *The Kings Prophecie*) and a sense of the precariousness inherent in the 1603 succession, by comparing the struggle of the enslaved Israelites against 'Pharoe' in Exodus 14 with England's struggle against the sovereign threat posed by Philip III of Spain and Pope Clement VIII. These European 'Pharoe[s]' seek 'to overthrow' English 'lives and hopes' by re-establishing a Roman Catholic monarch on the throne and 'yoking bondage' in the churches, at the expense of the rightful king and (consequently) the 'Nation'.

Such apocalyptic Protestant presentation of England as a modern Israel, 'God's chosen though beleaguered nation', is not what is remarkable. It had been familiar in English writing since the reign of Edward VI, and so is found occasionally in Jacobean accession literature.[20] *Vertue Triumphant* links the 'Nation[s]' of England and Israel metaphorically and linguistically, but this does not necessarily indicate Calvinist 'Covenantal' theology, since recent criticism holds that the idea of the English elect nation did not emerge in an undeniable expression until the 1640s.

---

[20] Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), p. 51. For example, John Hanson (who may have been a scholar of Peterhouse, Cambridge) rejoices that:

> As [God] reduc'd his chosen *Isreall*,
> From savage cruelties of *Egypts* fell; […]
> Even thus (ô *England*) God hath dealt with thee,
> Conducting thee through seas of miserie.

(*Time Is a Turne-Coate. Or Englands three-fold Metamorphosis* [London: [Richard Field] for J[ohn] H[andson], 1604], pp. 12-13). See Nick de Somogyi, 'Hanson, John (*fl.* 1604)', *ODNB* (online edn. 2004), www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12226 [accessed 11 April 2015].

William Haller's influential argument that John Foxe initiated the idea of England as the '"elect nation" […] set apart to lead mankind back to true religion' has now been largely dismissed as anachronistic, but debate continues over the 'special bond' between God and England.[21] However, even critics who differ on this topic agree that 'the comparison between England and Israel' was 'valid' as a rhetorical trope, if not a theological one, at the start of the century.[22] So far, *Vertue Triumphant* seems to be a variation on a recognized theme. What is surprising about this passage, however, is that Leighton is unclear whether 'his elect, or his anointed King' remains in peril.

On the one hand, the English ('like […] Gods elected Nation') unexpectedly had 'passage easie, drie and faire' through the 'raging Sea' of Elizabeth's death and its immediate aftermath, and they now stand in 'fields of peace' (probably an allusion to Psalm 23 and Ezekiel 34:14-15). Not only had there been no 'overthrow' in the transfer of 'Regall Power', but (as Henry Chettle would celebrate in *Englands Mourning Garment*) 'our Royall Soveraigne now raigning hath conserved league and

[21] William Haller, *Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs' and the Elect Nation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963) and Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood*, p. 263.

[22] Mary Morrissey, 'Elect Nations and Prophetic Preaching: *types* and *examples* in the Paul's Cross Jeremiad', *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature, and History 1600-1750*, ed. Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 48. See also: Theodore Dwight Bozeman, 'Federal Theology and the "National Covenant": And Elizabethan Presbyterian Case Study', *Church History* 61 (1992), pp. 394-407; Patrick Collinson, 'Biblical Rhetoric: the English Nation and National Sentiment in the Prophetic Mode', *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester : Manchester University Press, 2011), p. 27; Michael McGiffert, 'Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism', *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982), pp. 463-502, and 'God's Controversy with Jacobean England', *The American Historical Review* 88.5 (December 1983), pp. 1151-1174; David A. Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990). For a summary of, and conclusion to, the debate, see Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood*, p. 263.

peace with all Princes', calling an end to England's 'great conflict' with Spain just six weeks after his accession.[23] Although the Treaty of London would not be signed until 18 August 1604, James's preludes of peace, if successful, were to rule out the possibility of Spanish invasion for the first time in almost twenty years, and promised 'a great expansion of trade' alongside the progressive geopolitical alliance of Christendom.[24]

On the other hand, the poem lacks the unambiguous expressions of either triumph or relief that *The Kings Prophecie*, and (more widely) the Armada literature lead us to expect. (The Armada is even plainly alluded to in lines 7-10 (as a great victory over Spain comparable to the promise of peace which attends the Stuart succession), jarring with the preludes of peace.) In its place a sense of continuing jeopardy becomes explicit from the third stanza:

> Our state that liv'd so many months and yeeres, *(13)*
> Odde weeks and daies, with fearfull thoughts of death,
> See how Gods power and mightinesse appeares,
> To give us life that gron'd and gaspt for breath!
> And doth defend our countrey, state and land
> (As those he loves) from cruell Pharoes hand! *(18)*

At first, the reader is struck by God's graceful liberation of 'those he loves' from the 'fearful thoughts of death' that have held them for 'many months and yeeres'. This evolution in the 'state' from breathless anxiety to relieved jubilation is reinforced by metre. Short clauses disrupt lines 13-14, a dramatic effect accentuated by the use of syntactic division and asyndeton (a figure of omission and pathos: the absence of

[23] Henry Chettle, *Englands Mourning Garment* (London: [E. Short?] for Thomas Millington, 1603), B3v.

[24] Dietz, *English Public Finance*, p. 119. Croft, 'Rex Pacificus'*, The Accession of James I*, pp. 140-154.

connecting particles between clauses).[25] In lines 15-18, the arrangement of end-stops and enjambment transforms the tone: a comma still separates lines 15-16, but the internal division of line 14 has vanished; the exclamation ending line 16 not only expresses relief, but anticipates the emphatic conclusion of the final couplet (ll. 17-18), in which this emerging concord is perfected. The couplet flows without a break and with a full rhyme.

'Yet' (to use Leighton's own word) all verbs describing divine intervention on England's behalf at this precarious point of 'death' and 'life' are in the present tense: God 'works', 'appeares', and 'doth defend' the country. (Perhaps uncertain how to please the king, Leighton does not name Britain, England, or Scotland in the course of his poem, opting instead for epithets like 'happie land', 'Our state', and 'Our Kingdome'.) Contrary to appearances, the 'fearfull thoughts of death' that accompanied Elizabeth's demise still imperil the state. Such demonstration of initial celebration and relief troubled by encroaching anxiety is indicative of a pattern in the opening of *Vertue Triumphant*. Even those 'fields of peace' in which the English are left form part of a warning about the insecurity of their safety:

> Yet some may seeke by envie and debate *(19)*
> To sow sedition in our fields of peace,
> But they shall reape the sheaves of Pharoes hate
> That sunke in Seas, when they sought to increase.
> God grant all those that grudge our Regall power,
> The Sea may drowne, or earth may quicke devower. *(24)*

'Yet' can be interpreted not only as a conjunction, but also in the sense of 'even now'; even now, as England rejoices, 'those that grudge our Regall power' remain a current

[25] Also called *dissolutio* (*Silva Rhetoricae*, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/A/asyndeton.htm [accessed 11 September 2014]; Henry Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence* [London: H[ugh] Jackson, 1577], G4r).

concern.[26] These new adversaries are perhaps more frightening than the old, because they are less discernable: 'some' indicates an unspecified number of unspecified referents; 'may' indicates how little is known about their plans 'To sow sedition'. Lines 21-22 project a prophetic certainty rooted in the auxiliary verb 'shall', but the words 'God grant…' expose the closing couplet as no less than a plea for future 'peace' in the context of a possible flowering of future dissent.[27]

Leighton is a master of ambivalence and ambiguity (often expressed in metrical variation for which he is not given critical recognition), and this opening passage demonstrates that (in his view at least) James I of England, though proclaimed king, is not yet secure in his position. If anything, the 'Israelite paradigm' intensifies the danger to king and country.[28] Mary Morrissey's analysis of the elect nation trope in contemporaneous sermon literature concludes that 'the comparison between England and Israel is not *typical*' (in the sense of typology, to be fulfilled by predestination or grace) but '*exemplum*, or *example*, a far looser form of comparison'.[29] As a result:

> England's blessings, so constantly rehearsed in these sermons, do not […] prove England's chosenness. Babylon, Tyre, Nineveh and Sodom had all enjoyed peace and prosperous trade and had all been punished by an angry God for their ingratitude. [...] [England's] blessings, in being greater than those of many contemporary nations, merely

[26] 'Yet, adv., adj., conj.', *OED Online* (online edn. 2014), www.oed.com/view/Entry/231659 [accessed 5 May 2014], II.2.a, 7.b.

[27] 'Shall', when used for the second or third person (singular and plural), expresses what Fowler calls 'intention or determination on the part of the speaker or someone other than the actual subject of the verb' (H. W. Fowler and R. W. Burchfield, *Fowler's Modern English Usage: Revised Third Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 707).

[28] Michael McGiffert, 'God's Controversy', *AHR*, pp. 1151-74.

[29] Morrissey, 'Elect Nations', *The English Sermon Revised*, pp. 51, 53-4.

> argued the gravity of her sins and made more imminent the threat of judgment hanging over her.

Her analysis could be extended to Leighton's didactic tract on 'Vertue' in the 'state', which is a poetic sermon of sorts. Assuming the mantle of an Old Testament prophet, Leighton sounds a knell to warn an unmindful and feckless nation of the threats he perceives lurking amid the hopes. Like Hall, he seizes general attention with a thrilling opening narrative and immediately provokes the reader to engage more closely with his message. Instead of Hall's wide range of allusions, Leighton uses the arresting and unique rhythm of 'Death to his elect, or his anointed King' (l. 12) to achieve this; amid four stanzas of faultless iambic pentameter, in line 12 alone the five feet are a dactyl, spondee, iamb, dactyl, and tailless trochee. The positioning and double stress of 'elect' highlights its ambivalent state: it is both an adjective and a noun, referring simultaneously to the King and to his subjects.[30] (The use of both 'elect' and 'anointed' is otherwise tautological, and it would be contextually superfluous to read them as a gloss.[31])

If 'peace' remains dependent on the actions and alertness of God's 'elect' and their 'anointed King', then the ensuing 221 stanzas which teach readers how to be good and loyal Protestants and Englishmen, and the mutual duty between such subjects and a good and loyal monarch, are not unconnected. They will have to

[30] This rhythm could be interpreted as a direct inversion of the poem's usual pattern (that is, becoming a trochaic pentameter). The shock and inferences of such an inversion would also be effective in seizing the attention of the reader; however, this seems an unnatural and forced imposition that does not actually reflect the natural rhythm of the line when read.

[31] See also 'elect, adj. and n.2.', *OED Online* (online edn. 2014) www.oed.com/view/Entry/60216 [accessed 2 May 2014].

'worke' to avoid 'dreadfull desolation', as a transitional stanza between the prologue-like opening and the moral treatise explains:

> Our Kingdome cast in dreadfull desolation,
> Our mindes seduc'st with spight and proud sedition,
> Our factions fraught with secret expedition *3*
> To take our lives, and worke us all perdition.
> How great a debt owe we to him above,
> That sends a King to worke united love? *6*

It is again unclear whether the tenses are past, present, or future, and this may encourage vigilance and action by emphasizing the uncertainty of how things stand. James is 'anointed' and 'sen[t]' by 'him above', but he must 'worke' to protect the nation by creating 'united love' (between himself, all his subjects and God), reclaiming the verb 'worke' from the 'factions' (l. 4). As (in the earlier second stanza) 'God works' too (l. 11), the king's role echoes the divine, in flattering concord with *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* and 'The Argument' of *Basilikon Doron*. (*Basilikon Doron*'s prefatory sonnet famously begins 'GOD gives not Kings the stile of Gods in vaine, | For on his Throne his Scepter doe they swey', concisely summarizing an argument of *The Trew Lawe*.)[32] By inference, 'Our' role – that is, the role of his subjects – is to resist 'spight and proud sedition', 'factions', and 'secret expedition'.

Aside from this stanza though, in what may be the least conscious and most surprising sign of perceived insecurity, James is remarkably absent from a poem directed to him. He is never named, referred to only as 'a King', 'a Monarch', 'a Prince',

[32] James VI and I, *The Trew Lawe of Free Monarchies* (London: [Thomas Creede for] Robert Waldegrave, 1603) and *Basilikon Doron* (London: Richard Field for John Norton, 1603, Felix Kyngston for John Norton, 1603, E[dward] Allde for Edward W[hite], 1603, Simon Stafford for Thomas Salisbury, 1604; Cambridge: John Legat, 1603). As Part 2 discusses, both texts were republished in London, anglicised, for James's new subjects in the weeks following the proclamation; the London editions were extremely popular. See Lake, 'The King (The Queen) and the Jesuit', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* pp. 243-260

and (if addressed, which is rare) 'Highnesse', 'Lord', 'Majestie' (distant, if respectful, terms). Hall may be the vociferous Calvinist, but it is Leighton's text in which every achievement is 'the worke of Mightie Jove', and 'Gods power and mightinesse' is pervasive; for example, James's infinitive 'to worke' is subordinate to God's action in 'send[ing] him (l. 6).[33] In the didactic body of the poem, this remoteness could be explained if it had been composed largely before the queen's death, and then rededicated to James. Even if this interpretation is accepted, however (and it is by no means certain, as more than three months had passed since 25 March by the time of the poem's publication), it does not explain the king's near-absence from the prominent and particular framing stanzas that make it undeniably an accession poem. His absence from the poem denotes that the figure of James is, for Leighton, an unknown and uncertain figure in life as well as verse. At this moment, the poet's faith is in God, not the king; the king is more of a mystery than God.

Vertue Triumphant was entered into the Stationers' Register on 4 July, and Leighton was one of the 432 gentlemen to receive a knighthood at Whitehall on 23 July.[34] But celebration and thanksgiving strident enough to earn a knighthood sits alongside a warning which vividly imagines future strife if its united audience does not exhibit the '*Vertue*' which will hold up 'Rule and Emperie' in the person of this 'anointed King'. *Vertue Triumphant* manages to be at once a thanksgiving, a celebration, and a caution. Its negotiation exposes a lack of confidence in the king, in the security of his throne, and therefore in the security of England, which a review of

[33] Leighton, *Vertue Triumphant*, A3rv.

[34] *Vertue Triumphant* was Leighton's first book, and he had no other distinguishing political or social accomplishments or connections to recommend him for an honour (Hahn, 'Leighton, Sir William', *ODNB*) .

the responses to the accession suggests was widely held during the first months of James's reign, but which is not critically recognized. In spite of Leighton's posturing as a lone prophet, cruder and more strident voices accompany him. For instance, two pamphlets which also predate the king's arrival at London on 7 May corroborate the perception of James's dangerous insecurity, in spite of their different primary focuses: Robert Pricket's *A Souldiers Wish unto his Soveraigne Lord King James* and Robert Fletcher's *A Brief and Familiar Epistle*.

A Brief and Familiar Epistle explicitly dates itself '23 April 1603'. *A Souldiers Wish* was entered into the Stationers' Register on 3 April 1603, and is dedicated to 'her late Majesties privie Counsell […] in the absence of my soveraigne [...] to whom a Souldier wisheth a happie Coronation'. In other words, at the time of publication the 'Coronation' had not yet taken place, and the king is still 'absen[t]' from London. They may be called 'her late Majesties privie Counsell' because the text went to press even before James had ratified their posts (confirming them as *his* 'Counsell'), which he did on 5 April 1603.[35] (Until their posts were confirmed, the Lord Mayor (as the only figure of the English state whose political role was not dependent on the monarch) briefly became England's highest authority.) It may also be paying homage to them for masterminding the transfer of the crown, in their last actions as Elizabeth's Council. Diplomat Dudley Carleton, writing to John Chamberlain from Paris in April, recorded that their role was publicly recognized:

> You shall understand that the satirists here who, in the depth of their judgments, presaged our ruin and confusion, shrink up their shoulders and allow as much to the wisdom and counsels of our great ones as

[35] G. P. V. Akrigg, *Letters of King James VI & I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), pp. 10-12, 206-213; see also Croft, *King James*, p. 51.

> they were wont to detract, and now they see we have so well shaped this fit, that they begin to feel their own pulse and to cry with one voice, 'La France est bien malade.'[36]

Robert Pricket's *A Souldiers Wish* rejoices (like Leighton and Hall) that 'the time [for which] wilde ones wisht' has been followed by 'quiet peace with gratious calme contente'. However, he continues:

> And now my wish desires that day to see,
> When *James* the king of England crown'd shal be.
> That then my eyes may my dread Soveraigne vew
> When all his owne becomes his proper due,
> Then doe I looke that Gods Lieutenant heere,
> Shall like earths God most gloriously appeere:
> Armd in the strength of true salvations law
> Thereby to keepe his kingdomes land in awe,
> And then oh King, heavens Lord shal be thy God,
> Who in his wrath will with an Iron rod:
> Bruse and break downe the strength of every arme,
> That but attempts to doe thy highnesse harme,
> And then thy Crowne shall sure establisht be,
> To the Oh King and thy posteritie.[37]

As in *Vertue Triumphant*, the uncertainty created by the tenses (here, either future or conditional) demonstrates that the Jacobean paradise is contingent on the act of James being 'crown'd'; it seems the proclamation that has made Pricket's address 'To the[e] Oh King' legal is essentially worthless. As Roy Strong explains,

> That the Coronation was not devoid of significance we can gather form the plea made by those involved in the Bye Plot, who argued that 'their Practise against the King could not be Treason, because done against him before he had been crowned.'[38]

Only 'Then' (on the moment of coronation) will 'all his owne becom[e] his proper due […] And then thy Crowne shall sure establish be' (ll. 4, 13), because 'then […] heavens

---

[36] Dudley Carleton, *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 1603-1624*, ed. Maurice Lee Jr. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1972), p. 29.

[37] Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish*, B2v, B3r, B4v.

[38] Strong, *Coronation*, p. 251.

Lord' will protect him (ll. 9-12) (and James and the 'Crowne' will have been fused, as the synecdoche of line 13 demonstrates). The repetition of 'then' (ll. 2, 5, 9, 13) and other temporal vocabulary such as 'when' (ll. 2, 4) and 'that day' (l. 1) amplifies this dependency. Until 'that day', England is poised between the future and conditional, and Pricket can 'wish' that his hopes come true. 'Wish' is a hollow word; the 'wish' of the 'wilde ones' (we know) was not fulfilled.

Pricket's 'wish[es]' encourage Robert Fletcher to publish *A Brief and Familiar Epistle*. Fletcher is (he claims) writing on account of 'hearing some to dispute of his Majesties just and most lawfull Title', and reading:

> *a Souldiers wish*, Intitled to his Majestie, and patronized by all the Lords, &c.

As a result:

> I could not choose but imitate, and therefore have written a briefe Epistle to the vulgar, touching his Majesties Title.[39]

Like Hall and Leighton and Pricket, Fletcher celebrates the fact that although Elizabeth's death was, in summary, 'Doubtfull (to some) to have begun our strife' (an ambiguous phrase which denotes the uncertainty):

> You trembling harts that quakte for feare;
> with watch and ward to doubt the worst,
> Now here proclaimed every where:
> the joyfull newes of James the first.[40]

This is clearly simple verse, but it is consequently frank (unlike *Vertue Triumphant* and *A Souldiers Wish*) about the belief that 'strife' will still arise in spite of 'the joyfull newes' of the proclamation, if the 'vulgar' are not convinced of 'his Majesties Title'. *A*

[39] Robert Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle shewing His Majesties most lawfull, honourable and just title to all his kingdomes. With an epitaph or briefe lamentation for the late Majestie Royall* (London: [Richard Read for] John Harrison, 1603), B1v, B2rv, A2rv.

[40] Fletcher, *Briefe Epistle*, B2v.

Souldiers Wish has won over 'all the Lords', so *A Brief and Familiar Epistle* addresses 'the vulgar'. The text's sincerity of motive is corroborated by stylistic methods employed to hold the readers' attention, to aid its absorption and influence. For example, the main prose 'Epistle' honours its promise to be 'briefe' (just three succinct pages); its message, following the pattern of Sir Philip Sidney's reasoning that 'verse far exceedeth prose in the knitting up of the memory', is then 'illuminated or figured forth by the speaking picture of poesy' in the two succeeding poems.[41] These two factors are substantiated with the bibliographic evidence of the text's attractive printed style: large printers' ornaments throughout; regular and well-pressed type by Richard Read; and wide margins in its 4^{o} form. (Finally, in the second poem 'Our late sorrow and our present joye', assertive actions are again 'by God' or the '*Britaines*', while James is 'sent', 'found', 'begunne', 'maintain[ed]', 'defend[ed]', and 'led, | to worke our weale'. He is a stark contrast to the active Elizabeth of the first poem, 'An Epitaph […] for the late Majestie Royall'.[42])

Pricket and Fletcher were writing in days immediately following the proclamation of the new king, and his period of extended absence from the capital before 7 May. But even though immediate concerns of 'how our state | Might after her [Elizabeth's] discease be wrongd by fate' recede with James's presence in London and then his coronation on 25 July, the urge to disseminate publicly a representation of the king as dependable, secure, and fortified against threats does not abate. In *King James His Welcome to London*, for example, the poet 'I. F.' expresses his relief:

[41] Sidney, 'The Defence of Poesy', *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, pp. 352, 368.
[42] Fletcher, *Briefe Epistle*, B2rv.

> Nor neede I a Phisition, all prooves ease:
> Nought ministreth occasion to displease.
> Except much rest, much peace, much good, much quiet,
> Security and safety growes a riot.
> For all the hopes which Papistry expected, *5*
> Or else the triumphs to revenge erected,
> Roisters and murtherers, are cleane put downe:
> Dispayring, when they heare *James* weares the Crowne.
> Enmity, uproares, hope of civill broyles,
> Sedition, mutiny, domesticke coyles, *10*
> Are now made voide; they have tooke needelesse paine,
> Lurking conspirators conspir'd in vaine.[43]

A metrical struggle between English and 'Papist' 'expect[ations]' portrays the peaceful outcome as precarious and surprising, although it overlays a couplet foundation that suggests reassuring inevitability. The 'hopes' of the opposing sides are given alternate emphasis, allowing 'papistry' to come close to victory only to be inverted and undermined. Suspense is allowed to build time and again with lines conveying hostility to the king (these constitute half the passage), and the effect of *brachylogia* (another appeal to *pathos*, in which a lack of conjunctions gives a broken or hurried delivery).[44] Every time, however, the threat is 'putt downe' (sometimes literally, as in the enjambment of lines 7-8 and 10-11). I. F. employs the same device in miniature within single lines, demonstrated most strikingly in the sudden inversion of the polyptotonic line 12 ('Lurking conspirators conspir'd in vaine' ; polyptotonic means that a word is used repeatedly in different forms in close proximity [an appeal to *logos* and *pathos*]).[45] Peace utterly subsumes the language of

---

[43] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, A4v.

[44] Also called *articulus* (*Silva Rhetoricae*, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/A/articulus.htm [accessed 11 September 2014]). In *The Garden of Eloquence*, Peacham classifies this as a figure of separation, 'fit for any vehement affection' (I4v).

[45] Also called *traductio* (*Silva Rhetoricae*, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/T/traductio.htm [accessed 11 September 2014]). *(cont)*

threat: it is, for example, 'security and safety' which 'growes a riot' (l. 4), not the 'hopes' of 'Papistry', 'Roisters and murtherers', or 'lurking conspirators' (ll. 5, 7, 12).

For I. F., 'all the hopes which Papistry expected [...] are cleane put downe' as soon as '*James* wears the Crowne', just as Pricket had 'wish[ed]' in April (and indeed Leighton, with his 'anointed king', in early July). Faith in the power of the coronation – 'Doth not the crown of England prove the King?' in the words of William Shakespeare's King John – was an established concept but one based on political spin (as Shakespeare recognized).[46] It came to particular prominence in the aftermath of the Wars of the Roses[47]; William Camden would write that:

> the Lawes of *England* many yeeres agoe determined [...] that the Crowne once possessed, cleareth and purifies all manner of defaults or imperfections.[48]

The critic Robert Lane explains the concept as follows:

> The premise of the doctrine is that coronation, as the sign of free acclamation by the secular and religious authorities of the realm, cuts off any competing claims (an obvious effort to bring closure – and peace – to the theoretically endless and potentially lethal succession disputes.[49]

Peacham explains in *The Garden of Eloquence* that it encourages the reader or listener 'to note well the importance of the word repeated' (I3v).

[46] William Shakespeare, *King John*, II.2.273 (G. Blakemore Evens and others [eds.], *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 2nd edition [Boston New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997], p.815).

[47] In spite of the fact that James had argued (in *True Lawe*) that God made a king, not the coronation, his royal office was not confirmed; Sybil M. Jack has studied the intense political and propagandist weight placed on his coronation in '"A Pattern for a King's Inauguration": the coronation of James I in England' (*Parergon* 21.2 [July 2004]).

[48] William Camden, *Annales rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum regnate Elizabetha* (London: [George Purslowe, Humphrey Lownes, Miles Flesher] for Benjamin Fisher, 1625), I.14.

[49] Robert Lane, '"The Sequence of Posterity": Shakespeare's "King John" and the Succession Controversy', *Studies in Philology* 92.4 (Autumn 1995), p. 474.

In this context, I. F.'s insistent reference to the importance of the coronation paradoxically exposes a lack of faith that the coronation will be any more conclusive than the proclamation had seemed in the verse of Pricket and Fletcher.

However, now that '*James* weares the Crowne' and is in (or near) London, he is fittingly more present and active in *King James His Welcome* than in earlier poems. To give just two of many examples, he 'took […] in hand, | The government', and is praised as 'he':

> Who art the benefactor to our land,
> Who when it would have fallen […] mad'st it stand.

This places more credit with the king, but it also exposes him to new dangers. As the poem progresses I. F. begins to warn that even now, after the coronation, London must still 'shadow [James] from false conspired harmes'. Thinking on the 'troubles' faced by 'former Princes', the poet concludes that there will always be 'traitors' (l. 7) who remain hostile:

> The foolish cur that at the Moone did [ba]rke:[50]
> Or he that tooke the sky as a faire marke
> To shoote at, was deceiv'd, so both in vaine,
> Did take an idle and a thankelesse paine.
> So (honour'd Majesty) I thinke twill be,
> With those that aime at such a marke as thee.
> I meane those traitors, who through envies spight,
> When most they fawne, doe chiefely fawne to bite.
> And yet when all is done, their owne intent,
> Still proves unto their owne destruction bent.
> I speake not that I judge or know of any:
> Although the like have hapned oft with many.[51]

A crowned monarch inevitably faces 'envies spight' (l. 7), and will be menaced by the ill advice of courtiers and swains: those who 'fawne to bite' (l. 8), a new kind of

[50] sic: lurke.

[51] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, B3v-4r.

'traitor' (l. 7) and an extension of the 'cur' imagery of line 1. This happened, after all, to Elizabeth, 'the Moone' of line 1 (although, in her case, it was 'in vaine' [l. 3]); she survived the threat and pressure of 'The foolish cur' (that is, from the overly-ambitious in one way or another, as in Aesop's Fable 133), and the shooter who 'took the sky as a faire marke' (ll. 1-2; perhaps, quite literally, failed assassination attempts that stalked her reign). Her heir meanwhile had already withstood 'lurking conspirators' during his Scottish reign and the accession period, so the outlook is good (especially with the tenderly intimate support of his subjects expressed in the use of 'thee' and 'I' throughout the poem).

Yet although I. F. accordingly has slightly more confidence than, for example, Pricket, he is not assured; Pricket had 'wishe[d]' for his utopia, but I. F. still only 'thinke[s] twill be' (l. 5). Crucially, thoughts of insecurity about the succession have infected the perception of James's everyday monarchy. The representative examples of Leighton, Pricket, Fletcher, and I. F. show that this insecurity cannot be overcome simply by his political establishment through time, presence, and the fact of the coronation. *Vertue Triumphant*, *A Souldiers Wish*, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle*, and *King James his Welcome* chronicle the joy that James's proclamation inspired in the context of the fears surrounding Elizabeth's death, but it is certain that they display continuing concerns regarding the new reign's security. (Not least in their use throughout of rhetorical tropes and figures determined for persuasion, specifically the figures of *pathos*: *paenismus*, *martyria* and *pathopoeia*, and *descriptio*. *Martyria* (or *testatio*) confirms something using the writer's own experience as an example, while *pathopoeia* (or *pathopeia*) displays the writer's emotions 'to stir his hearers to the same'. *Descriptio* lays out the consequences of an act through description, to

'expresse and set forth a thing so plainly and lively, that it seemeth rather painted in tables, than declared with words, and the mind of the hearer therby so drawn to an earnest and stedfast contemplation of the thing described'.[52]) Taken from a diverse range of circumstances, styles, and authors, these four examples are representative of the like-minded tone of much literature responding to the accession in early- to mid-1603. Against expectations, the assured stance of *The Kings Prophecie* is distinctly unusual, which raises two questions: was this unexpected attitude unique to poetry and, if not, why were they so worried?

For most Englishmen, James was a desirable successor to the queen: an experienced male monarch, Protestant, relatively young, and with many children. However, there was cause for concern: he faced accusations of illegitimacy, Catholic sympathies, and the spectres of rival claimants, invasions, and insurrections. He was also relatively unknown. Helen Hackett's analysis of the development of Elizabeth's iconographic cult in the aftermath of her accession offers an informative comparison with the situation faced by her successor and his poets. 'When Elizabeth succeeded to the throne on 17 November 1558', Hackett explains, 'she and her followers urgently needed an effective iconography which would inspire confidence in the new regime.'[53] There was, Jean Wilson agrees, little 'assurance of the political stability which we can in retrospect see that she brought.'[54] This was because Elizabeth inherited with the crown 'a legacy of political challenges', including 'Doubts [...] as to

[52] See *Silva Rhetoricae,* http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/D/descriptio.htm, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/M/martyria.htm, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/P/pathopoeia.htm, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/P/paenismus.htm [accessed 11 September 2014].

[53] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 38.

[54] Wilson, *Entertainments for Elizabeth*, p. 1.

the very propriety and legitimacy of government by a woman'. Hackett cites John Knox's *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, which was published just before the death of Elizabeth's sister Queen Mary in 1558, as the prime example of the arguments that Elizabeth had to discredit; Wilson offers many more. This was as a result of Mary I's anti-Protestant policies, her marriage to Philip Prince of Austria, and the subsequent 'perceived subjugation of England's foreign policy' to that of Spain, which had 'generated hostility not only to Catholicism, but also to female rule'.[55] However, the new queen and her literary and political allies were able to retaliate quickly and effectively in the lavish London coronation pageant of 15 January 1559, and in its published version just eight days later (the imprint, unusually, states the date of publication).[56] While it 'purport[ed] to be merely a record of a spontaneous upwelling of love', the pageant was in fact financed and controlled as much by the queen herself as by the Guildhall; Richard C. McCoy and Jonathan Goldberg both suggest that Elizabeth approved the pageant script before the performance.[57] David Norbrook sums up the purpose of the live pageant succinctly: 'She wanted to show foreign observers that her people were more devoted to her

---

[55] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 38; see also Wilson, *Entertainments for Elizabeth*, pp. 3-5.

[56] The anonymous resulting pamphlet, *The passage of our most drad* [sic] *Soveraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion* was probably by Richard Mulcaster (later MP for Carlisle and headmaster of Merchant Taylors' and St. Paul's Schools), who was paid 40s by Elizabeth for a narrative of the pageant. See William Barker, 'Mulcaster, Richard (1531/2–1611)', *ODNB* (online edn. 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19509 [accessed 1 Dec 2011].

[57] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 48. See also David M. Bergeron, 'Elizabeth's Coronation Entry (1559): New Manuscript Evidence', *English Literary Review* 8 (1978), pp. 3-8. Richard C. McCoy, 'The Wonderful Spectacle": The Civic Progress of Elizabeth I and the Troublesome Coronation', *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, ed. János M. Bak (Berkeley and Oxford: University of California Press, 1990), p. 223, Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature*, p. 31.

than to Rome'.[58] The written account, it can be inferred, furthered this purpose by quickly distributing the ephemeral occasion to a wider audience and preserving it as a permanent sanction of Elizabeth's rule; the text is enhanced in its printed form by descriptions of positive public responses to and interactions with the queen. Moreover, even at the precarious moment of inheritance between a Roman Catholic monarch and a Protestant one, Elizabeth's accession had been foreseen for several years. It followed the text of the Act of Succession 1543 (tested and bloodily upheld after the death of Edward VI), and the then Princess Elizabeth was the nearest blood relative of her childless half-sister Queen Mary. She had also been, as she often recalled, 'borne mere Englishe here amongst us, and [was] therefore most naturall unto us', and resided (during Mary's final years) at Hatfield House, just eighteen miles from her sister's place of death.[59]

The initial public celebrations immediately after Elizabeth's accession, skilfully manipulated to foster a sense of national sanction and security, were however impossible for James to replicate in 1603. At the time of his proclamation the king was in Edinburgh, fifty miles from the border of his new kingdom, and more than three-hundred miles from its capital. Although he promptly began his journey south, James would take six-and-a-half weeks to reach London. His absence was further prolonged by a plague (the like of which had not been seen since 1563) that followed fast on the proclamation and only abated nationally in the summer of

[58] Norbrook, 'Panegyric of the Monarch', pp. 36-7.

[59] *A special Grace appointed to have been said after a banket at Yorke […] November 1558* [n.p., n.d], Aiii (v); see also Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI', *EHR*, p. 515.

1604.[60] The English strove to interpret this ominous catastrophe as an act of God to purge the nation for its new King, but (even if that argument held) it remained the case that, as Paul Slack summarizes, 'the celebrations and processions which set the convincing seal of public approval to a coronation were severely curtailed'.[61] The coronation took place on 25 July 1603 (St. James's Day), but the 'celebrations and processions' were delayed until the following March when the sickness had loosened its grip on the capital, a few days short off a year after the accession.[62] In the meantime, older subjects remembered the proclamation of Lady Jane Grey in 1553, and the sombre warning of one Elizabethan writer that 'Many times, Might hath overcome Right'.[63] As Richards has made clear, James's accession proclamation was 'Elaborately insistent about his right to rule, in terms and at a length which had last been seen in the accession proclamation of Lady Jane Grey'.[64] To make matters worse, the initial problems James faced were more serious and numerous than those of his predecessor. Although the immediate transfer of the crown was managed peacefully, this peace had been and (as the four poets quoted have demonstrated) seemed to remain uncertain and insecure. Two problems presented themselves to ordinary Englishmen like Leighton, Pricket, Fletcher and I. F.: the strength and popularity of James's claim, and the presence of his many notional rivals.

---

[60] E. A. Wrigley and R. S. Schofield, *The Population History of England, 1541-1871* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 653 (Table A10.2).

[61] Slack, *The Impact of Plague*, pp. 18-19. (See also Wilson's account in *Plague in Shakespeare's London*).

[62] For the grave restrictions on the coronation itself, see Jack, '"A Pattern for a King's Inauguration"', *Parergon*, pp. 67-91.

[63] Thomas Wilson, *Camden Miscellany XVI: The State of England Anno Dom 1600*, ed. F. J. Fisher (London: Camden Society, 1936), p. 5.

[64] Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI', *EHR*, p. 518; see also the printed text of the proclamation, *Forasmuch as it has pleased almighty God*, pp. 1-3.

Fundamental questions of legitimacy beset his claim. Firstly, James was born outside England, and a statute of Edward III forbade the inheritance of any English property by such 'strangers'. An exception was included for the children of the monarch, but (as Robert Lane explains) 'the scope of [this exception] became a disputed issue in the succession controversy, namely, did it extend to more remote descendants?'[65] (The statute, 25 Edward III c.1, was intended to be 'a way of depriving Frenchmen of their English land' in 'response to the loss of Normandy in 1204'.[66]) Straightforward English xenophobia cannot be ignored either.[67] Ian W. Archer has shown that 'Evil May Day' (a 1517 riot against the habitation of 'strangers' in London) 'haunted the consciousness of the sixteenth-century metropolitan magistrate', and continued to influence perception of their presence in the early seventeenth century.[68] Several letters preserved in the State Papers Domestic (for instance) report of Sussex labourers who remained vocally hostile to the rule of a 'forreyne prynce', even after James's coronation.[69] The last 'forreyne prynce' to be

---

[65] Lane, '"The Sequence of Posterity"', *Studies in Philology*, pp. 460-81.

[66] Frederick Pollock and F. W. Maitland, *The History of English Law*, 2nd Edition, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), I:458-67. See also Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI', *EHR*, p. 514.

[67] Ian W. Archer's study of English xenophobia finds, in particular, that 'the alien provided a convenient scapegoat for economic difficulties' during the last two decades of Elizabeth's reign (*The Pursuit Of Stability: Social Relations In Elizabethan London* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991], p. 4).

[68] Archer, *The Pursuit Of Stability*, p. 140.

[69] SPD James I, SP 14/2 f. 96 (*State Papers Domestic* [accessed 14 September 2014]). It may initially seem confusing that the letters record the objection to a 'forreyne', not 'strange', prince. Historical and anthropological studies of Early Modern England (and particularly London) tend to determine that the term 'strangers' was applied to immigrants (mainly from France and the Netherlands), while 'foreigners' denoted the non-free English. The *OED* makes clear however that, in practice, the terms were interchangeable (see 'stranger, n.', 1.a. and 4.a., www.oed.com/view/Entry/191250, and 'foreigner, n.', 1a and 2, www.oed.com/view/Entry/73066 (*OED Online*, online *(cont)*

England's (most recent) king had, moreover, become its greatest enemy. When Prince Philip of Austria arrived in England in 1554 to marry Queen Mary, he assured the Privy Council that he would speak to them as not 'a prince of Spain and a stranger, but as a native Englishman'; probably, Harry Kelsey suggests, a reference to his descent from Edward III.[70] In turn, it was seen as necessary to remind his new subjects of this English descent in order to commend him to them. Mary had a genealogy prepared, which was shown openly around the Court and referenced extensively in the new royal couple's official Entry to London on 18 August, as the climax of the procession. A contemporaneous manuscript records:

> At the lyttell conduit was a very prety pageant, being but sleight, but mervaleouse fayre, made in maner of a vyne or tre of roses […] and so at every branches end satt a childe in a king's or quenes apparell, declaring the dyssent of the king and quene, untyll they came to the toppe, wher they sat both together in the toppe of the said pageant.

A letter by John Elder also describes the 'pageant', and a comparison clearly demonstrates that, while charming, the device was not subtle in its message:

> [A]t the west end of Chepe they made the fyft staye, where was the fourth and most excellent pageant of al, wherein was contained, declared, and shewed their most noble genealogy from kinge Edward the third, which genealogie was most excellently and moste ingeniously set out, with a great arboure or tree, […and] of whom both their majesties are lineally descended.[71]

---

edns. 2014) [accessed 15 June 2014]). In a letter to Elizabeth on 4 August 1588, for example, James himself 'promise[d] to behave myself not as a stranger and foreign prince but as your natural son and compatriot of your country in all respects.' (Akrigg, *Letters of King James*, p. 88).

[70] Harry Kelsey, *Philip of Spain, King of England* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2012), p. 80, on French ambassador Antoine, 1e comte de Noailles, to Henry II, 27 July 1554 (Abbé de Vertot, *Ambassades de Messieurs de Noailles en Angleterre*, 5 vols. [Leiden: Dessaint & Saillant, and Durand, 1763], III.286).

[71] John Gough Nichols, *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary* (London: J. B. Nichols for the Camden Society, 1850), pp. 80, 149. The original manuscript is British Library Harley MS 194.

Even with Henry VIII's Tudor daughter on the throne, herself a Roman Catholic, in 1554 the factor of her husband's foreignness was something that required forceful confrontation.

To make matters worse, the Scots were a traditional enemy, largely on account of the very geographical proximity that made James seem, from another angle, an excellent choice. On 28 April 1588, as England prepared herself for attack from Spain, the Earl of Huntingdon had reported from York that:

> I have earnestly spoken to sundry gentlemen to raise some lancers for defence of the realm against invasion, and found at first many willing, though a service strange to these countrymen, and never required of any here before. But I perceive since that they are most loath to enter into that charge, because they fear they should always hereafter be charged for all kind of service, as other parts of the realm be; if assured that they should only serve towards Scotland, as in former times, they would neither shrink much at this, nor be so backward at the muster of light horsemen.[72]

The gentlemen of the north of England were more willing to finance fighting Scotland than the Armada. The kingdoms had fought since the thirteenth century, but the Eight Years' War of the 1540s (widely known today by its romanticized nineteenth-century title, the 'Rough Wooing') had marked the beginning of a renewed period of conflict that climaxed in the 1587 execution of Mary Queen of Scots, James's mother, for treason against Elizabeth.[73] Mary had 'cast a threatening shadow over the Elizabethan regime' ever since her failed betrothal to the future Edward VI, and had 'hugely complicated English attitudes to Scotland and Scottish attitudes to England'.[74]

---

[72] Henry, Earl of Huntingdon to Sir Francis Walsingham, SPD Elizabeth I, SP 15/30 f. 194 (*State Papers Online* [accessed 14 September 2014]).

[73] See Marcus Merriman, *The Rough Wooings: Mary Queen of Scots, 1542-1551* (East Linton: Tuckwell, 2000).

[74] Roger A. Mason, 'Scotland, Elizabethan England and the Idea of Britain', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 14, p. 279.

More recently (and crucially during James's Scottish reign), the late 1590s and 1600s had seen intense border disputes, and the protection of northern Catholics by the Scottish crown. Still worse, James was descended not from one of England's rivalrous neighbours, but from two; as a result of the 'Auld Alliance' or 'Vieille Alliance' between England and France from 1295, his grandmother was French Guise royalty. He had communicated with his mother in French, and his Scottish published work had to be anglicized for the English market in 1603.[75] Elizabeth had made such capital of being 'borne mere Englishe' that this was a remarkable estrangement.

Aside from the Edwardian statute against alien inheritance, James's claim fell foul of two further English legal instruments. The Bond of Association (1585) had dictated that anyone found guilty of seeking the death of Elizabeth would be stripped of his/her place in the English succession.[76] (It was subscribed, revealingly, shortly before Mary's execution; this is not to mention rumours of James's own 'shadowy movement' in the 'machinations behind what would become Essex's rebellion'.[77]) James could alternatively trace his claim through his father, Henry Stuart Lord Darnley, but both parents were descended from the Tudors (and, indeed,

---

[75] Akrigg, *Letters of King James*, for example p. 56; Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*: The Scottish Context and the English Translation', *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 50.

[76] Susan Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 30. The Bond of Association can be read in David Cressy, 'Binding the Nation: the Bonds of Association 1584 and 1696', *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G. R. Elton from American Friends*, ed. G. R. Elton, DeLloyd J. Guth, John W. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 271-334, and drafts showing its evolution are preserved as SPD Elizabeth I, SP 12/173 and 12/178 ff. 81-4 (*State Papers Online*).

[77] Lake, 'The King, (The Queen,) and the Jesuit', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, p. 248; Michael Questier, 'Sermons, Separatists, and the Succession Politics in Late Elizabethan England', *Journal of British Studies*, 52.2 (April 2013), p. 310.

Plantagenets) through their grandmother Princess Margaret, the elder sister of Henry VIII. Henry had omitted Margaret from the Act of Succession (1543), the very text that had helped to secure Elizabeth's inheritance. A few wild rumours even circulated that James was illegitimate. James Travers summarizes:

> Henri IV of France, who was fond of a bad joke, said that it was right that James was called 'Solomon' since he was the son of David [Riccio]. The suspicion of bastardy hung over James and was a serious enough potential impediment to his claim to the English throne for the Scottish Parliament to pass an Act in 1596, which made it treasonable to slander James' parents.[78]

Any one of these factors could have been manipulated to bar James legitimately from the English succession.[79]

Secondly, it is completely wrong to suggest (as several critics have) that 'England received James Stuart as king probably because there was no other single, strong competitor.'[80] A vicious pamphlet war had raged on the subject of the potential rivals throughout the 1590s. Most famous and influential among these tracts was *A Conference about the Next Succession of the Crown of England* by 'R. Doleman' (almost certainly a pseudonym of the Jesuit Robert Persons[81]) which

---

[78] James Travers, *James I: The Masque of Monarchy* (Kew: National Archives, 2003), p. 3. For a thorough refutation of these rumours, see Rosalind K. Marshall, 'Riccio, David (*c.*1533–1566)', *ODNB* (online edn. 2004) <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23475> [accessed 15 June 2011].

[79] For a detailed summary of the 'series of legal ambiguities and conflicting political principles with regard to the succession of the English Crown' (especially as they related to Mary Queen of Scots) see Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*; Chris W. Brooks, *Law, Politics, and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), Ch. 4; Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, and Rei Kanemura, 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election? The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies* 52.2 (April 2013), p. 319.

[80] Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, p. 132.

[81] Victor Houliston, 'The Hare and the Drum: Robert Persons' writings on the English Succession, 1593-6', *Renaissance Studies* 14.2 (2000), pp. 235-250, and 'Persons [Parsons], Robert (1546–1610)', *ODNB* (online edn. 2004)
(cont)

comprehensively condemned James's claim 'on grounds of descent, law, religion and practicalities'.[82] *A Conference* 'affected an entirely neutral and objective assessment of the rival claims', but Susan Doran summarizes that 'the weight of his argument clearly worked against James's title and in favour of that of the Infanta'.[83] By contrast, its final lines on 'the King of *Scotland*' are indicative of his stance regarding James. Quoting his supposed English sources, Persons concludes:

> It is to be thought (say these men) that few *English*, be they of what Religion or Opinion so ever, will shew themselves forward to receive such a King. [...] And thus much concerning the King of *Scotland*.[84]

James was gravely 'exasperated' (Peter Lake has even made a convincing case that *The Trew Lawe of Free Monarchies* was the King's response, opposing Persons' elective model of succession with the theory of divine ordination).[85] He had good reason to be so, as several critics agree that Persons 'seriously damaged his potential succession'.[86] The Roman Catholics themselves believed quite the opposite, and

---

<www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21474> [accessed 24 November 2011]. 'The Hare and the Drum' interrogates recent studies of *A Conference*; Houliston concludes that '[Cardinal William] Allen, [Sir Francis] Englefield, and possibly others, provided material for the book, [but] Persons compiled and wrote the final version' (p. 237).

[82] Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', *James VI and I*, p. 29.

[83] Houliston, 'Persons [Parsons], Robert', *ODNB*; Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', *James VI and I*, p. 29.

[84] R. Doleman, *A Conference about the Next Succession of the Crown of England* (Antwerp: [printer unknown], 1594), p. 96. For the chapter on James see pp. 86-96.

[85] *Central State Papers (Scotland)* (hereafter *CSP Scotland*), 13/100 (*State Papers Online*); Lake, 'The King, (The Queen) and the Jesuit', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, pp. 250-7. D. H. Wilson, Maurice Lee Jr., and Peter Holmes have all also recognized a connection between the two texts without pursuing it far (Wilson, *King James VI and I* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1967]; Lee, *Great Britain's Solomon* [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990]; Holmes, 'The Authorship and Early Reception of *A Conference About the Next Succession to the Crown of England*', *The Historical Journal*, 23.2 [1980], pp. 426-8).

[86] Kanemura, 'The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, p. 320. See also: Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', *James VI and I*; Lake, 'The King, *(cont)*

recent studies suggest that *A Conference* was poorly received by the papal hierarchy who feared that it might harm the Catholic cause in England and lead to an increase in persecution.[87]

In a striking indication of its perceived influence, however, Rei Kanemura has shown that the publication of *A Conference* made a staunchly Puritan MP, Peter Wentworth, cease to lobby 'for the settlement of the succession in Parliament', and instead begin to argue – in line with the then-James VI – that:

> the crown is an inheritance directly given by God, that the King is thus enthroned by his descent only, and that inheritance of blood is vital, "preferred before any parliament".[88]

Indeed, *A Conference* still has the power to persuade a modern academic. Houliston disagrees with Doran, arguing that it 'was intended to be a first step towards a Catholic policy on the succession, rather than a crafty manoeuvre on the part of a scheming Jesuit'. However, Doran's reading is surely correct, as Houliston's counter-argument is based on the untenable conviction that Persons:

(The Queen) and the Jesuit', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*; Anne McLaren, 'Challenging the Monarchical Republic: James I's Articulation of Kingship', *The Monarchic Republic of Early Modern England: Essays in Response to Patrick Collinson*, ed. John F. McDiarmid (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

[87] Kanemura, 'The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, p. 332; Stefania Tutino, 'The Political Thought of Robert Persons's *Conference* in Continental Context', *Historical Journal* 52 (2009), pp. 51-56; Victor Houliston, *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Persons' Jesuit Polemic, 1580-1610* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 87-88, and 'The Hare and the Drum: Robert Persons' writings on the English Succession, 1593-6', *Renaissance Studies* 14.2 (2000), p. 235.

[88] Kanemura, 'The Contested Title of James VI and I', pp. 332-3; Peter Wentworth, *Treatise Containing [...] The True and Lawfull Successor to these Realmes* ([Edinburgh]: [Robert Waldegrave], 1598), pp. 53-4, pp. 55-6. Wentworth's Treatise was commissioned by Scotland's royal printer, and Doran has made a convincing case that it may have been sponsored by James VI; James, however, sought to deny this (Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', *James VI and I*, passim, esp. p. 34; Lake, 'The King, [The Queen,] and the Jesuit', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, p. 248).

> stops short of endorsing [Isabella's] as the strongest claim. In the course of time Persons was to support the Infanta's candidature actively and deliberately, but there is no evidence that he had already decided to do so in 1593 when the book was written. His stated concern was to alert his Catholic readers, in the absence of officially sanctioned information or public debate, to the simple facts of the succession issue, as he saw them.

For Houliston, it was sincerely 'a call to earnest and responsible deliberation, "to keep off the wolf that desires to creep in by night", […] a warning of the dangers of ignorance in this matter.' It is not necessary to consider whether 'the wolf' is James Stuart to see that Persons is playing the propagandist. His rhetorical strategy encourages readers to believe they are drawing their own conclusions, since he 'stops short of endorsing [Isabella's] as the strongest claim' overtly, when they have been subject to a heavily suggestive and biased presentation. It is extraordinary and revealing to see that Persons' strategy still works so effectively.[89]

Sir Thomas Wilson, a minor public official loyal to the Cecils, was among others who responded to *A Conference* in James's favour, with his 1601 *The State of England*.[90] However, Wilson's defence could circulate only in manuscript. Elizabeth had ruled 'public discussion of the succession […] treasonous by parliamentary statute [13 Elizabeth I, c.1]'; as 'public discussion' included print, this significantly reduced the potential audience of (what Axton has called) the 'Protestant Stuart

---

[89] Houliston, 'The Hare and the Drum', *Renaissance Studies*, pp. 239-40, 242.

[90] Others, aside from Wentworth's *Treatise*, included: Irenicus Philodikaios (pseud.), *A Treatise declaring, and confirming the just title and righte of James the sixt* ([Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1599]) and Cambridge University Library MS I.i.IV.33 (draft), Harington's *Tract on the Succession*, and arguably James's *Trew Lawe*. (See Kanemura, 'The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, pp. 332-4; Doran, 'Three Late-Elizabethan Succession Tracts', *The Struggle for the Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, p. 99; Jean-Christophe Mayer, *Breaking the Silence on the Succession* (Montpellier: Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3, 2003), pp. 223-26.

counterblast' to the published *Conference*.[91] (This was enforced: Peter Wentworth wrote his second treatise on the subject while imprisoned in the Tower of London as a result.[92]) More seriously, while *The State of England* is 'prefaced by lengthy justification of the superiority of the claim of James VI', it nevertheless admits to the claims of '12 Competitors'.[93] To give just two examples, Arbella Stuart, although also 'of [Margaret's] […] lyne', was certainly legitimate, not the child of a traitor, and was (as Wilson writes) 'English borne (the want whereof, if our Lawyers opinions be corant is the cause of his [James'] exclusion)'.[94] (Hugh Holland's accession text *Pancharis* was, according to the title page and prefatory poems, 'dedicated to the Invincible James': 'King, by most Desert, and onely Right'. It also, however, contains a dedicatory poem to Lady Arbella.[95]) Persons' Infanta, Isabella Clara Eugenia, was divided from the English by both seas and religion, but she could boast a faultless descent from Henry III and Edward III, and the support of the Spanish kings Philip II and Philip III (her father and brother respectively) and the more equivocal interest of the Pope. Henri IV of France would not back a Hapsburg claimant like Isabella, but he 'never forgot that James's grandmother was a Guise' either (which may explain his joke about James's legitimacy) and so, in 'the summer of 1602 […] he began to

---

[91] Lane, '"The Sequence of Posterity"', *Studies in Philology*, pp. 2-3; Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, p. 95; Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, pp. 89-90.

[92] Lake, 'The King (The Queen) and the Jesuit', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, p. 247; John E. Neale, 'Peter Wentworth', *EHR* 39 (1924), pp. 185-7, pp. 195-8.

[93] Thomas Wilson, *Camden Miscellany XVI: The State of England Anno Dom. 1600*, ed. F. J. Fisher (London: Camden Society, 1936), p. 1. A. F. Pollard and Sean Kelsey, 'Wilson, Sir Thomas (d. 1629)', *ODNB* (online edn. 2008) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29690 [accessed 1 December 2011].

[94] Wilson, *The State of England*, pp. 1, 2, 5.

[95] Hugh Holland, *Pancharis* (London: Clement Knight, 1603), A3r, A4v.

indicate an active interest in supporting a Catholic candidate'.[96] In what is perhaps a call to arms, Wilson opens with a stark judgement:

> this crown is not like to fall to the ground for want of heads that may claim to wear it, but upon whose head it will fall is by many doubted.[97]

It is almost beside the point that neither Arbella nor Isabella wanted the throne.[98] Isabella was already joint-sovereign of the Spanish Netherlands; their successful but complex rule demanded their full attention. (In what may have been a diplomatic indication of this, a portrait of the Infanta by Frans Pourbus the Younger (the Pourbus Portrait) was even gifted to Queen Anne via the ambassador of the Spanish Netherlands in 1603.) That did little to deter their supporters, as shown by the 1603 Main Plot on behalf of Arbella, and Cecil's suspicions that the Spanish intended to 'attempt the Kingdome again' (from late 1601) on behalf of Isabella.[99]

Persons 'was received by the Pope in an audience during which they discussed papal support for the Infanta', and Norbrook even finds rumours (beyond the ramblings of the Earl of Essex) that Cecil himself 'was intriguing for a Spanish succession', possibly a misunderstanding based on his early peace negotiations.[100] Recent studies suggest that Pope Clement VIII (like Henri IV) was in fact wary of

---

[96] Maurice Lee Jr., *James I & Henri IV: An Essay in English Foreign Policy, 1603-1610* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970), pp. 8, 10; see also Catherine Loomis, 'Philip III and the Stuart Succession', *Revue Belge* XLIII, pp. 509-13.

[97] Wilson, *The State of England*, p. 5.

[98] Lee, *James I & Henri IV*, pp. 7-8.

[99] *Letters from Sir Robert Cecil to Sir George Carew*, ed. John Maclean (London: Camden Society, 1844), p. 117; see also Edward Tenace, 'A Strategy of Reaction: The Armadas of 1596 and 1597 and the Spanish Struggle for European Hegemony', *English Historical Review* (2003) Vol. 118 Issue 478, pp. 855–882.

[100] Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', *James VI and* I, p. 30; Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 173 and 'Panegyric of the Monarch', p. 133; Pauline Croft, 'Rex Pacificus', *The Accession of James I*, p. 140.

supporting the idea of increasing Hapsburg power by endorsing Isabella, and that 'enthusiasm of the English Catholics for the Infanta had considerably diminished' by 1601-2. Consequently, in 1602-3:

> the [Spanish] council […] conclu[ded] that the English Catholics should chose a candidate themselves and have him or her nominated by King Philip. The plan was welcomed by the count of Olivares [on 1 February 1603], who believed that English Protestants would prefer a native to the foreign king 'in their hatred of the Scottish domination'.

However, while he was advised to do so from 1602, Philip did not abandon the Hapsburg claim to seek an alternative who might receive united Catholic support 'until early in 1603, just before Elizabeth's death, and by then it was too late'.[101]

It is in this fraught and frightening context that Jacobean accession literature must be read. While the accession of James I may seem inevitable to modern scholars, with hindsight and privileged access to private and state correspondence and proceedings, it is undeniable that the popular English perception was that the death of Elizabeth could bring invasions, insurrections, and strife due to the lack of an unassailable figure to assume her role. The new king, supposedly the nation's buckler who would (in Leighton's phrase) 'cleer […] the troubled skie of cloudie state', threatened to become instead a figure of insecurity and concern.[102] Only a very small number of Englishmen had been privy to secret communications masterminded by Sir Robert Cecil throughout 1601-3, which sought to ensure an easy succession.[103] Instead, private letters and diaries across 'all parts of the people' (geographically and

---

[101] Kanemura, 'The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, p. 332; see also Questier, 'Sermons', *Journal of British Studies*, p. 312; Lee, *James I & Henri IV*, p. 8.

[102] Leighton, *Vertue Triumphant*, A2r.

[103] See inter alia Croft, *King James*, pp. 48-50, and Akrigg, *Letters of King James*, passim.

socially) corroborate the poetic and more general literary narratives of what Dekker called 'an universall feare' and 'generall terror' at the end of Elizabeth's reign.[104] A few days before the queen's death, the government was preparing for the worst. On 20 March, 'sondrie Earles and Barons' received word (or warning) from the Privy Council that 'such noblemen of the realme as are now abiding either in the Citie of London or neere unto it' were ready to fight for the 'preservation of the peace and welfare of the state'. The ports were closed, and (John Chamberlain told Dudley Carleton) 'principall papists were made sure, and some daungerous companions clapt up.'[105] Two days after Elizabeth's death, Robert Cecil heard from his half-brother (Thomas Cecil Lord Burleigh) that people in Yorkshire had 'expected' 'their houses should have been spoiled and sacked', and Sir George Carew informed him that the recently pacified province of Munster (of which Carew was President) 'trembled to think of her Majesty's decease, as if instantly upon it the kingdom would have been torn in sunder'.[106] In these two letters, reports of reception are filtered through the networks of power, but popular sources also relay rumours that 'many men, both noble and others, had made very great provision of armour, munitions, and victuals'.[107]

---

[104] *The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford*, ed. D. J. H. Clifford (Stroud: The History Press, 2009), p. 21; Thomas Dekker, *1603*, B2r. See also Lake, 'The King (The Queen) and the Jesuit', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, p. 244.

[105] Acts of the Privy Council (NS) 32/494; John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton (30 March 1603), *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, I.188-9.

[106] HMC *Salisbury (Cecil) MSS*, 15/8-11.

[107] Simon Theloal to Dr. Dun (letter of 26 March 1603), Bodleian Library MS Tanner 75, ff. 79-81; Godfrey Goodman, *The Court of King James the First*, ed. J. S. Brewer, 2 vols. (London: Samuel Bentley, 1839), II.57-8. For corresponding accounts see Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson C.886 (John Style, *Annals of York to AD 1631*), p. 160; *The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*, ed. Dorothy M. Meads (London: Routledge, 1930), p. *(cont)*

The diary of John Manningham (a student at the Middle Temple) gives one of the most detailed accounts of the tension in London, recording that 'garboiles' (that is, brawls and disturbances) had been anticipated, 'which God be thanked were more feared than perceived'.[108] There was instead:

> Noe tumult, noe contradicion, no disorder in the city: every man went about his busines as readylie, as peaceably, as securely, as though there had bin noe change, nor any newes ever heard of competitors. God be thanked, our king hath his right.[109]

Manningham's wider account is particularly telling because, like the poetic examples, it demonstrates (alongside the relief) the desire to endorse the new king's proclamation after the fact. On 13 April, Manningham spread the rumour that 'The Queene nominated our King for hir successor' on her deathbed. He may have heard this from Dr Henry Parry, as Hackett explains that Parry 'was on duty in her chamber in her last sickness and told Manningham of her behaviour in her last days'.[110] The reassuring, legitimizing, idea that 'our dying Queene pronounc'd him heire' as 'her lives last act' was repeated in several records, owing to an anonymous manuscript account, probably by Cecil's secretary, which was repeated in the state pulpits.[111] (In the accession verse, for example, Henry Chettle writes: 'her Highnesse that ruled us

---

201; *Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham*, ed. Harold Spencer Scott (London: Royal Historical Society, 1902), pp. 53-4. Tangentially, Carleton's reply to Chamberlain from Paris suggests that 'satirists' in the French capital 'presaged our ruin and confusion' too (April 1603; *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain*, p. 29).

[108] 'garboil, n.' *OED Online* (online edn. 2012) <www.oed.com/view/Entry/76703> [accessed 3 May 2014].

[109] Manningham, *Diary*, pp. 147, 170 (24 March 1602/3).

[110] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 222.

[111] Richard Mulcaster, *The Translation of certain Latine verses written uppon her Majesties death, called A Comforting Complaint* (London: Edward Aggas, 1603), A2r, B1v. An extant version of the likely-Cecil account is British Library MS Cotton Titus C.VII.57.

many yeeres in peace, left us, in her death, more secure, by committing us to our lawfull Prince.'[112]) The poet and historian John Clapham, who was at the time one of the six clerks of the Court of Chancery, would later conclude (incidentally, ratifying the rumour's contemporary currency) that:

> These reports, whether they were true indeed or given out of purpose by such as would have them so to be believed, it is hard to say. Sure I am they did no hurt.[113]

At the same time, conflicting, dissenting accounts of the queen's death disputed her nomination of any successor, as Catherine Loomis has shown; the French ambassador Christophe de Harlay, Comte de Beaumont, would report 'that the Queen was speechless for the final 36 hours of her life and slept peacefully for the last five'.[114]

Alternative claimants were still being discussed in credible private discourse after the proclamation. For example, when Lord Beauchamp (the great-grandson of Henry VIII's sister Mary) carefully assembled his allies 'to goe with him to proclayme the King', 'a good lady not understanding gave intelligence that he assembled his followers' to claim the throne for himself.[115] Anyone reading this account must agree with the understated conclusion of Judith Richards that this potentially fatal

---

[112] Henry Chettle, *Englands Mourning Garment*, B3v-4r.

[113] John Clapham, *Elizabeth of England: Certain Observations Concerning the Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. Evelyn Plummer Read and Conyers Read (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951), p. 99.

[114] Catherine Loomis, 'Elizabeth Southwell's Manuscript Account of the Death of Queen Elizabeth (with text)', *English Literary Renaissance* 26.3 (Autumn 1996), pp. 491-3 (492); Thomas Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, 2 vols (London: A. Millar, 1754), p. 507.

[115] Manningham, *Diary*, pp. 160-1 (30 March 1603); see also Chamberlain, *Letters*, pp. 188-9.

'misunderstanding is an indicator of the tensions of the time.'[116] Even in April, clergy and local lawmen received instruction from the Privy Council that:

> every Sunday your parson, Vicar or Curate, doo publish and sett forth […] to the parishioners, admonishing them to their due obedience, and how much wee are bound to praise God for that he hath sent so worthy and Royall a prince to raigne over us (namely) James the First, King of England, Scotland, France & Irreland, without any Bloodshed, tumults or uproars to the disturbin of the publique peace of this his Ma[jes]tyes realme, and to our great & manifold comfort farre contrary to all mens expectations.[117]

In London, meanwhile, Peter McCullough has found that on Sunday 27 March, the vicar of St Andrew's Holborn:

> warned against "intestine discord" and offered thanks for what few could have been completely sure of, the successful and peaceable transfer of power.[118]

The continuing nervousness was justified; Persons, after all, had hedged his bets by arguing that 'to resist a tyrant and elect a new ruler was not unlawful'.[119] Munster did indeed erupt into serious disobedience from March until May, as Carew had feared, with several towns refusing to proclaim James as their king.[120] In late June, a plot to kidnap the king for political advantage came to light (in imitation of the 1582

---

[116] Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI', *EHR*, p. 517.

[117] For example, British Library MS Add. 6709 f.4v, 'To Mr Penifather Parson of Draycott and to the Constable there' (2 April 1603), quoted in Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI', *EHR*, pp. 517-8.

[118] Peter McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 102.

[119] Kanemura, 'The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, p. 331.

[120] Most notably, Cork (see Kevin Terry, *Terrys of Cork 1600-2000* [Midleton: Litho Press, 2005], pp. 56-7; Francis H. Tuckey, *The County and City, or Cork Remembrancer* [Cork: Osborne Savage and Son, 1837], p. lxvi; George Bennett, *The History of Bandon* [Cork: Henry and Coghlan, 1862], p. 19). The proclamation in Ireland was complicated by the end of the Nine Years' War on 30 March 1603 as the death of Elizabeth was kept quiet until the Earl of Tyrone had acquiesced (see Cyril Falls, *Elizabeth's Irish Wars* [Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1995], pp. 332-4).

Ruthven Raid), and in July a second, (loosely) associated plot was uncovered. The arrests and arraignments of the Main and Bye Plots would last until December, and the immediate social and political repercussions into 1604.[121]

In keeping with Jacques Ellul's thesis that print media tends to mirror and reinforce the political attitudes of the population, there was an unquestionable surge in writing for the English press after the accession of James I which indisputably reflected popular relief and joy, but also concern about the new sovereign's potential vulnerability and the danger to which this might expose England.[122] Like Hackett's early Elizabethans, many new-made Jacobeans looked to this literature not merely to echo their thoughts, but to assuage their immediate fears, and to counteract wider problems the king represented. In the texts responding to the accession, James is accordingly transformed from a figure of insecurity and concern to one of strength and promise, interceding in and reflecting the popular attitude to the monarch of flesh and blood. On the early development of Elizabeth's iconographic cult, Hackett deduces that 'Knox's attack [...] was a contribution to the iconography of the good female ruler, if only through negativity and contrast'.[123] Comparably, an icon of James emerges that responds directly to opposition arguments to make him appear the strongest and most desirable of monarchs. The writers thus enact Walter Lippman's concept of 'the manufacture of consent', through *response shaping*, *response reinforcing*, and *response changing*. *Vertue Triumphant*, *A Souldiers Wish*, *A Briefe and*

[121] Diana Newton, *The Making of the Jacobean Regime: James VI and I and the Government of England, 1603-1605* (Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society, The Boydell Press, 2005), pp. 40-41.

[122] Ellul, *Propaganda*, esp. pp. 38-41.

[123] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 39.

Familiar Epistle, and *King James his Welcome* have shown that the persuasive technique of *circulus in probando* (a rhetorical form of circular reasoning) is used to portray James as a strong king deserving of support and trust, and (by shaping perceptions) thus to transform him into the figure initially presented. In the remaining sections, the following section will show how this transformation was actually achieved and justified.

2: 'Touching his Majesties title'.

The glut of genealogies which circulate in 1603-4 represent the most straightforward attempt to establish James as the strongest claimant for Elizabeth's throne. They publicize his legitimate descent, usually based on the terms of the Proclamation and often enhanced by illustrations. They range from Cotton's 'unusually well briefed' manuscript, to more commercial ventures, and from one to seventy pages, often including images of the Royal Family to make the bond concrete.[124] Unlike the genealogies of Philip Prince of Austria in 1554, their sheer volume indicates market

[124] [John Johnston], *A Trewe Description of the nobill race of the Stewards: succeding Lineallie to the Croun of Scotland unto this day: And now this yeir 1603. unto the Croun of England* (Amsterdam: [by C. Claeszoon for] Andro Hart, Edinburgh, 1603); George Owen Harry (at the request of M. Robert Holland), *The Genealogy of the High and Mighty Monarch, James, by the grace of God, King of great Brittayne, &c.* (London: Simon Stafford for Thomas Salisbury, 1604); Anon., *The petigree of our Royall King James* (London: E[dward] W[hite], 1603); John Hayward, *Answer to the First Part of a Certaine conference concerning Succession, published not long since under the name of R. Dolma*n (London: [Richard Read, Richard Bradock, Peter Short, Thomas East, Richard Field, and John Harrison for] Simon Waterson, and Cuthbert Burbie, 1603). The following meanwhile appear in the Stationers' Register: Anon., *Pictures of the Kinge and Queene, and the Two younge princes* (29 March 1603); Anon., *A Treatise declaringe and Confyrminge all objections to the just tytle and Right of [...] James the Sixt Kinge of Scotland to the succession of the Crowne of England* (6 April 1603); Walter Dight, *The Kinges Majestie his Armes* (8 December 1603); Anon., *The Royall Progenye of oure most sacred King James &c. and The King and the quene with their pedigree and pictures* (both 19 July 1603).

popularity; the speed with which they appeared suggests an eagerness to learn about (or document, even possess) this man and his claim. The prose letter of Fletcher's *Briefe and Familiar Epistle* provides one very early example, but the first genealogy of James appeared on 26 March, and texts of a similar kind continued to be published into early 1604.[125] Many texts versify these 'pedigrees'. For example, in a passage popular and effective enough to be heavily plagiarized in the anonymous ballad *The Petigre of our Royall King James*[126], in *To the Majestie of King James: A gratulatorie Poem* Michael Drayton interrupts his prophecy of the impending future greatness of a British empire to write of the 'true descent' on which it all depends:

> Which now in order let me first dispose,
> And tell the union of the blessed Rose,
> That to thy Grandsire *Henry* I may bring thee,
> (From whom I after to thy birth may sing thee.)
> That *Tudors* blood did worthily prefer,
> From the great Queene that beautious Dowager,
> Whose sonne brave *Richmond* fro[m] the Brittons fet,
> Graft in the stock of Princely *Sommerset,*
> The third faire Sien, the sweet Roseat plant,
> Sprong from the Roote of the Lancastrian *Gant,*
> Which had seaventh *Henry,* that of royall blood
> By his deere Mother, is the Red-rose bud,
> As theyr great *Merlin* propheci'd before
> Should the old Brittons regalty restore,
> Which *Henry* raigning by th'usurpers death,

[125] Sir Robert Cotton's genealogy, 'The lineall dessent of the Saxon kings to James the king now living. 1603. 26. March' (SPD James I, SP 14/1 f. 3), was in the hands of the authorities within two days of Elizabeth's death (Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI', *EHR*, p. 520), probably at the behest of Henry Howard (Kevin Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979], pp. 114-5) to whom Cotton was the 'closest advisor' (Linda Levy Peck, *Northampton, Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I* [London: Allen & Unwin, 1982], p. 103). See also Travers, *James I*, p. 12.

[126] Anon., *The petigree of our Royall King James* (London: E. W[hite], 1603). Kathleen Tillotson also demonstrates that *Petigre* also derives more than half its material from Drayton's poem ('The Source of *An Excellent New Ballad*', *Review of English Studies* 14:54 [1938], pp. 173-175).

Maried the Princesse faire *Elizabeth*
Fourth *Edwards* daughter, whose predest'nate bed
Did thus conjoyne the White-rose, and the Red:
These Roseall branches as I thus entwyne,
In curious trayles embelishing thy lyne,
To thy blest Cradell let me bring thee on,
Rightly deriv'd from thy great Grandsires throne.
Who holding Scotlands amity in worth,
Strongly to linck him with King *James* the fourth,
His eldest daughter did to him unite,
Th' unparaleld bright lovely *Margarite,*
Which to that husband prosperously did bring,
The fifth of that Name, *Scotlands* lawfull King,
Father to *Mary* (long in *England* seene)
The *Daulphins* dowager, the late *Scottish* Queene.
But now to *Margarite* backe againe to come,
From whose so fruitfull, and most blessed wombe
We bring our full joy, *James* her husband dead,
Tooke gallant *Anguish* to a second bed,
To whom ere long she bare a princely gerle,
Maried to *Lenox,* that brave-issued Earle,
This beautious *Dowglasse,* as the powers imply,
Brought that Prince *Henry,* Duke of *Albany,*
Who in the prime of strength, in youths sum'd pride
Maried the Scotch Queene on the other side,
Whose happy bed to that sweet Lord did bring,
This Brittaine hope, *James* our undoubted King,
In true succession, as the first of other
Of *Henries* line by Father, and by Mother.[127]

This excerpt is long but necessary, demonstrating how Drayton makes his dry genealogical subject matter engaging and effective. At the most simple level, the claim is shaped as Drayton names thirteen illustrious direct ancestors to 'graft' James onto a legitimate royal 'lyne' as a shoot of the famous 'union of the blessed Rose', making him less unfamiliar. Each named forebear has a claim to the English throne (with the exception of James IV), and the English vastly outnumber the Scots. 'Thy lyne' is even foretold by '*Merlin*', reaching James's entitlement back to pre-Conquest times, compounding its inevitability and making him more desirable through

[127] Drayton, *A Gratulatory Poem*, A4v-B2r.

association with exciting legendary antecedents. Inventive use of grammar and verse carry the reader through this potentially dense and overwhelming pedigree. Drayton addresses the poem to the king using the intimate second person, encouraging a sense of immediacy with the reader (and their comprehension). Only four of forty-four lines are end-stopped, and extensive enjambment keeps the sense of the passage flowing between couplets. These couplets themselves propel the reader forwards, offering immediate gratification which makes the story move with pace, while adding to the sense of certainty; they also, like his iambic pentameter, create an unobtrusive and readable prosody. James's double descent from '*Henries* line by Father and by Mother' is carefully cultivated. Although more emphasis is placed on the descent of Darnley from '*Margarite*' than on that of Mary (nine lines [ll. 31-9] to just four [ll. 27-30] until they are 'mar[r]ied' [l. 40], to circumvent the issue of her treachery), the double descent binds the passage together. In lines 19-20:

> These Roseall branches as I thus entwyne,
> In curious trayles embelishing thy lyne,
> To thy blest Cradell let me bring thee on,
> Rightly deriv'd from thy great Grandsires throne.

Drayton is being literal. Taking a floral theme from the image of 'the White-rose, and the Red' (and possibly from '*Margarite*'[128], another name for the daisy), he 'entwyne[s]' the image of the Tudor Rose through the versified genealogy (ll. 2, 9-10, 12, 18-20), 'embelishing' the text of the passage like a trellis. Complementing this, the two 1603 editions of the popular fourteen-page quarto contained an engraving of a family tree, complete with leaves and thorns. This is an adaptation of the established

[128] 'marguerite, n.' *OED Online* (online edn. 2014) www.oed.com/view/Entry/114067 [accessed 4 May 2014].

Tudor image (discussed by Roy Strong) for presenting royal descent in visual art.[129] Ironically, of course, it had therefore also been used for the Royal Entry of Philip, Prince of Austria – albeit with great success, as the device which (the manuscript records show) was considered most 'prety', 'most excellent', and 'moste ingeniously set out […] of al'.[130] Drayton is therefore drawing on a recognized device with established success, and adapting it for poetry. All of these instances combine to create an unfaltering romp towards the final, exciting, inevitability of '*James* our undoubted King, | In true succession'. Objecting to it would be at once futile and imprudent.

Pricket's *A Souldiers Wish* demonstrates a contrasting strategy which is equally effective at familiarizing its readership with the strength of James's blood claim. Unlike Drayton's exposition, Pricket relies on the surfeit of texts of descent to enable his use of the ironic rhetorical device of *paralipsis* (that is, emphasizing a point in the act of pretending to disregard it):

> G[r]eat pearlesse Prince I need not to derive,
> The lineall race which doth our hopes revive.
> Thy kingdome England: knowes thy true dissent,
> And yealds it selfe unto thy government.[131]

He dismisses concerns about James's right to the throne by seeming to pass over the 'true dissent' in order to draw attention to it; Pricket can be confident that, even if his readers have not read one of the many Jacobean genealogies themselves, they must be aware of their existence. Hence the line 'thy kingdome England: knows thy true

---

[129] Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy*, Fig. 52.

[130] Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, pp. 61-78; Nichols, *Chronicle*, pp. 80, 149.

[131] Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish*, A4r. Rhetorical *paralipsis* is also called *occultatio*; another device of *pathos* (*Silva Rhetoricae*, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/P/paralipsis.htm).

dissent' – they could scarcely have avoided it – and so the poet can assume the relaxed pose that would strengthen trust in James still further. The use of *apodixis* carefully supports this strategy of circular reasoning; it is 'A forme of speech' (Peacham had explained):

> by which the Orator groundeth his saying upon generall and common experience [or knowledge…] Of all the formes of speech there is not one more apt, or more mighty to confirme or confute then this.[132]

Together, these two persuasive techniques have the effect of making the reader think there's no point in opposing something so obvious. Pricket's poem then leaves the issue for good. Fletcher once again takes Pricket as his starting point, assuming his readers' knowledge of the genealogies in order to manipulate their perception of 'his Maiesties most lawful right and lineall succession'. His *Brief Epistle* offers an enlightening prefiguration of its verse techniques in the prose letter. It begins:

> If any will be so desperate impudent, to affirme that our Sacred and most excellent Soveraigne now deceassed, was not to be naturally sorrowed for, I am perswaded that everie good Christian wil condemne that person: even so every one that now after our mourning and bootlesse sorrow, will not confesse, that our most excellent Soveraigne Lord and King, is not the true lineall, most honourable heire and lawfull successor, he hath not reade any of our own histories or Chronicles: nor doth he understand ought, but may be reckoned among the vulgar to be voyde of common sence, for as the first proclamation was excellently penned touching his Maiesties most lawful right and lineall succession, so it is not yet much above fifty yeres since a conjunct union was sought to have knit both the Realmes of *England* and *Scotland* together.[133]

Unlike Pricket, Fletcher then closely traces the history of these 'fifty yeres' (based on the genealogies and 'the first proclamation'), but (following his precedent) he

---

[132] Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence*, pp. 86-7; *Silva Rhetoricae*, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/A/apodixis.htm. Together, these two persuasive techniques have the effect of making the reader think there's no point in opposing something so obvious.

[133] Fletcher, *A Brief and Familiar Epistle*, A3r.

employs several rhetorical and propagandist techniques in this passage to convince readers to agree with him. First, he refers to external documentary evidence in the form of 'the first proclamation' and 'our own histories or Chronicles'. Second, he appeals to the reader's pride and imitative instinct, by implying that any who doubt James is the Tudors' 'heire and lawfull successor' are fools, just as he had earlier suggested by association that only 'the vulgar' would doubt 'his Majesties just and most lawfull Title'.[134] No one would want to be the (again, 'vulgar') man who 'doth understand ought, but may be reckoned among the vulgar to be voyde of common sence.' Third, Fletcher eases the transition between Elizabeth and James by calling both of them 'most excellent Soveraigne', in an implicit metaphor of 'succession'. Complementing this, Fletcher's argument begins with a point readers are unlikely to oppose (indeed, to do so would be of treason): Elizabeth (he declares) was a 'Sacred and most excellent Soveraigne [...] to be naturally sorrowed for', and the author is 'perswaded that everie good Christian wil condemne that person' who would be 'so desperate impudent' as to say otherwise. Having gained his readers' complicity he then makes – in the same register and vocabulary – a less secure point, 'condemn[ing]' likewise any who:

> will not confesse, that our most excellent Soveraigne Lord and King, is not the true lineall, most honourable heire and lawfull successor.

The figurative use of the act of confession makes loyalty to the king part of being a 'good Christian' (like loyalty to the queen in the preceding line), just as it is part of

[134] Sigmund Freud, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (London and Vienna: The International Psycho-Analytical Press, 1922) and Wilfred Trotter, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War, 1916-1919* (London: Keynes, 1985).

being a wise man, while wider reiteration makes James Elizabeth's 'heire' and 'successor' linguistically as well as legally.

Fletcher's 'Epistle' moves from this broad opening treatment imitative of Pricket to a narrower focus on the 'lineall succession', to associate Elizabeth and James more closely and therefore more securely than the reiteration alone could manage:

> Howsoever her Majesty might seeme to conseale from us her heire apparant, by her grave, wise, & honourable foreseeing Counsell, yet you may see that her most prudent Counsell surviving her most gratious Majesty did presently proclaime this royall Gentleman to be our King and blessed substitute sent of God. Who being the graund sonne of the eldest daughters son of King Henry the vii. and Queene Elizabeth his wife, as then the very heire to the imperiall Crowne of this land, he is also the intire and most deare sonne of the same eldest sisters daughters sonne, a most Godly, goodly, and noble young gentleman, borne heare in England amongst vs, whose very princely presence, my selfe have seene and spoken with, at Saint James house neere Charing Crosse: so that he is our lawfull, and true undoubted King of Scotland by mother and father: of England by father and mother.[135]

The volume of proof thrust upon us to suggest that James Stuart is a member of Elizabeth's immediate Tudor family is almost befuddling. Fletcher again refers to external evidence: this time, his own meeting with Lord Darnley (like Drayton, redirecting focus from Mary, who is mentioned only briefly at the very end of the passage). Next, the persistent use of familial terms (such as 'sonne', 'sisters', 'mother', 'father'), regardless of their immediate context, are as effective in conveying the idea of James's consanguinity with the Tudors as are the facts of his multiple lines of descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. This allows Fletcher to close the discussion with assurance in a final *epiphonema* (or *acclamatio*: an epigrammatic

[135] Fletcher, *A Brief and Familiar Epistle*, A3r, A3v-4r.

summing up, from 'so that he is our lawfull…'), illustrated with *antimetabole* (or *commutatio*: 'by mother and father…by father and mother') and *parison* ('of Scotland by…and…: of England by…and…') to achieve in prose the same powerful conclusive effect that the final rhyming couplet gives to the arguments of Drayton and Pricket.

Fletcher's focus narrows still further, performing something of a coup for the 'lineall succession' argument. The effective removal of Mary from the text allows Elizabeth's supposed 'proclamation' of her 'heire' to be imbued with language of pregnancy. He writes that she 'seeme[d] to conseale from us her heire apparent' until she 'did proclaime this royall Gentleman'. In the context of Fletcher's decision to describe their shared ancestor as 'Queene Elizabeth' (which, for reasons of clarity, is a very uncommon name for Elizabeth of York in the literature of 1603-4), James appears to be presented as a descendent of the late Queen. This motif is developed in Fletcher's poetry; for example, in the penultimate stanzas of 'An Epitaph' he writes:

> Yet see, the Lord did harbour in her brest,
> which she kept secret more then fortie yeare:
> Who should succeed her, and continue rest,
> amongst her subjects whom she held most deare.
> A King by birth, and neerest to her blood: *5*
> (Ordain'd of God) *Englands* aye lasting good.
>
> O mirror then of Majestie and power,
> of wisdome and of woman-hood the best:
> That could conceale untill her latest hower,
> that we in her succession should be blest.[136] *10*

Echoes of the Annunciation cannot be ignored and, much more widely, accession literature was fond of pointing out that Elizabeth had died on 25 March, the Feast of the Annunciation (or Lady Day), the day on which both Jesus and King James were disclosed. Metaphorically and in the eyes of heaven, Fletcher suggests, James is

[136] Fletcher, *A Brief and Familiar Epistle*, B1v.

Elizabeth's son. 'This good King which God hath sent' is therefore neither a 'stranger' nor unfamiliar, but is (unlike, the reader infers, the Infanta):

> a Prince of our English Tribe extracted from the loines of our most famous Kings and Queenes, not devided from us by seas, not alienated from us by nature, nor much by the very *Etimologi* of our vulgar speach, but principally and before all things, O gratious God: not differing from us in religion and the trueth of thy blessed word.[137]

A Gratulatorie Poem, *A Souldiers Wish*, and *A Brief and Familiar Epistle* are particularly early examples. Such preliminary work with and around the genealogies allows Tudor mytheo-history to be perpetuated, 'grafting' it (as Drayton wrote) onto the figure of the new Stuart king and so 'naturalis[ing] obedience to the Crown' (to recall Hackett's summary of Elizabethan accession literature).[138] When Hugh Holland (a Westminster-educated Catholic convert of the Inns of Court circle) transfers *Pancharis*, a tale of 'the Love between Owen Tudyr, and the Queene, Long since intended to her Maiden Majestie', to James, Queen Anne, and Prince Henry in August 1603 (through the addition of dedicatory poems celebrating the accession), he describes committing his 'Ryme of thine old Auncestore' to a new branch of the tree.[139] Drayton meanwhile had concluded with a more figurative example, in which Tudor propagandist imagery begins to dominate and work on James's behalf, just as it had done for Elizabeth[140]:

> Thus from the old stock showing thee sprong to be,
> Grafting the pure *White,* with the *Red-rose* tree,
> By mixture made vermillion as they meet,
> For in that colour is the Rose most sweet:

[137] Fletcher, *A Brief and Familiar Epistle*, B3v.

[138] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 98.

[139] Holland, *Pancharis*, A2r, A4r.

[140] See Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 42: 'Elizabeth I is not identified, say, with St Elizabeth, but with her own grandmother Elizabeth of York'.

> So in thy Crowne the precious flower that growes
> Be it the Damaske, or Vermillion Rose.[141]

Sometimes this is taken a stage further. Through the Tudor line, James can be granted heroic mythological forebears, strengthening admiration of his ancestry and providing optimistic 'figura' or 'types' to prefigure his monarchy (in the style of much *speculum principis* literature). Matthias Flacius Illyricus offers a late Sixteenth Century explanation of the concept of types:

> Typus, sunt vel actiones, vel res aut etiam personae, quae olim ad hoc ipsum à Deo propositae sunt, ut futura quaedam depingat.
>
> Types are actions or things or even persons, which have been set forth by God at some point in the past, so that, besides these things themselves, He might depict some things that have yet to be.[142]

'Typology' or 'figuralism' is an exegetical method which determines 'patterns of prefiguration […] and fulfilment'.[143] Initially applied to scriptural texts, it was adopted in secular, especially moral and historical, literature. A 'type' or 'figure/a' is 'a person, object, or event of Old Testament history, prefiguring some person or thing revealed in the new dispensation' as 'forma perfecta'. Accordingly, all texts could be read in both a historical and symbolic sense.[144]

---

[141] Drayton, *A Gratulatorie Poem*, A4v-B2r.

[142] Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae sue de sermone Sacrarum literarum* (Basel: Ioannem Oporinum and Eusebium Episcopium, 1567), 2O6r, col. 334; translation by Morrissey, 'Elect Nations', *The English Sermon Revised*, p. 49.

[143] Morrissey, 'Elect Nations', *The English Sermon Revised*, p. 49.

[144] 'type, n.' www.oed.com/view/Entry/208330, 'figura, n.' www.oed.com/view/Entry/70063, *OED Online* (online edn. 2014) [accessed 4 May 2014]. Further information on typology can be found in Elizabeth Salter, *Medieval Poetry and the Figural View of Reality* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968); Jean Danielou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (London: Burnes and Oates, 1960); K. J. Woollcombe and G. W. H. Lampe, *Essays on Typology*, Studies in Biblical Theology 22 (London: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1957).

George Owen Harry's seventy-page 1604 genealogy describes James's historical 'descent' from 'his Majesties ancestour Owen Tudyr' as part of a:

> lineall descent from Noah, by divers direct lynes to Brutus, first Inhabiter of this Ile of Brittayne; and from him to Cadwallader; the last King of the Brittish bloud.

'Owen Tudyr' was the historical founder of the Tudor dynasty, but Brutus and Cadwallader are legendary characters in Geoffrey of Monmouth's popular twelfth-century *Historia Regum Britanniae*. According to the *Historia*, Brutus was a descendant of Virgil's Aeneas and, aside from being 'first [human] Inhabiter' of Britain (after whom it was named), was its first king, and Cadwallader (his descendent) was its 'last'. In Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* (c.1136), 'Troia Nova' (London) is founded by Brutus of Troy, giving its name to the pre-Roman Trinovantes tribe (whose land encroached on present day Greater London); Geoffrey himself found the legend in Nennius's *Historia Britonum* (ca. 828), but greatly expanded it.[145] According to Polydore Vergil, Henry VII 'ad Cadwalladrum sui generis seriem referebat' (that is, 'traced his ancestry back to Cadwallader'), and thereby to Brutus.[146] Merlin's prophecy and the promise of the Angelic Voice to Cadwallader – that one (British) descendant would eventually bring all the British lands ('patriam recuperaret', in Vergil's term) under his rule once more – had been used by Henry VII (and several other kings, including Henry V and Edward IV) 'to promote for a variety of motives the idea of the king's '"British" lineage', to validate

---

[145] *The Historia regum Britannie of Geoffrey of Monmouth. 1, Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 568*, ed. Neil Wright (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1984); J. S. P. Tatlock, *The legendary history of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniæ and its early vernacular versions* (New York: Gordian Press, 1974).

[146] *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil*, Camden Series LXXIV, ed. and trans. Denys Hay (London: Royal Historical Society,1950), p. 4.

his crown and, thus, diverse ideological or belligerent projects.[147] (Vergil was even used to justify the international ambitions of Henry VIII during what Roy Strong calls the 'vigorous, offensive […] imperialism of the 1530s'.[148]) They were visibly connected with the Tudor monarchy; Henry had even commissioned a set of statues of British Kings, including Brutus, for Richmond Palace.[149] The myth had not been considered historically accurate for some time, but it still held romantic currency; Graham Parry writes that

> Educated Englishman in Tudor times were not over-eager to accept this dismissal of a cherished national myth by an unfeeling foreigner, but Polydore [Vergil]'s critical views were reaffirmed by the researchers of the native historian, William Camden, whose *Britannia* was first published in 1586.[150]

Yet this rousing mythology of former kings is not merely (like the Tudor name and imagery above) transplanted to bolster the image of James – it is instead uniquely enhanced by his presence. Compellingly, in Harry's presentation, James alone can claim on valid grounds to be the new 'King' of 'Brittayne' who would fulfil the prophecies and re-found a British empire.

A versification of Harry's genealogy from the early summer of 1604, William Herbert's *Prophesie of Cadwallader, last King of the Britaines*, offers the most explicit and extended development of this idea and its consequences. This poem is (again)

---

147 Alan MacColl, 'The Construction of England as a Protestant "British" Nation', *Renaissance Studies* 18.4 (2004), p. 586; Sydney Anglo, 'The *British* History in Tudor Propaganda', *Bulletin of John Rylands Library* 44 (1961-2), pp. 17-48; Lesley Ann Coote, 'Cadwallader and the Angelic Voice: The Rationalization of Chaos 1450-1485', *Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England*, pp. 195-234.

148 Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy*, pp. 7-8.

149 Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, p. 63.

150 Graham Parry, *The Seventeenth Century: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1603-1700* (New York and London: Longman, 1989), p. 167.

seventy pages long, but in this representative summary passage the speaker catches sight of Cadwallader's 'booke' of 'Annales' (when the king lets it fall accidentally), 'Wherein were charactred in lines of gold' the 'sacred prophesie':

> The foremost booke did *Britaines** raigne relate,
> The next of *Swayne***, the third of *Saxens* state.
> The fourth and last did write of *Williams* raigne,
> In which there was an ancient prophesie:
> Written of yore, confirmd by *Merlins* twaine,
> What should ensue to *Williams* progeny,
> Was there at large explainde in poetry.
> The warres of *England* for the crowne of *France*,
> There many battels with their mournfull chance.
> The civill warres of *Yorke* and *Lancaster*,
> The *Cambrian* helmet changde for *Englands* crowne:
> How true discent did *Tudors* blood preferre,
> The brow of peace dispearced *Mars* his frowne,
> The land of warre is rulde by justice gowne.
> These shall have end, then shall arise a King
> Which plenty shall conduct, in concords string.
> He with unnumbered linkes of reasons chaine,
> Shall three in one, and one in three unite:
> *Britaine* should be the name, for *Brute* doth raigne…[151]
>
> * Brutus, and his sons
> ** Roman Britain, i.e. when Britain was a '*swayne*' to Rome.

The passage moves directly in line 15 from the 'end' of 'rul[e]' by '*Tudors* blood' to the news 'then shall arise a King', leaving no room for debate that James is this 'second *Brute*' who 'unite[s]' '*Britaine*'. Pointedly, this '*Britaine*' is made of 'three in one, and one in three', discrediting the Tudor Spenserian concept of 'Britain' as 'a synonym for England' that (usually) included Wales.[152] This undoubtedly endorses the Union project (which was becoming conspicuous in mid-1604), but more interestingly its

[151] William Herbert (also Harbert) *The Prophesie of Cadwallader* (London: Thomas Creede for Roger Jackson, 1604), B2r.

[152] MacColl, 'The Construction of England', *Renaissance Studies*, p. 604; Mason, 'Scotland, Elizabethan England and the Idea of Britain', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, p. 279.

Trinitarian resonances point towards other, Protestant, ambitions. Alan MacColl has shown that 'the legendary history [of Britain] and English Protestantism are inseparably interwoven' during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[153] Elizabeth had patronized Spenserian Protestant allegories rooted in an ancient Britain, and had herself represented what Kevin Sharpe calls 'fulfilment of national destiny', but (Robert Mason explains):

> It perhaps hardly needs saying that the idea of Elizabeth acting out the role of a godly British Constantine, delivering the people of Scotland as well as England from the thraldom of Popery, proved as spectacular a piece of miscasting as could be imagined. Elizabeth had no sympathy with the kind of apocalyptic scenarios that saw her leading British – or, still worse, European – Protestantism in a final showdown with the antichristian Church of Rome.[154]

James meanwhile had written *His Majesties Lepanto* and, although the victory was (as James admitted in his preface) won by 'a forraine Papist bastard', the poem nonetheless extolls a God-given military victory against a religious and territorial threat. James unequivocally (in the 1603 edition, at least) claimed to have 'intended' this as a 'comparison to our present estate' and the 'cruell persecution of the Protestants in al cou[n]tries'.[155] It must be recognized that his reception in England in 1603-4 (in spite of the Spanish peace) does not tally with ideas of the 'Beati Pacifici'

---

[153] MacColl, 'The Construction of England', *Renaissance Studies*, p. 584. In sixteenth-century England this connection arose because:

> the fundamental Protestant principle of a return to an original purity of doctrine and practice found ready analogies and parallels in the old idea of the nation's ancient British origin. […] The British material became part of the wholesale rewriting that accompanied the Reformation. (p. 583)

[154] Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, p. 357; Mason, 'Scotland, Elizabethan England and the Idea of Britain', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, p. 286.

[155] James VI and I, *His Majesties Lepanto, or, Heroicall Song* (London: Simon Stafford and Henry Hooke, 1603), A2r-3r.

monarch of later Stuart iconography. Poems like those of Hall, Pricket, and Anthony Nixon (among many others) demonstrate that, unlike Elizabeth, James was initially presented as a monarch who might 'lead […] British – or […] European – Protestantism in a final showdown with the antichristian [Catholic] church.' Correspondingly, if (through the combination of quasi-Scriptural prefiguration and fulfilment) James is a new Brutus founding in Britain a '*Troynovant*', then Britain – by an extension of Virgil's *translatio imperii* – is (under James) the regeneration of Classical Rome and the continuation of 'imperium sine fine'. This was by no means a new idea; according to Geoffrey of Monmouth, Troynovant was the city founded by Brutus (giving its name to the Trinovantum, the local Britons). Discussing Edmund Spenser's *The Faeire Queene*, Lawrence Manley writes that

> The focus of the poem's prophetic vision of *translatio* is Troynovant, the capital seat of Britain, which carries on from Troy, by way of Virgil's Rome, the destined westering of civilization.

He explains Spenser's epic vision for cultural rejuvenation and 'civilizing process of epic *translatio*' that is rooted in 'the renewal of urban splendour' or '*renovatio*'. 'Troynovant' is in fact 'the major focus of this epic movement' in English literature, and so 'the city symbolically embodies historic destiny; it extends the life of civilization and forms the basis of human culture'.[156]

Hence, Herbert gracefully includes 'a comparison of the English kings, with many worthy Romanes', such as '*Tiberius*', who when he:

> did the Septer sway,
> Of *Albas* Empire, great *Saturnias* king:
> *Germanicus* whose head was deckt with bay,

[156] Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 172, 174-9, 182. Manley goes on to give a combined history of Troynovant and *translatio*, pp. 180-200.

> Fought still abroad, and conquest home did bring:
> So *Edward* [the Black Prince] did whose praise the *Spanyards* sing,
> Let *Beaumont* witness fearfull *Phillips* flight
> And *John* [of France] which yielded to the *Gascoigne* knight.[157]

Through James, Britain can usurp the cultural place of contemporary Rome; he rescues Classical Rome from its bonds to the current city and appropriates it instead for the glory of Britain. When he manifests British destiny, he manifests Protestant destiny, and concurrently becomes an unparalleled icon for the hopes of both Protestant and national advancement.

James is a reassuring token of continued Tudor lineage, the literal heir of York and Lancaster, and he is also the spiritual heir of figures who presage not only his own future greatness, but that of Britain, an advance that only this 'second *Brute*' could instigate. James has a further individual adornment (lacked by Arbella Stuart and the Infanta) to add to his improved Tudor blazon in his 'sonne and heire apparent'. James brings what Fletcher calls the 'hope of happy succession' in Prince Henry and his siblings or, to use Pricket's joyful cry, 'A King, A Queene, a Prince, a Duke, all these'; while he himself secures the present state of the Tudor rose, its future is assured in these 'princely bud[s]' (a presentation which corresponds with Ellul's powerful 'myth of Youth').[158] For the first time in fifty-six years England has unquestionable dynastic stability, and Kevin Sharpe stresses that 'the importance of this single fact cannot be overstated.'[159] Nixon for one sees this as worthy of particular celebration, emphasizing it with a fitting crescendo of anaphora:

---

[157] Herbert, *The Prophesie of Cadwallader*, C2r.

[158] Fletcher, *A Briefe Epistle*, A2v; Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish*, B3v.

[159] Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010), p. 16.

> Long maist thou sit upon thy princely throne.
> Long maist thou rule, and long may we obay,
> In *Justice* seate long may thy Scepter sway.
> Long may thy sonnes thy regall Scepter sway:
> Long may they immitate their fathers waies:
> Long may thy vertues shine in them, that they
> May rule in peace and honour all their daies.
> Long maist thou all thy childrens children see,
> And after death attaine felicitie.[160]

The Kings Prophecie (one of several poems named to capitalize on the Protestant and mythical hopes) has – as might be expected – a slightly atypical approach, but it illuminates wider perceptions about James's ultimate triumph being in his progeny, rather than his descent. For Hall, it is the 'birth' of 'thy princely sonne' – the 'sweete hopes' of the real Stuart future above and beyond those of the mythologized Tudor British past – that 'seem'(s) to make 'this golden age begonne'.[161]

Bringing together these arguments, I. F. goes so far as to suggest that (between King James and Prince Henry) '*England* was neare established till now':

> Now may we proudly boast we neede not feare,
> We have a King, and this same King an heire
> A toward Prince (if fame be true) or rather
> A vertuous sonne sprung from a vertuous father.
> Long may he live, a furtherer of our joy,
> And when he raignes, raigne still without annoy.
> Blest be his match, his issue so increase,
> As we may still injoy an endlesse peace.
> By which we may tryumph thou tookest in hand,
> The governement of this our English land.
> So as the Romanes *Romulus* did call,
> The first foundator of their City wall.
> Or as *Aeneas* Latines term'd to be,
> The chiefest father of their progeny:

[160] Anthony Nixon, *Elizaes Memoriall. King James his arrivall. And Romes Downefall.* (London: T[homas] C[reede] for John Baylie, 1603), C4v.

[161] Hall, *The Kings Prophecie*, A7r, B8r. 'begonne' is recorded as a variant of 'begun' from Middle English to the late sixteenth century in 'begin, v.1.' *OED Online* (online edn. 2014) www.oed.com/view/Entry/17123 [accessed 4 May 2014].

> And first found Captaine of their Italy:
> Or *Brute* the Patron of our Brittany:
> So after ages may in time to come,
> Call thee the *Romulus* of their English Rome,
> Thou shalt be our *Aeneas* the first grounder,
> Of all our setled stay, our hopes first founder.
> We thinke nor *Samothes,* nor on *Bruits* name:
> But attribute their entrance to thy fame.
> […]
> But yet we hope thy issue will so stretch,
> As that it will even to the worlds end reach.
> For we have neither cause to doubt or moane,
> But now may build our house of lime and stone.[162]

In a final devastating blow against accusations that could be levelled at the strength of his claim, James supplants not only his Tudor predecessors but his mythological forebears too. He is not dependent on association with them; now they depend on him: '*Romulus*', '*Aeneas*', '*Brute*' literally follow (and then become subordinate to) the Stuart epic of lines 1-10, while the achievements of '*Samothes*' (another legendary king) and '*Bruit*' are 'attribute[d]' to James. He has even surpassed Cadwallader since, in a foreshadowing of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, the Stuarts 'will even to the worlds end reach' in both temporal and geographical terms (that is, through imperial conquest and dynastic marriage), furthering Britain's power and influence. The British and Tudor myths of foundation and descent are re-founded in James's image, and the reborn hopes of a glorious empire and 'an endlesse peace' are bound up with this new, Stuart, branch of the royal tree. Thus James becomes the progenitor, not only of the Stuart house, but also of a new and contemporary mythology that suits the imagined empire to come. Through the act of depicting his legitimate claim on grounds of descent, a representation of the king emerges that reinvigorates national security and

[162] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, A7r, B4rv.

national ambition, reflected in the permanent materials of I. F.'s British 'house' (which they now 'may build') at home, and his gaze that prospects 'even to the worlds end'.

3: 'A PHOENIX FROM HER ASHES': ELIZABETHAN IMAGERY AND THE PRESENTATION OF JAMES.

The corpus of literature produced at the accession of James I successfully argues that the new king is entitled to the Tudor inheritance overall, and that he may (in fact) be its quintessence using the lyrical persuasive appeal of *logos* and *anchors* of lineage and tradition. However an 'icon', rhetorically, is both a likeness created through imagery, and a comparison 'in which a person is held up against the explicit image of another.'[163] Select symbols from Elizabeth's personal iconography are used to prove James's right to the direct succession. Kevin Sharpe describes how, by 1603,

> the English regal style was enshrined as the Tudor style […] and, still more, as the Elizabethan style: a style of government as much as of self-representation.[164]

This is undoubtedly true, but in this specific context it is also misleading. These Elizabethan *anchors* are not examples of what Curtis Perry terms 'residual Elizabethanism'.[165] They demonstrate instead that James can fill the space she has vacated in person as well as dynastically, and can exceed (as well as succeed) the queen. Transposing recognized imagery from one subject to another achieves three associated aims: the transfer of loyalty through association, the familiarization of the unknown[166], and the dramatization of 'this change (as I may well say) without

---

[163] *Silva Rhetoricae*, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/figures/I/icon.htm [accessed 18 May 2014].

[164] Sharpe, *Image Wars*, p. 9.

[165] Perry, *Jacobean Culture*, p. 155.

[166] As Frederic C. Bartlett explained: 'It is a part of the regular method of propaganda to use the symbol, which stirs the sentiment, always in an atmosphere of stress, strain or crisis. Thus the generalizations which fit the sentiments will be met by that *(cont)*

change', in the words of Richard Eedes's 1603 sermon (or 'semper eadem', 'always the same', to use Elizabeth's own motto).[167] The stratagem, as an appeal to the emotions, is an example of argument by *pathos* to complement the argument by *logos*, and may be influenced by Edmund Spenser's successful application in *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579) of Catholic images to his Protestant queen, to 'strengthen' (David Norbrook argues) 'the prestige of his ruler', and overcome 'unease' among her subjects (for example, Elizabeth's espousal of 'the language of love poetry to overcome the discomfort felt by many courtiers at being subordinate to a woman').[168] Moreover, the poets are making use of the successes of Elizabethan royal iconography since, as E. C. Wilson explains, 'she first gave English nationalism a completely adequate centre and symbol.'[169] It also draws on the classical debate device of *synkrisis*, in which social equals are examined side by side, often using corresponding words or phrases (in this case, imagery), to consider their similarities and/or differences.[170] As Curtis Perry and John Watkins have shown, Elizabethan imagery gained oppositional qualities only later in James's reign; in the iconography of 1603-4, James is Elizabeth's worthy successor, not merely her legitimate one.[171]

---

enthusiastic sweeping away of criticism which fits the emotion.' (*Political Propaganda* [1940], quoted in David Welch, *Propaganda: Power and Persuasion* [London: British Library, 2013], p. 203).

[167] Richard Eedes, *Six Learned and Godly Sermons* (London: E. Bishop, 1604), 16rv.

[168] Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, pp. 76, 103.

[169] Wilson, *England's Eliza*, p. 366.

[170] Also called *comparatio*, it is most famously used by Plutarch in the *Parallel Lives*.

[171] Perry, *Jacobean Culture*, pp. 184-5; Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth*, p. 6.

Predictably, James inherits the conventional symbols of monarchic tribute, such as sun metaphors.[172] For instance, *Vertue Triumphant* begins:

> Now that Hyperion with his chearfull beames,
> Hath cleer'd the troubled skie of cloudie state;
> Since little springs do runne to largest streames, *3*
> And mutuall faith determines feare of hate;
> Oh happie land who such a King do'st gaine,
> By whom are dri'd the teares of sorrowes raine.[173] *6*

Just as the sun's rising dispels threatening weather, so James banishes fearful anticipation in England. This 1603-4 stereotype is related to – but not the same as – what Catherine Loomis terms elegy's '"nature reversed" trope'.[174] Drawn from Sidney and Spenser, this trope also 'persuad[es] the reading public that Elizabeth's death and James's arrival were natural'. (According to Loomis, the trope teaches the reader how to mourn effectively, assuming pathetic fallacy by 'locating [it] within the disordered consciousness of the reader', and that the trope otherwise offers a blunt comparison of their relative fertility. Instead, beyond the simple core allegory of threat overcome, it is possible to see in the imagery of spring weather yet another opportunity to stress British renewal and the promise James brings as summer, and then the harvest, are still to come.[175]) Perhaps the most beautiful examples in the accession poetry are found in Henry Petowe's 1603 sonnet sequences: *Elizabetha quasi vivens* and

---

[172] See Peter C. Herman, '"Best of Poets, Best of Kings": King James VI and I and the Scene of Monarchic Verse', *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writing of James VI and I*, ed. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), pp. 61-103, on the 'specific conventions or audience expectations for monarchic verse' (p. 66) which can be extended to apply to verse addressed to monarchs (as in Dennis Kay, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990]).

[173] Leighton, *Vertue Triumphant*, A2r.

[174] Loomis, *The Death of Elizabeth I*, p. 56.

Englands Cæsar. *Elizabetha quasi vivens* describes the effigy of Elizabeth that was carried in her funeral procession, which:

> like to Phoebus in his golden Car,
> Was the bright eye of that obscured day:
> And though her glorious prograce was not far,
> Yet like the smiling Sunne this semblance lay.

Since the effigy is (necessarily) like Elizabeth, Elizabeth must also be either 'like' the sun or even the sun herself. The effigy's arrival disperses the 'clowds […] Whose presence turn'd the day to sable night': the dark thoughts of 'clowded men', consoled with a sight of the late queen, and (literally) the 'Three thousand and od[d] hundred' official mourners clad in 'blacks' who preceded her coffin:

> As blacke as night, trampling the lower sphere,
> As by degrees from place to place they goe.

Accordingly, on James's coronation in *Englands Cæsar*, Petowe demands:

> Ope wide yee Oryent gates of *Caesars* tower;
> *Caesar* him selfe with a most royall trayne
> Must grace your golden leaves, this is the hower,
> Fly open then for *Caesars* entertayne.
> Usher his way, my *Muse* say that he comes,
> At whose uprise *Phoebus* doeth stand at gaze,
> Thinking the Heavens had ordeyn'd two Sunnes;
> One for the earth, which made Heavens Sunne amaze.
> Such is the glory of his reflecting gleames,
> Compos'd of sacred mettall: made by *Jove*
> That night turnes day when as he darts his beames,
> Frownes into smyles such is his princely love.
> Then London smyle, let no brow dare to frowne,
> When Royall James rides to his regall Crowne.[176]

James, explicitly one of 'two Sunnes', surpasses the other ('Heavens Sunne') in his 'glory', as it is his presence alone that dispels the darkness of potential threats (when 'night turnes day' metaphorically rather than literally). The charm of this poem, however, lies in the elaboration of the metaphor around the 'reflecting gleames' of

[176] Henry Petowe, *Englands Caesar* (London: John Windet, 1603), B2r, C3r.

James's 'sacred mettall'. The 'mettall' is at once the King himself who 'reflect[s]' God's glory, and the 'regall Crowne' to which he rides, which will flash and catch the 'glory' of the celestial sun, making James seem (in wearing it) even more like the sun to which he is compared.[177] The sun symbolizes the king's 'glory' and sacred state, and the nourishment and amelioration that will be drawn from him. The homophone sun/son makes it a particularly effective image in 1603-4, emblematically fabricating the metaphorical patrimony and used in lines such as '*Luna's* extinct, and now behold the *Sunne.*'[178]

James also inherits certain images that had been specific to Elizabeth: the rose, the phoenix, and the moon.[179] Crucially, not all of her ornaments adorn James; pearls, for example, do not appear. The rose, phoenix and moon are widely used, however, because they offer particular and supportive metaphorical possibilities for the new king. A few critics have written on the presence of Elizabethan imagery in early Jacobean literature, recognizing that artists 'invest' James 'with the symbolism of the old Queen, just as the coronation had invested him with the traditional regalia'.[180] Most significantly, Hackett argues that such imagery consoles the readers for their loss.[181] However, recent criticism (supposedly articulating an explicit Stuart bias) has merely reiterated Hackett's argument without considering the implications

---

[177] 'mettle, n. and adj.' (meaning A1) www.oed.com/view/Entry/117727, 'metal, n. and adj.' (meanings 1.i.b and 7) www.oed.com/view/Entry/117221, *OED Online* (online edn. 2011) [accessed 1 December 2011].

[178] Petowe, *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, B3v.

[179] See Louis Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2006), passim.

[180] Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981), p. 1.

[181] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, pp. 220-1.

of the transfer from a Jacobean perspective.[182] The rededication of this iconography is more than an example of what Perry's 'residual Elizabethanism'.[183] It places the insecure and unknown James literally and spectacularly (in the words of Pricket) 'in our farre renounde Elizaes stead'.[184] The rest of this section deconstructs the Jacobean moon, rose, and phoenix in turn, showing how and why they work, and considers their effect on other themes and imagery.

One standard use of the monarchic sun imagery, Hackett has recognized, 'was to acclaim James as the sun rising after the moon', the most recognisable image of the late queen (again, as in Petowe's line, '*Luna's* extinct, and now behold the *Sunne*').[185] Henrie Campion's poem 'Since that to death is gone that sacred Deitie' (in the Cambridge collection *Sorrowes Joy*) demonstrates why this was effective:

> Many there are like wolves, and mastie dogges,
> Who long chaind up expected long this daie
> That then they might shake off their iron clogs,
> And with full mouth run on us as their praie:
> Co[m]fort fed hope not long, not hope did comfort taste,
> Of hope & cō[m]fort for they see their last.
>
> For Phæbe gone, a Phæbus now doth shine,
> Mars, and Minerva's champion let's him call,
> Englands strong shield, under whose sacred shrine
> England may shake, but neare is like to fall.
> Shine Phæbus stil, neare may thy vertuous lights
> Ecclipsed be with blacke obscured nights.[186]

[182] Loomis, *The Death of Elizabeth I*, p. 51, p. 66; Perry, *Jacobean Culture*, pp. 154-5; Roy Strong, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Elizabeth I* (London: Random House, 2003), p. 15.

[183] Perry, *Jacobean Culture*, p. 155.

[184] Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish*, A4r.

[185] See Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, pp. 174-8, p. 220, and Loomis, *The Death of Elizabeth I*, pp. 56-7.

[186] Henry Campion, 'Since that to death is gone that sacred Deitie', *Sorrowes Joy*, pp. 15-16. Venn and Venn record only one Campion at Emmanuel College in 1603, *(cont)*

Those 'wolves' and 'dogges' who wait on Elizabeth's death are confounded when 'Phæbe' (the moon) is replaced by 'Phæbus' (the sun). Elizabeth-'Phæbe' had been 'admired' by 'Vesta, Minerva, Pallas, Venus' in a preceding stanza, but here James-'Phæbus' becomes 'Mars, and Minerva's champion' (he is not merely 'admir'd', but is their favourite and crusader). So blessed by a goddess of wisdom and two gods of war, James-Phæbus can be an even more 'strong shield' against the 'blacke obscured night' which threatens the 'vertuous light' of British Protestantism than Elizabeth-Phæbe had been (who was merely 'admir'd' by Pallas/Minerva). (Ambiguously, the sentence structure suggests that he may even be 'Mars' himself – and, after all, England is safe 'under [his] sacred shrine').

This monarchic sun imagery underscored the natural progress of the succession; as Loomis concludes, 'James's succession is as natural and necessary as it is that one day follows another'.[187] In this context, however, it undermines the Elizabethan moon (which is paler, colder, changeable, and without the ability to nourish). Yet sometimes the moon is used to symbolize a Stuart dynastic future that builds on the Elizabethan past, in an exemplification of the factual lures used elsewhere (to increase the persuasive force of the argument through 'delightful teaching'; an instance of *pathos* embellishing the *logos* of the genealogical arguments).[188] For example, Thomas Cecill (sic), Lord Burleigh's son, reassures his reader that 'The losse [of Elizabeth] is but as when the moone doth change', an

---

William Campion who matriculated 26 January 1601/2 (*Alumni Cantabrigienses*, I.i.287). According to Norbrook, Emmanuel College was a 'Protestant stronghold' at the time ('Panegyric of the Monarch', p. 129).

[187] Loomis, *The Death of Elizabeth*, pp. 52-53.

[188] Sidney, 'The Defence of Poesy', *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, pp.16-17

optimistic presentation which portrays 'the moone' as an eternal body naturally 'chang[ing]' in a regular, predictable way.[189] In *King James His Welcome*, I. F. asserts that:

> for his issues certaintie, I dare
> His off-springs firmnesse to the Moone compare.
> Who having long time gloriouslie advaunst,
> Hir choisest brightnesse, and a great while daunst,
> Within the spherie circle of the skie,
> Doth mildly at the last decrease and dye.
> Yet not so utterly extinguished,
> As that she is for ever dim'd and dead,
> But she at length at every open view,
> Doth rise againe, and former light renew.
> So may thy heires continue, though by course
> Death crops them one by one, without remorse,
> Yet the one dead, the other shall succeed,
> And as the old doth die, the young shall breed.
> Whose race (if like to thee) may ne're be done,
> Before there be an end of Moone and Sunne.[190]

In lines 1-6 'the Moone' appears as the recognized metaphor for Elizabeth, but over the course of the passage any lingering associations with in-'firmnesse' or mutability are negated. The image is claimed instead for fecundity, 'renew[al]', and permanence on account of James's 'off-spring', as its diurnal motion encapsulates how his 'heires continue, though by course | Death crops them one by one'. The 'succe[ssion]' is (at last) regular and predictable, like the moon. The adopted imagery is, in this context, a forward-looking symbol of the utmost security for English government, representing the 'certaintie' offered by the Stuarts.

The rose illustrates another aspect of the dynastic security James brings to the English monarchy, but where the moon depicts his role in the (as it were)

[189] Thomas Cecill, 'Now is my muse clad like a Parasite', *Sorrowes Joy*, p. 22.
[190] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, B4v-C1r.

heavenly and eternal institution, the rose considers the consequences of his immediate inheritance of the crown. Although Loomis interprets use of the Tudor rose in what she considers to be, specifically, Elizabethan 'funeral literature' – where the rose is 'a *memento belli*' reminding us 'that a civil war would be a disaster' – she supplies little supporting evidence.[191] The rose can, in fact, aim to reduce the likelihood of war through the use of a familiar illustration that diminishes the perceived distance (literal and metaphorical) between the cousins, and, with it, the space for a rival claimant. This is possible because the rose is the only image that can signify both the line from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, and Elizabeth specifically. The 'Tudor' rose becomes as valid an image of the Stuart branch as of the defunct legitimate line of Henry VIII, and James simultaneously becomes a familiar figure of monarchy drawn directly from Elizabeth.

One of many examples of the rose trope is found in Theophilus Field's 'An Epitaph upon our late Soveraigne' (also in the Cambridge collection *Sorrowes Joy*):

> Here in this earthen pot lies withered
> Which grew on hie, the white rose and the red.
> Strawe[192] roses here, out of this rosie bedde,
> Out grows, & lives the Roy-flowre which was dead;
> Thus is a Phænix of her ashes bred.[193]

Field is able to allegorize the fear and unlooked for ease of the succession (increasing the poem's persuasive power of consolation) through the rose: although mature canes (the branches of which carry the stems and their flowers) may die, the

[191] Loomis, *The Death of Elizabeth*, p. 61.

[192] This unclear word may simply be 'strew'; on the other hand, 'strawe' was a Scottish variant of 'strive' meaning, suggesting that the withered rose is resurrected, against all expectations and sense. 'strive, n.' *OED Online* (online edn. 2015) www.oed.com/view/Entry/191722 [accessed 9 May 2014].

[193] Theophilus Field, 'An Epitaph upon our late Soveraigne', *Sorrowes Joy*, p. 14.

appropriately named crown lives on and sends up new shoots to replace them. 'The white rose and the red' seems to have died with Elizabeth, until the image is rejuvenated as the Jacobean 'Roy-flowre'. The two incarnations share roots, growing from the same 'rosie bedde'. However, 'bedde' also summons associations of childbirth and it is explicitly 'her ashes [that] bred' James; moreover, he is 'the Roy-flowre which was dead' (that is, Elizabeth herself), in an expression of the transfer of the body politic. Given these initial similarities, if the two monarchs now diverge that will only be because James 'Out growes' Elizabeth: he grows out of the queen, through the 'ashes' and 'bedde', but the words also promise that he will 'Out growe' her by surpassing her abilities and achievements. 'Her ashes' recall those ashes to which the dead return in Genesis 3:19 and the burial service of *The Book of Common Prayer*, converting an image of death (for Elizabeth) into one of fertility (for the Stuarts).[194]

The rose simultaneously symbolizes that James is Elizabeth's heir in dynastic, personal, and spiritual terms; one who can preserve and equal her role, but who may even improve upon it. It shows that the Stuarts inherit the Tudor rose with as valid a claim as the nominal Tudors themselves, making them seem less of a cadet branch. As with the transformed moon, the rose offers an optimistic illustration of the succession in which the new king converts images of transience into those of renewal, strong possession, and the perpetuation of a familiar monarchy (in every sense).

Field is unique, however, in using the rose as a metaphor of rebirth. He does so to complement another adopted Elizabethan image: the 'Phænix', which is directly

194 *The booke of common prayer and administration of the Sacramentes, and other ritess and ceremonies in the Churche of England* (London: [John Kingston for] Richard Jugge and John Cawode, 1559), U2r.

related to the main conceit through the punning use of 'ashes'. 'Ashes' are used to fertilize a 'rosie bedde'; they are also the remains/beginning of the 'Phænix' (implying that Elizabeth too was 'a Phænix' in accordance with the legend[195]). This enables the poet to conclude with a powerful metaphor that reinforces his theme of continuity and rightful inheritance in a single word. The conceit of the 'Phænix rare'[196] is particularly popular, perhaps because it reinforces the concept of Eedes's 'change without change' by encouraging symbolism of Classical and Byzantine Rome, cultural renewal, Christian resurrection (and even James's Guise ancestors, to make it personal to the new king[197]).[198] According to Susan Doran, it

> had long been a symbol for hereditary rule because, like the institution of monarchy, the generality of the phoenix lives on when the individual dies; and like a ruler, only one of its kind is ever alive at any time.[199]

[195] The mythology of the Arabian phoenix and its lifecycle was well known through Ovid's *Metamorphoses* XV.391, and to some extent also through descriptions in Hesiod's *The Precepts of Chiron*, Herodotus's *Histories* II.73, Tacitus's *Annals* VI.28, Martial's *Epigram* V, and Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* X.

[196] Herbert, *A Prophesie of Cadwallader*, D2r.

[197] Michael Bath, *Emblems for a Queen: the needlework of Mary Queen of Scots* (Archetype Publications, 2008), p. 4, p. 157, and Margaret Swain, *Needlework of Mary Queen of Scots* (Bedford: Ruth Bean Publishers, rev. edn. 1986), p. 25.

[198] Roelof van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972); Strong, *Gloriana*, p. 18; Frances Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), p. 38; Misako Himuro, 'The Phoenix in the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians', *Renaissance Studies* (December 1999) Vol. 12 Issue 4, pp. 523-544; Valerie Jones, 'The Phoenix and the Resurrection', *The Mark of the Beast*, ed. Debra Hassig (New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 99-110.

[199] Susan Doran, 'Virginity, Divinity and Power: The Portraits of Elizabeth I', *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 178.

For Elizabeth, John Watkins argues, the phoenix 'honored her uniqueness, [and] self-sufficiency', but other studies of Elizabethan iconography show that the Elizabethan Phoenix had also been a ward against succession fears for some time. Hackett writes:

> As Elizabeth passed beyond childbearing age, the Phoenix became an increasingly apt image of her singularity, sexual purity and self-perpetuation by spiritual rather than physical means.[200]

The original promise of the metaphor – that a single heir would be provided even though the queen was childless – has been fulfilled, and this favourable outcome makes the Phoenix a powerful symbol (familiar, successful, and therefore reassuring) of the benefits realized in the person of the heir it had imagined, albeit inverted now to look back towards the queen. Ironically, while the two images of ephemerality (the moon and the rose) become symbols of continuity, the image that modern scholars associate with individual rebirth proclaims a rousing but prudent vision of long awaited innovation under James.

On a first reading, the Phoenix does seem to stand for a continuity between Elizabeth and James so total that she is reborn in him. To give a selection of the many examples, Cecill's poem elaborates on his notion of 'the moone''s continuity-in-change by comparing Elizabeth's 'losse' to:

> when a Phœnix dies: Phœnix is dead:
> And so a Phœnix followes in her stead.
> Phœnix for Phœnix.[201]

Nixon names James *'A* Phoenix *from* Elizaes *ashes bred*' while Thomas Churchyard ends his *Sorrowfull Verses* with the epigram:

> This *Phœnix* dead, from her warm Cynders streight,

[200] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 122; Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth*, p. 18.
[201] Cecill, 'Now is my muse clad like a Parasite', *Sorrowes Joy*, p. 22.

> In forme of Man, another *Phœnix* rose,
> Who clapt his wings, And flew up such a height,
> (So neere the Sunne) that he GODS glorie showes.

Likewise, in John Lane's *Elegie*:

> See how our *Phœnix* mounts above the skies,
> And from the nest another *Phœnix* flyes.[202]

and in I. F.'s *King James His Welcome*:

> The *Phoenix* that of late fled to the skies
> Hath left her ashes, from whence doth arise
> Another *Phoenix,* rare, unmatcht, unpeered,
> Unto whose love, love is it selfe indeered.[203]

I. F.'s adjectives 'rare, unmatcht, unpeered', in an example of amphiboly (i.e. intentional syntactic ambiguity), can apply grammatically both to the particular Jacobean '*Phœnix*' and to the '*Phœnix*' as a generic creature. (The negative 'un...un' phrasing of James's apparent peerlessness is not indicative of impairment or inadequacy. Asyndetic privative adjectives are a ubiquitous Classical and Biblical literary device, used (for example) of God in 1 Timothy 1.17 and the honourable senator Thrasea in Tacitus's *Annals* 16.26.)

The Phoenix appears to fulfil our expectations as a straightforward rebirth metaphor, acting as a talismanic device to protect the nation from drastic change (whether from James's new government or threats to it). In Thomas Byng's 'Great god in dreadfull judgement', for instance:

> That regall race to peace restored first
> This land, when two brave Peares did joyne in one,
> Ending of civill wars the bloody thirst, *3*

[202] Nixon, *Elizaes Memoriall*, D3v; Thomas Churchyard, *Sorrowfull Verses made on the death of our most Soveraign Lady* ([London: S. N., 1603]), fragment; J[ohn] L[ane], *An elegie upon the death of the high and renowned Princesse* (London: [W. White] for John Deane, 1603), B3v.

[203] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, B3r.

That one might raigne a compleat Prince alone.
Such one Eliza was whilst shee did live;
One Phenix dead, another doth survive.[204] *6*

The line of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York is preserved in Elizabeth and James; 'Phenix' becomes synonymous with 'Tudor', and James is again gifted the Tudor legacy though he cannot be given its name. In this case, personal rather than dynastic continuity is seen as the key to 'peace'. Byng states that the union of York and Lancaster meant 'That one might raigne a compleat Prince alone' (that is, the rival claims were reconciled, 'Ending […] civill wars' and bringing 'peace'). 'Such a one Eliza was whilst shee did live', and so the poem implicitly hopes that the relatively unknown James will 'raigne' as she did, by identifying them both with the 'Phenix' in line 6.

However, it has not been recognized that the accession Phoenix is hardly ever an explicit metaphor for Elizabeth's rebirth in James. On the contrary, in *Ave Caesar* Samuel Rowlands even laments that:

The *Phenix* of the World to heaven is flowne,
And of her Ashes there remeyneth none.[205]

While this may be because Elizabeth was a nonpareil, it is equally likely that the poets were made uneasy by the incongruity of a married Scottish king as the fictive double of an unmarried English queen. Accordingly, they transform the Phoenix to circumvent these tensions while retaining the earlier talismanic qualities of the symbol. In *Vertue Triumphant*, for example, Leighton uses the 'phoenix' as another surrogate birth metaphor:

Our memorable Phœnix now takes rest,

[204] Thomas Byng, 'Great god in dreadfull judgement', *Sorrowes Joy*, p. 10.
[205] Rowlands, *Ave Caesar*, A4r.

> Her ashes doth a mightie Monarch raise,
> Whom best men love and God himselfe hath blest,
> For all our good, and his eternall praise.[206]

The 'mightie Monarch' is 'raise[d]' (a contextually maternal verb[207]) from 'Her ashes', in other words from the very substance of 'Our memorable Phœnix' (supported by the established idea of the roses' fertile ashy bed). Nixon's second Phoenix is likewise '*from* Elizas *ashes bred*', and it also 'rose' from Churchyard's 'Cynders', I. F.'s 'ashes', and Lane's 'nest'. (The popularity of this aspect of the metaphor is further supported by its use in the official speech that welcomed James to London on 7 May, in which 'Out of the Ashes of this *Phenix* wert thou King *James* borne for our good'.[208]) Leighton's Elizabethan and Jacobean figures are fundamentally distinct: there is no rebirth of a 'Phœnix', but a birth instead of a 'Monarch'. The 'Phœnix' appears only in the first line of the passage and its final word, 'rest', suggests exhaustion in keeping with the birth conceit – but this is also a euphemistic reference to death. Elsewhere, too, Lane's 'Phœnix mounts above the skies', Byng's second 'Phenix' 'survive[s]' the first, and those of Cecil and Churchyard are unambiguously 'dead'. In the context of the accession, the Phoenix metaphor is about a pairing of James's beginning and Elizabeth's end, rather than a metaphorical rebirth of the old queen in the new king.

In fact, it is explicitly the death of the Elizabethan '*Phoenix*' that allows the birth of the Jacobean '*Phoenix*', created from her substance. It is clear in all these references that it is not a single Phoenix that is being reborn, but 'Another *Phoenix*' (as Churchyard, I. F., Lane, and Byng all call it). The contemporary version of the

---

[206] Leighton, *Vertue Triumphant*, A2r.

[207] 'raise, v.1.', *OED Online* (online edn. 2014) www.oed.com/view/Entry/157611 [accessed 9 May 2014], 11(d) and 12.

[208] Martin, *A Speech Delivered, To the Kings most excellent Majestie*, A3v-4r.

Phoenix myth dictated that only a single Phoenix could exist at any one time, and so in order for England to achieve the Protestant Jacobean glories imagined elsewhere in these same poems, Elizabeth's departure must be a certainty without being traumatic (which would be an additional danger in itself). It is for this reason that the Phoenix offers a uniquely apt symbol, as *Time is a Turnecoat* encapsulates. Calliope advises John Hanson's Muse:

> Go seeke that *Phœnix* mounted in the skie,
> Transform'd to ever-during Dignitie;
> The *Phœnix* of our age, Earths onely Faire,
> Faiths Empresse, and heav'ns high glorious Haire:
> *Englands Phœnix* admir'd for Rarity,
> For Beautie, Vertue, and Pure Chastitie:
> O shee's consum'd with heavn's resplendent Light,
> That from her ashes *one* might rise as bright,
> And flourish foorth upon the verdant ground
> Whose parallel in Art is scarcely found.

There can only be one of '*Englands Phœnix*' at any given time. Nothing compares with Elizabeth while she is 'The *Phœnix* of our age, Earths onely Faire' ('The' and 'onely' stress her singularity). As 'Faiths Empresse', she is praised for her protection of Protestantism in 'all *Britaines* Ile':

> *Eliza*, who in many dangers stood,
> For Gods high glorie, and her subjects good:
> By her, th'incarnate Gospell was possest;
> Through her, all *Britaines* Ile Jehova blest.

However, her death 'transform[s]' both herself and James: 'shee's consumed […] that from her ashes *one* might rise as bright'. Before that moment, James is valueless, unmentioned, but as '*Englands Phœnix*' he gains 'Rarity' himself (he is '*one* […] as bright'). Where Elizabeth's defence of Protestantism was a British vocation, James has the opportunity to pursue a wider, more heroic and aggressive Protestant campaign not merely contained within '*Britaines* Ile':

> Let no man dread *Romes* Hydra bearing sway,
> For *Albions Hercul's* crops his heads away.[209]

In consolation, Elizabeth is 'transform'd' into something still greater. As James inherits England, she takes her place as 'heav'ns glorious Haire', no longer tied to one 'age', to 'Earth', and to '*England*'.[210] 'Now', the Muse continues, 'is *Eliza* dead | And *David* rais'd in her Angellike stead'; as Petowe unequivocally writes:

> Heaven stand at gaze, yee blessed Angels see,
> Looke through the Windowes of the firmament,
> Upon the Phœnix of all Soveraignty:
> Bid heavens ELIZA from that continent,
> Where she sits crowned in blisse: bid her looke downe
> On princely James her deere succeeding brother:
> To see him goe tryumphant to his Crowne
> Belov'd of those that whilome call'd her mother.[211]

The Protestant monarch approaches God more closely through the Phoenix. In the *Piers Ploughman*-derived poem *The Plowman's Tale*, an anonymous Middle English Wycliffite bird allegory republished in 1548, for example, Christ appears as the Phoenix to rescue the reformist Pelican from a mob of conservative birds of prey. Christ is a Phoenix because of his death and resurrection; his monarchs are not resurrected but are Phoenix-like because they follow Christ. As in the imagery of the Annunciation, James (in particular) is in imitation of Christ. For example, Churchyard alludes to Christ's incarnation when his second 'Phœnix rose […] In forme of Man', and (for I. F.) it is the Phoenix 'Unto whose love, love is it selfe indeered' (love being both a sobriquet for Christ and an allusion to the ideal 'caritas' of Christianity).

---

[209] Hanson, *Time is a Turne-coate*, pp. 2-3, 5.

[210] Hagiographic representations of Elizabeth based on Foxe were commonplace (in the memorial literature, for example, H. S., *Queene El'zabeths Losse and King James His Welcome* [London: T[homas] C[reede] for John Smythicke, 1603], B1rv); see also Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood*, p. 259, and Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 25.

[211] Petowe, *Englands Caesar*, C2r.

References to flight (when 'our *Phœnix* mounts about the skies') even recall the Eagle of St John the Evangelist and the Protestant monarch's role in perpetuating the Gospel; as Churchyard concludes, he:

> clapt his wings, And flew up such a height,
> (So neere the Sunne) that he GODS glorie showes.[212]

Where the Elizabethan Phoenix was a reassuring symbol of self-perpetuation for a childless monarch, the accession Phoenix is transformed from a personal image to an allegory of Protestant kingship. It passes from a device provoked by fear to one encapsulating British hopes, by moving from rebirth to new birth.

The moon, the rose, and the Phoenix are often contiguous. Together and severally these iconic images of Elizabeth (in which her underlying insecurities had been acknowledged) are transformed into vessels for Jacobean confidence. A future is envisaged in which Elizabeth's strengths are perpetuated in James, but her limitations are overcome, as received ideas encourage hopes of security and expansion. They illustrate, as Eedes's August sermon continued, this 'change […] without change':

> a change of person, but not of the bloud royall; a change of the Governor, but not of the Religion and government of the land.[213]

It is striking, however, that (before James) the moon, the rose, and the Phoenix are metaphors associated overwhelmingly with women. They were, Hackett explains, related to the iconography of the Virgin Mary and the goddess Cynthia-Diana[214], gaining 'wider associations with femininity and virginity as general qualities'

[212] Churchyard, *Sorrowfull Verses*, fragment.
[213] Eedes, *Six Learned and Godly Sermons*, B1v.
[214] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, pp. 80-1 (phoenix) and pp. 174-8 (moon).

and becoming a shorthand for admirable and powerful women.[215] It seems unlikely that the early Jacobeans are referring to what Michael B. Young calls 'the stigma of effeminacy', since English writers had not even discussed (in print at least) the story of James's boyhood infatuation with his cousin Esmé Stuart, Duke of Lennox, before he became their king.[216] It is more likely that presentation of the monarchy had become intertwined with these metaphors over the course of Elizabeth's forty-five year reign, and that (in this context) the poets merely chose from among Elizabethan iconography flexible and productive aspects, which just happen to be feminine.

Yet imagery of state femininity does remain important under James (contrary to what Louis Montrose suggests).[217] This male monarch (with a wife and several children) needed to retain the almost magical confirmation of national unity and security which the virginal tokens of Elizabeth had given to England and the English Church, invoking the tales of the Virgin Mary and the preservation of Christ's virgin martyrs.[218] Philippa Berry writes that, metaphorically and well as politically, the Queen's 'power was founded in her unmarried situation.'[219] Hackett takes this further, writing of Elizabethan somatic symbolism that the queen as virgin conveyed

---

[215] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 9. For example, the imagery is appropriated for the coronation pageants of Anne Boleyn in 1533 (pp. 29-34), and in representations of Mary I from 1553-8 (pp. 34-7).

[216] Michael B. Young, *King James VI and I and the History of Homosexuality* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), p. 5. Croft, *King James*, p. 15; Curtis Perry, '1603 and the Discourse of Favouritism', *The Accession of James I*, pp. 155-176.

[217] Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth*, p. 78.

[218] On the power of the Virgin Martyrs, see Karen A. Winstead, *Virgin Martyrs: legends of sainthood in late medieval England* (Ithaca: Cornell University press, 1996) and *Chaste Passions: Medieval English Virgin Martyr Legends* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000).

[219] Philippa Berry, *Of Chastity and Power: Elizabethan Literature and the Unmarried Queen* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), p. 111.

a 'steadfastness and unassailability which are national as well as personal', as virginity could 'figure divine wholeness'. As a result:

> The Queen's virginity is a magic charm which keeps the nation in God's favour and therefore safe; moreover the orderly and unconquered nation state is symbolized by the intact body of its monarch.[220]

If Elizabeth is impregnable, so was England. Intactness could also represent unity and (as Fletcher would write) if the nation were 'unite[d]':

> No forraine power dare then purloyne
> One foote of ground from *Britaines* peace.[221]

Paradoxically, it is James's very masculinity that allows this protective token to become permanently unassailable. Richards and others have recognized that James is presented as a prospective husband for the nation.[222] I. F. for instance is one of many who presents the capital as a longing bride who 'hath held ope her willing armes' for James, and an anonymous text called *Englands Wedding Garment. Or A preparation to King James his royall coronation* announces that 'the day, | Wherein king *James* our king is crown'd' is 'Englands bridall day'.[223] However, it has not been recognized that (just like the transfer of the iconic Elizabethan images of the moon, the rose, and the Phoenix) England can assume the queen's virginity herself, in the role of new bride, 'When royall crowne of Maiden Queene, | Shall circle round thy sacred head' (as *Englands Wedding Garment* continues). Once married, these can be exchanged for the protection of her husband, the crown, and so virginity becomes no

[220] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, pp. 100-111, 116-7.

[221] Fletcher, *Epistle*, B2v.

[222] Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI', *EHR*, pp. 517-18.

[223] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, B2v; Anon., *Englands Wedding Garment. Or a preparation to King James his royall coronation* (London: [Richard Read for] Thomas Pavier, 1603), B1v, B2v, D1v.

longer dependent on the person of the monarch but on the institution (even though this is enabled, initially, by the person of James). The idea of the monarch's marriage to the nation was an Elizabethan commonplace, which (as Kevin Sharpe explains) 'helped forge bonds between subjects and sovereign', but there were tensions inherent in its use alongside the virginity trope. This re-gendering also relieves the nation of its taxing duty to protect a vulnerable wife – although a contentious word, Kevin Sharpe's research indicates that, in the aspects of the Queen's iconography built upon 'a discourse of friendship and love', 'Elizabeth's sex made her a figure to be protected.'[224] Instead, on her 'bridal day':

> Spare now no cost, let angels flie,
> As Hearaulds of your in-bread joy,
> Our *Cæsar* now to London's come,
> Who will us shield from all anoy.[225]

As *Englands Wedding Garment* shows, this re-gendering simultaneously maintains the requirement of devotion and faith to a husband that clarifies the hierarchy which had been complicated by female rule. Richards explains:

> [when Elizabeth and her sister] chose to represent themselves as metaphorical wives, wedded to a kingdom which functioned, it was argued, as a mixed monarchy. […] a queen would never lack sage (male) advice from her Council and from Parliament [a requirement which had made critics of female rule uncomfortable]. Political authority was shared, even within the marriage metaphor, for the two Queens.[226]

The use and transformation of recognisably Elizabethan symbols thus presents James as a hopeful incarnation of continuity, of fulfilment, but also of progress. Elizabethan imagery is skilfully adapted for James just as Kevin Sharpe has

[224] Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, p. 354.

[225] Anon., *Englands Wedding Garment*, B3v.

[226] Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI', *EHR*, p. 528.

argued Elizabeth herself took 'the representational strategies of her father, and […] adapted them to her own very different personal and political circumstances and difficulties.' This, he argues, 'helped forge affective bonds with subjects that lasted long after her death.' Finally, Sharpe continues (still of the Tudors):

> All authority requires legitimation but the need to legitimize and the challenge of legitimizing applied especially to new dynasties […] Legitimation unquestionably involved an appeal to the past, to tradition; but, necessarily, at moments of crisis or change, legitimation might require a departure from tradition.[227]

The Jacobean versions resolve the inherent insecurities in the selected images: the mutability of the moon, the ephemerality of the rose, the renewal of the Phoenix (when fears about Elizabeth's childlessness paralyse thoughts of the future). This resolution is built on the *anchors* of genealogical proofs of his rightful claim, and the precedent set by the queen (even if somewhat flawed), creating a persuasive mode of discourse for a male monarch that is contextually relevant for a kingdom that has not been ruled by an adult king for fifty-six years and three monarchs. James is unlike Elizabeth, but he is recognisable in her context – and both of those conclusions offer a positive prospect to reinforce the perception that James's inheritance of the English crown is a boon for the country.

4: 'ARMED WITH THE GREETING TONGUES OF MEN': LOYALTY ENACTED.

This chapter has so far explained why, and demonstrated how, English printed poetry responding to the accession created a literary icon that presented the new king as the resilient personification of the promise of the moment, to counter perceived threats to James and (consequently) to the country. The attractive aspects

[227] Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, pp. 11-12, 75.

of this figure of wish-fulfilment sought to alter popular perception at an unsettling time and (through a form of circular reasoning) make him as secure and desirable as his poetic supporters longed for him to be. Deconstructing the icon, however, examines only one half of the equation; the image of the icon's reception also needs analysis. Popular assent proves to be as much an aspect of the Jacobean icon as his genealogical or temperamental claims. While the GENERAL INTRODUCTION has made clear that the term 'propaganda' is anachronistic, it is derived from the Latin gerundive meaning 'that which is to be spread'; likewise, the advantageous representation of the king is only of use when it is accepted by its intended audience. I. F. had rejoiced that threats to the king and to the nation 'are cleane put downe' when plotters 'hear *James* weares the Crowne'.[228] Content analysis once again exposes the writers' acute awareness of the importance of reception, in a determination to record – and create – demonstrations of support for the king. Vocabulary of documentation, proclamation, and promulgation fill the poetry, and the texts themselves are acts of this. The writers construct a performative literature — if they write a thing it will be made true, through both the influential power of persuasion (to make a suggestion happen) and the credibility of record (allowing it to make history in its own image, regardless of truth).[229] They also offer the transient and fundamentally insecure key events of the accession documentary security and a wider audience. In this context the permanence of an artistic representation of a

[228] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, C4v.

[229] Here performative literature is intended in the sense of a written form of 'performative utterance' as defined by J. L. Austin and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (inter alia). See J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 6 and passim.

thing makes it more real than the thing itself. The importance of this has never been recognized. Images of the king's enthusiastic reception by his new subjects, and its auspicious consequences, seek to convince the reader that James is accepted by the English, and will profit them, strengthening the nation in reality and in the imagination: this is the heart of the persuasive 'circulus in probando' (circular reasoning) argument. Persuasion is 'transactive' and 'transactional': when the aim is to achieve a response, the writer needs to create not only the icon itself but a receptive and active audience.[230] Here, the most useful anchor is that of the 'group norm'.[231] The writers also use *pathos* and *ethos* (with attendant devices such as *apodixis*) to increase the icon's appeal and its reception through emotional manipulation and example.

It is not a fantasy to suggest that poets are aware of the icon's manipulative power. *Elizabetha quasi vivens* directly addresses this when Petowe describes the waxen 'semblance' of Elizabeth (the effigy carried in her funeral procession) and its effect upon the spectator:

> Faire Englands Queene, even to the life though dead,
> Speake if I write not true, did you not crye?
> Cry foorth amaine and say, her Princely head
> Lay on a pillowe of a crimson dye,
> Like a sweet beauty in a harmlesse slumber:
> She is not dead, no sure it cannot be,
> Thus with unlikely hopes, the vulgar number
> Flatter themselves (oh sweet lyv'd flatterie.)
> Indeed a man of judgement would have thought,
> Had he not knowne her dead (but seene her so,
> Tryumphant drawne in robes so richly wrought,
> Crowne on her head, in hand her Scepter too)

[230] Jowett and O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion*, p. 33

[231] Jowett and O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion*, p. 33; on 'group norms', p. 37.

> At this rare sight he would have sworne and said,
> To Parliament rides this sweet slumbring Maide.[232]

The sonnet plays out the struggle between what the spectator has 'knowne' and what he has 'seene', distinguishing between intellectual and emotional belief. Elizabeth is, for instance, 'even to the life though dead'; the expression of 'unlikely hopes' is immediate and impulsive, but this enthusiasm is promptly curbed by a blunt reminder about the disjuncture between appearance and reality. The monosyllabic emphasis on the final words, 'though dead', is a deliberate, even wilful, device to counteract the seductive power of the image. This is one instance of the speaker's attempt to maintain an objective analytical perspective, as when (for example) the 'unlikely hopes' that 'She is not dead' are retrospectively attributed to 'the vulgar number' rather than the speaker, against the reader's expectations. However, this objectivity repeatedly fails, as the structure of the poem (which mirrors these tides of emotion) demonstrates. The third person subject in lines 10 and 13 follows the grammatical precedent of the sonnet before, but this continuity is punctured by the intrusion of the first and second person in lines 2 and 3. The internal chaos of this outburst (ll. 2-3) and its denial (ll. 7-8) are resolved at the volta by a soliloquy-like self-justification. That is, the final quatrain (from line 9) introduces 'a man of judgement' whose 'thoughts' align with those of the ordinary men, yet who seems to be the speaker's proxy; there is a synthesis of opinion into a single shared experience. This, like the appeal 'Speake if I write not true, did you not crye?' draws every addressee – character and reader – into a confederacy of deception that recognizes the image's manipulative power yet cannot help but admire and submit to it. The

[232] Petowe, *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, B2r-3r.

reader is subjected to the persuasive devices of *pathopoeia* and *descriptio*, designed to move the hearer emotionally in spite of the facts, in a reflection of the speaker's experience (the powerful persuasive device of *martyria*, a device of *ethos*). (*Pathopoeia,* or *pathopeia*, displays the writer's emotions 'to stir his hearers to the same'; *descriptio* lays out the consequences of an act through description, to:

> expresse and set forth a thing so plainly and lively, that it seemeth rather painted in tables, than declared with words, and the mind of the hearer therby so drawn to an earnest and stedfast contemplation of the thing described.[233])

The sequence's title, *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, contributes to the overall effect: it means, clearly, 'Elizabeth just as if alive', but by putting this in Latin Petowe maintains something of the mystery about her state. It is both an admission and a concealment of her death – as throughout the poem.

Whether or not Petowe is honestly recording his own experience of the funeral procession is beside the point. For the 'spectators which did view that sight', this 'counterfeit [of] Art' becomes as real as the thing it represents; as he himself put it:

> He that knew her and had *Eliza* seene,
> Would swear that figure were faire Englands Queene.

The 'counterfeit' supersedes the referent by overcoming her weaknesses. Through *prosopopoeia* (also called *conformatio*, the attribution of life to an inanimate object in an appeal to both *pathos* and *logos*) 'that figure' of '*Eliza*' triumphs over mortality, reinforced when the accompanying prose account of 'the order and formall proceeding at the Funerall' climaxes in:

---

[233] Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence*, pp. 143, 134. See *Silva Rhetoricae,* http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/D/descriptio.htm, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/M/martyria.htm, http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/P/pathopoeia.htm [accessed 11 September 2014].

> The lively picture of her Majesties whose body in her Parliament robes
> with a Crowne on her head, and a Scepter in her hand, lying on the
> corpes inshrin'd in leade, and balmed covered with Purple-velvet.[234]

The 'picture […] lying on the corpes' is 'lively' (echoing 'The lively figure of the late dead Queene' in the verse); that is, it is so lifelike that it appears to be living (in the words of the title, '*quasi vivens*').[235] The 'body' of the effigy usurps the role of the decomposing queen, who is now merely 'the corpes', meriting only the article 'the' rather than the pronoun 'her'. On 28 April 1603, during the explicit public display of the queen's absence and mortality, artistic representation allows her to appear immutable and unassailable to preserve national confidence until the arrival of the new monarch.

However, Petowe also recognizes that the image's remarkable power is not inherent; it is determined by its reception. In the previous sonnet, on the facing page (B2v), Elizabeth's 'semblance' had been:

> Drawne in a Jetty Charryot vayl'd with black,
> By foure faire Palfries that did hang the head.
> As if their Lady-Mistris they did lacke,
> And they but drew the figure of the dead.[236]

Different reactions to the effigy are laid out like the unprecedented perspective scenery of Samuel Daniel's January 1604 *Masque of the Twelve Goddesses*. The 'Palfries' are not deceived by the effigy's glamour, demonstrating unadulterated grief and so representing the spectators' repressed knowledge. Yet the speaker, enchanted, frames their reaction – rather than his – as the misconception in the 'As if' construction of lines 3-4. This extraordinary paradox allows the reader to appreciate

[234] Petowe, *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, C2r.

[235] See 'lively, adj.', *OED Online* (online edn. 2014) www.oed.com/view/Entry/109316 [accessed 12 May 2014].

[236] Petowe, *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, B2r-3r.

that the icon's manipulative power depends on a receptive audience, and their willingness to disseminate the fiction further (as Petowe is doing) – and thus so does its success or failure.

In *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, Petowe demonstrates what a successful artistic representation can achieve, whether in a physical or literary form, when it encounters (what Jowett and O'Donnell call) an 'active audience'. The queen transcends her mortality as the spectators transcend their grief, and so a moment of potentially extreme instability and fear is transformed into one of assurance and hope. Petowe is not only talking about the dead queen. His exegesis of representation and reception is as relevant to the portrayal of 'King at whose faire Crowne all glory aymes' who appears in the following, final sonnet as the 'Sunne' who has replaced '*Luna*', the '*Phœnix* from her ashes'. The poem concludes:

> He that in love to this saies not Amen,
> Pray God the villaine never speake agen. Amen.[237]

Petowe proves his loyalty by ending with the 'Amen' that he requires of others. This termination also encourages an immediate response from the reader, as it recalls liturgical *preces* (a call-and-response structure that is among the oldest forms of Christian prayer) with Petowe taking the role of the leader or officiant. This adds the stigma of heresy to those unwilling to speak. Petowe is suggesting that silence (or lack of display) is dangerous, even disloyal, because as I. F. had explained in *King James His Welcome*, antagonists are 'cleane put downe: | Dispayring, when they heare *James* weares the Crowne.' The fact that 'James […] weares the Crowne' is not enough; they must 'heare' it too. The reign is made secure not only through the creation of the

[237] Petowe, *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, B3v.

icon, but through its acceptance and onward dissemination which symbolize – and perform – 'loyaltie' to that artistic version of the king. As *Englands Welcome* puts it:

> Know forraigne powers: Englands true loyaltie,
> Is bent in service to her Soveraigne King:
> Nor shal the fierce allar'ms, nor frowne of enemy
> Give alteration, or daunted courage bring.

This proclamation of 'Englands true loyaltie' 'to her Soveraigne King' is formally underpinned by the acrostic KING (part of a full acrostic IAMES KING OF ENGLAND). His symbolic omnipresence figuratively leaves no room for doubt or for intruders within the verse, and accordingly within the mind. Later, it is the imagined absence of this verbal icon that represents, for the allegorical character England, the disaster that has been avoided:

> Thou mightst have falne to some seditious hand,
> Which would have rac'd thy name and spoil'd thy land.[238]

Had the perception of loyalty to James not been established, 'some seditious hand' would have 'rac'd thy name', punning on 'razing' the country and erasing the names of England and James.[239] The message is that without the king's (literary) icon, neither James nor the country can be secure.

The perception of the icon is therefore just as important as the icon itself, and accordingly demonstrations of idealized loyalty and reception figure large in literature of the accession. These representations perform *response shaping*, *response reinforcing*, and *response changing*, as they address three audiences concurrently and

[238] Anon., *Englands Welcome*, A4v (first series), B4v.

[239] 'raze, v.', (6), to tear down or demolish; an earlier meaning, (2), referred to the method of erasing writing by scraping (and then figuratively). *OED Online* (online edn. 2008) www.oed.com/view/Entry/158763 [accessed 15 June 2014].

without explicit distinction: the committed subject; the concerned subject; and the reader who questions James. *A Souldiers Wish* declares, like *Elizabetha quasi vivens*:

> Thy Citie London, doth it selfe addresse,
> The love unto her Soveraigne to express.
> There shall the King a hundred thousand see,
> Lift up their hands, and bow on humble knee:
> And crie King *James*, God by thy power defend,
> Their echoing shouts shall to the heavens ascend.[240]

The 'echoing shouts' of 'a hundred thousand' evoke a vast throng of loyal subjects in the imagination of any listener (or reader) who cannot actually 'see' them (i.e. readers outside of 'Thy Citie London', or indeed far from any part of the King's processional route from Edinburgh). If the 'shouts' can 'ascend […] to the heavens' (and by inference reach the ear of God), they can also be heard by Spain, Rome, and other foreign countries that threaten Britain. This is at once heartening for loyal subjects, and discouraging for enemies. A similar sentiment is found, and extended, in the anonymous *Englands Wedding Garment*:

> Our friends are glad, our foes now feare,
> The Orphant smile, and widdow sing:
> That after sweete *Elizaes* death,
> We have so wise, so kinde a King.
>
> The Scholer and the Souldier sing,
> The weaned childe, the beldam olde,
> The Cittie sing, and Countrie both:
> Our eares may heare, our eyes beholde.
>
> Our Gallant Peeres, our Court, our Church,
> In sweetest harmonie doe sing,
> Accenting loud with ayrie notes,
> God save our wise, and learned King,
>
> The Scottish Ile doth streame with teares,
> Shed forth for absence of her King,
> The bankes of English Ile for joy,
> With Ecchoes sounding loud shall ring.[241]

[240] Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish*, B3v-4r.

Several layers of reception are elaborated here, using the devices which are becoming commonplaces in accession literature. As in *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, the whole 'English Ile' (from 'Cittie' to 'Countrie', 'Court' to 'Church', 'widdow' to 'souldier' to name but a few) is united in greeting its king: 'sing[ing]' 'God save our wise, and learned King' together 'In sweetest harmonie'. This 'English' unity is reinforced by the repetition and *epistrophe* (also called *conversio*) of 'sing' at the end of lines 2, 5, 7, 10, and the *parison* (or *compar*: correspondence in clause structure) throughout lines 2, 5-7, 9-10. The song's 'Ecchoes' (drawing on the idea of repetition in the rhetorical devices) evoke the spread of the news from person to person and near to far, while the assertion that 'Our eares may heare, our eyes beholde' epitomizes the poet's use of *apodixis* once again (which Peacham had described as 'ground[ing…] upon generall or common experience' to persuade the reader to agree) to confirm the belief of those who are already 'sing[ing]'.[242] As in *King James His Welcome*, 'Our friends are glad, our foes now feare' because they hear the popular acclamation. 'Friends' and 'foe', whether at home or abroad, are presented with the reception of James (rather than James himself), as they hear 'The bankes of English Ile' 'ring' 'for joy | With Ecchoes sounding loud' (sounding the defensive undertones of *A Souldiers Wish*). For the reader, by extension, this reinforces belief in James just as it erodes hostility and doubt: the expression of all pervasive 'joy' convinces loyal readers of the strength of their position, strengthening it further; meanwhile, adversaries might begin to realize the hopelessness of their cause in the face of such 'joy'. The poet hopes that they 'by outward signes, | Your inward loyall hearts may see.'

---

[241] Anon., *Englands Wedding Garment*, A3r, A4r.
[242] Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence*, p. 86.

In *King James His Welcome* I. F. acknowledges openly that his text contributes to and encourages the 'peale' of popular acclamation. The canto specifically addressed to the new king begins:

> Haile then King *James!* I greete thee with a toung!
> Even that whose meaning is from duty sproung,
> Nor can my muse doe mee a greater pleasure! *3*
> Rather then sing thy welcomes without measure
> I will by that shew how my minde is loyall,
> Else should I much forget a Prince so royall. *6*

I. F.'s 'greet[ing]' is 'from duty sproung': 'duty' to the king, as it would now be treason to deny his rule, and 'duty' to England, as it would be equally dangerous to deny her such a suitable, rightful governor. Accordingly, having 'Haile[d]' James himself, his 'duty' now becomes persuasion. He continues, shifting his address to his fellow subjects in apostrophe:

> And let us seriouslie imploy our toungs *7*
> With crying welcoms, singing joyfull songs.
> That every sillable may distinctly sound:
> And like an Ecchoes voyce againe rebound.
> No doubt it is a pleasure to a King:
> To see his subjects welcoms to him sing. *12*
> So (mightie *James*) do thine, as doth appeare
> By all the troopes which are assembled heere.
> See how in clusters they march through the streets,
> To welcome (loving) thee with loyall greets.
> […]
> Looke how the English nation thether swarme?
> As like a Hive to keepe the Bee from harme.[243] *18*

I. F. is encouraging 'us […] the English nation' to fulfil our 'duty' as well, following his martyria. He appeals to other 'toungs' (pointedly referencing his own exemplary action in line 1) to offer 'crying welcoms' and 'joyfull songs', and so realize the reception described by other poets (the passage is filled with 'distinct' noise and the

[243] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, A3v, C1v-2r.

'Ecchoes' 'rebound', eradicating any dissenting 'voyces'). However, I. F. has cautiously noted that there is no 'greater pleasure' than such a 'duty': these outward shows of 'joyfull' acclamation mirror internal feeling (as he explains, 'I will by that shew how my mind is loyall') and accordingly transform the 'subjects' into defensive 'troopes', who are 'like a Hive to keepe the Bee from harme'. Shows of loyalty are therefore defensive: I. F. claims to reflect the common excitement, but also encourages a reaction from his readers because 'my pen | Is armed with the greeting tongues of men'; they are co-dependent and so the persuasive literature is *transactive*.[244] Writers like I. F., Petowe, Pricket, and the anonymous poets of *Englands Welcome* and *Englands Wedding Garment* encourage readers to express loyalty, and thereby propagate the propaganda. Ironically, putting performances of loyalty on the silent page encourages readers to take it off the page; realistic, non-allegorized, depictions of the king's reception provide a bridge between the acceptance of the icon in literature, and the support of James in the real world. Demonstrations of the desired behaviour, presented as what Jowett and O'Donnell call the anchor of the 'group norm', stimulate the very actions they claim to document; they are self-fulfilling, as through *apodixis* (the use of common experience to persuade the reader to comply) the readers are motivated to participate themselves.

Alongside outright solicitation, I. F. therefore offers a model of behaviour in his own actions, appealing to the reader's instinct for imitation and homogeneity. Another key mode of persuasion is to appeal to the reader's self-interest, offering rewards that are linked directly to the reception of the king (another key aspect of

[244] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, C3v.

'transactional persuasion'). For example, as the king progresses through his new kingdom towards London in *King James His Welcome*:

> The busie scholler throwes aside his booke.
> Glutting his halfe suncke eyes at thee to looke.
> The Marchant lets his getting gaines goe by:
> Finding more hope of gaine within thine eye.
> The souldier lets his weapons now to rust:
> Nor to the spilling of more blood dooth trust,
> But pleaseth most in peace, and craves a place
> Whereas he may behold thy princely face.
> The plowman leaves his oxe to grasse, whiles he
> Thy countenance indevoureth to see.
> The poore artificer now growes so bolde
> To slacke his worke, thy presence to be hold.
> The Gentleman, the matron, maide, and wife,
> The aged man, and youth, prayes for thy life,
> The nobleman, the comminalty, and all
> Rejoyce at sight of thee in generall.

The passage is filled with language of prosperity and security contingent on the act of 'behold[ing]' James's 'princely face'. The subjects' lives are made better by choosing to 'look' at their king; the proof of his 'presence' (and thus – it would seem – of his hold on the crown) generates the first glimpse of the Jacobean Protestant golden age foretold elsewhere. (Compellingly, these moments – in which the individual abandons his work – echo the calling of the disciples in the Gospel of Matthew 4:18-22.) James brings plenty, since they can 'glutt' their 'eyes' on him as though he were in himself sustenance; he offers 'more hope of gaine' than work and trade; he begets 'peace'. While this is synecdoche for the relief and hope of England, it is also literal – the national benefits which James creates profit the individual, irrespective of background, corresponding with Ellul's 'myth of Work'. For instance, the 'scholler' learns more from a glance at James than from 'his booke' (representing the learned king's patronage of artistic and intellectual endeavours), as he 'Glutt[s] his halfe sunke eyes at thee to looke' in an image of recovery from metaphorical starvation.

Meanwhile, the 'bolde' actions of 'the plowman' and 'the poore artificer' indicate that James has given them economic and social confidence: the 'plowman' does not fear his 'oxe' will be stolen, and both workers trust that they can briefly stop work to do their duty to their king. This is a new development, in the case of 'the poore artificer' at least, since he 'growes so bolde' only 'now', when James's 'presence' is immediate. In the composition of these individual vignettes, a society is illustrated that is directly and solely revitalized by the 'presence' and 'sight' of their new king. Necessarily, by assisting the individuals James assists the nation, and likewise the unity he inspires between disparate figures (as 'The nobleman, the comminalty, and all' come together to 'Rejoyce at sight of thee in generall') improves Britain on both the small and large scale. The reader is persuaded of the power of the image, of the trust of others in the power of the image, and in doing so is encouraged to make it work by supporting and propagating the image – ensuring its success, and the benefits contingent on that success. In appealing to imitative and acquisitive instincts, many poets recognize that their readers will be influenced by apparent opportunities of personal security that are connected directly with the reception of the image. Each reader must believe that James's accession will benefit him/her individually as well as nationally (in terms of – for instance – the benefits of peace), and that any Englishman who does not actively show his support is not only potentially malevolent, but isolated.

A second technique for creating a receptive and active audience builds on the device of the exemplary audiences (adapting the *descriptio* and *pathopoeia* that were used to stir the emotions and achieve a response). It offers a form of fictive doubling which allows the reader to experience important moments of the accession vicariously. Eyewitnesses of similar moments are reminded of their subjective

experience; others can participate through the narrative. In either case, the simulation contextualizes the accession (particularly the precariousness of its promise and threat). By making it accessible and powerful in the readers' minds, a real response is elicited, regardless of their particular situation and perspective. *Englands Wedding Garment* and *Englands Welcome* offer two complimentary examples: in *Englands Wedding Garment*, the reader encounters the general anticipation and excitement of the accession; *Englands Welcome* dramatizes the moment of the proclamation itself. Both offer the experience to wider audiences, contemporary and future, British and foreign, who can appreciate the joy and security that follows. In *Englands Wedding Garment* an arresting rhythm (emphatically imitating the rapid and rousing device of *hemistichomythia* in verse drama, a sequence of half-lines alternating between different speakers) is used to involve the reader:

> What newes said one? sad newes said some,
> Our Queene is sicke, our Queene is dead:
> Alas, said all true English harts,
> Then Englands joy from us is fled.
> But when the bright resplendant sunne,
> Had chast these darkesome cloudes away,
> We cri'd aloud, God save our King,
> Oh blessed time, thrise happy day.

The terse staccato exchange of lines 1-4 evokes the speed and danger of Elizabeth's final decline, and the spread of rumours which worsened popular fear in 'all true English harts'. In contrast, the arrival of James in line 5 brings a new fluidity to the verse (clothed in imagery recognizable as that of the reassuring Jacobean icon), and the polyphony of lines 1-4 becomes a chorus of 'We', rejoicing 'aloud' together. In *Englands Welcome*, England (the speaker of the visionary allegorical rendering of events) is herself the reader's proxy:

Long had I not thus look't with mixed dint,
When loe, I saw fast fixed on a poast
A long broade scroule, in Proclamation print,
And Nobles names upon it were imbost.
Which did adorne the paper, it the poast,
I started up thinking to reade the names:
When underneath I saw, *God save King James*.

I trembling stood, as one was still in feare,
I gaz'd about, as one was still amaz'd:
Untill a wel-tun'd concord I might heare,
With one consent and still one name they prais'd,
And still made me in feare, which was amaz'd.
I drew me neere to heare what they did sing,
I heard them sing King *James*, God save our King.[245]

As in *Elizabetha quasi vivens* the poet is recalling his own discovery of the proclamation, and transposing the experience into allegory so that his audience can also 'reade' the 'scroule' (rather than simply reading his experience). The poem presents the 'proclamation' (in an allegorized version of historical events) along with popular and individual reactions to it. 'England' (the reader's representative) is at first unsure whether she is reading treason in the words '*God save King James*'; she 'started up' 'trembling' 'in feare', until a general consensus makes a second, verbal, popular 'proclamation'. (In other words, these texts make the threat of the moment explicit.) However, when (in ll. 11-12) she first hears 'prais[e]' of 'one name' that is not Elizabeth, this consensus 'still made me in feare'; 'still made me in feare' is a deliberately ambiguous phrase to evoke the moment of confusion as the listener moves from fear to reassurance (just as the reader stumbles towards understanding) that this is no longer treason. On the one hand, the words repeat line 8, when she 'trembling stood, as one was still in feare' (frightened that she is witness to treason);

[245] Anon., *Englands Welcome to James* (London: [Edward Alde] for E[dward] W[hite] and C[lement] K[night], 1603), B2r.

on the other hand, her fear is made 'still' (when she realizes that the news is legitimate). This positive reading is supported because 'They' 'sing King *James*, God save our King' in 'a wel-tun'd concord', a metaphor for unity supported by their 'one consent' in musically rallying behind 'one name', just like the examples of *Englands Wedding Garment*, *King James His Welcome*, and *A Souldiers Wish*. This concord purges the ambiguity and anxiety of the initial moment, removing any questions about the validity of the acclamation. *Englands Welcome* gives a vivid narrative of one subject's experience in the crowd; the fact that that individual is an allegorical representative of all 'England', makes her role as a fictive double for any reader particularly effective. These examples help to bridge the gap between empathy and sympathy, inspiring emotional engagement alongside intellectual engagement, representing and encouraging national strength in support of James.

As such, written records of the joyful acclamation of the accession are like permanent and international versions of the 'ring[ing]' of the bells which took place throughout the country on 24 March 1603 (and which had also been, according to Roy Strong, the 'most essential feature' of the annual Elizabethan Accession Day celebrations all over England.[246]) Indeed, during the proclamation scene of *A Souldiers Wish*, the words 'King *James*' toll repeatedly (ten times in thirty-one lines) in the section's opening sentence, concluding with the 'hundred thousand' who 'Lift up their hands, and bow on humble knee: | And crie King *James*, God by thy power defend' mentioned above.[247] Similarly, in *Englands Wedding Garment* the shouts which spread the news are heard to 'ring' out across the country (and figuratively so

[246] Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy*, p. 125.
[247] Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish*, B4r.

in *King James His Welcome*). Although it is unclear whether specific examples like *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, *Englands Wedding Garment*, *King James His Welcome*, and *Englands Welcome* record the personal experiences of the poets themselves, the verse records certainly describe general responses. For example, a representative prose account of James's approach to London, T. M.'s *True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Majestie, from the time of his departure from Edenbrough; till his receiving at London*, remarks on 'the multitudes of people in high wayes, fieldes, meadowes, closes and on trees' who:

> were such, that they covered the beauties of the fieldes, and so greedy were they to behold the countenance of the King, that with much unrulinesse they injured and hurt one another, some even hazarded to the daunger of death: but as uncivill as they were among themselves, all the way his Majestie past with shoutes and cryes, and casting up of hates (of which many never returned into the owners hands) he passed by them over the fields, and came in at the backe side of the *Charterhouse*.[248]

According to the author, as he was 'drawing neere to *London*, the numbers of people more and more increased, aswell of Nobilitie, Gentrie, Citizens, Countrey-people, and all, aswell of degree, as of no degree; so great a desire had the Noble, that they preast with the ignoble to see their Soveraigne.'[249] Elsewhere, William Fitzwilliam reported to Cecil from Northamptonshire that he had witnessed 'the joy' of the people at the acclamation, 'appearing by many streames of innumerable voices delivered with such applause as it seemed to rend the very air'.[250] But Fitzwilliam, like Thomas Cecil

---

[248] For another, comparable, account, see Savile, *King James His Entertainment at Theobalds*, A4v.

[249] Anon., *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Majestie, from the time of his departure from Edenbrough; till his receiving at London.* (London: Thomas Creede for Thomas Millington, 1603), E2v-3r, F4v.

[250] William FitzWilliam to Robert Cecil (30 March 1603), HMC *Salisbury (Cecil)*, 15/19 (*State Papers Online*).

before him, was writing as a representative of the government – they had both proclaimed the King – while the commercial prose accounts, often supported by the establishment, could therefore be considered intentionally persuasive texts, just like the verse. In contrast, Manningham – writing for private purposes – had noted that in London:

> The proclamation was heard with greate expectacion and silent joye, noe great shouting.

'At night', he continues, 'they showed it by bonfires and ringing', but Richards has demonstrated that 'bonfires and ringing' were 'provided, paid for and promoted by the local authorities', official propaganda in the face of the uncertainty expressed on the King's accession.[251] It copied the traditions for the observance of the late Queen's Accession Day, on which day (Roy Strong describes)

> [a]ll over England the Queen's subjects expressed their joy in her government by prayers and sermons, bell-ringing, bonfires and feasting.

Yet even this was, at least initially, no spontaneous celebration, but a reaction to danger. He continues:

> The reason for the spread of these observances was, as Camden noted, the feeling engendered for the Queen after the northern rebellion of 1569 and more especially by the papal bull of excommunication issued in 1570.[252]

The idealized reception illustrated in the poetry is therefore also necessary because either the ideal and most useful turn of events did not happen, or it was seen by too few people to be of much use. Successful art is as true as reality to its spectators, because it creates its own reality. A written record of popular reaction to the

---

[251] Manningham, *Diary*, p. 147; Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI', *EHR*, p. 519.

[252] Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy*, p. 123-24 (Strong is referring to Camden's *Annales*, p.152).

accession is permanent, explicit, and can reach and convince many readers thereby making the fiction a reality by imitation, or by acceptance of this version of events.

The opening of *To the Majestie of King James* takes the importance of the idealized record of reception to its extreme. Drayton explains upfront why artistic records of the period following James's accession surpass the experience of the time itself in terms of their influence and historical importance:

> What though perhaps my selfe I not intrude
> Amongst th'unstedy wondring multitude,
> The tedious tumults, and the boystrous throng,
> That presse to view thee as thou com'st along,
> The praise I give thee shall thy welcome keepe,
> When all these rude crowds in the dust shal sleepe,
> And when applause and shouts are hus[h]'d & still,
> Then shal my smooth verse chant thee cleer & shril.[253]

Drayton, who had been so prominent in his praise of '*James* our undoubted King' and his 'Empire' (in Section 1), now admits that he might not even come 'to view' the accession events 'Amongst th'unstedy wondring multitude'; he will instead attend in the preferable reality he creates in verse. His written 'praise' will far outlast the 'applause and shouts' of 'the boystrous throng'. Their displays of loyalty (he tells James) will only be seen by 'thee as thou com'st along', while Drayton's 'verse' will 'chant thee' into the distant future, 'When all these rude crowds in the dust shall sleep' (and, by extension, James and his poet too). The 'applause and shouts' are transitory celebrations of interaction between the king and subjects and can be distorted by mere memory; the verse record offers this interaction immortality, in Drayton's own enthusiasm for, and dedication to, the monarch. The contrast between Drayton's attractive efforts ('smooth verse', 'cleer & shril', offering 'welcome'), and 'th'unsteady

[253] Drayton, *A Gratulatory Poem*, A3rv.

wondring multitude' is pointed. They are literally 'tedious tumults', 'boystrous throng', and 'rude crowds' in that they 'presse' into six lines, loudly and unruly with 'applause and shouts' – the direct opposite of 'smooth verse', 'cleere & shril' – only death can make them 'hus[h]'d & still'.

Artistic refinement allows a more powerful persuasive version of James, and of his subjects' response to him, to reach and affect a wider audience. Petowe, for instance, manipulates the coronation in *Englands Cæsar*, just has he had manipulated the funeral. Words of viewing ('see', 'heare', 'gaze', 'Looke', 'perceive') and the presence of 'spectators' fill the account (as they had filled Sonnets 4-5 of *Elizabetha quasi vivens*); the poet concludes, 'Eyes never saw such glorious royaltie'. The earlier pamphlet had proudly included facts, prosaic rather than poetic, such as the date of the funeral:

> Of Aprils Month the eight and twentieth day,
> M. sixe hundred three, by computation.[254]

Englands Cæsar seems to present a similar documentary record of the coronation which confirmed James's position as king. However, 'Eyes never saw' in truth, as Petowe finally admits (in this quotation, 'she' is London):

> Suppose this done, what glory hath been seene,
> Within the compass of the earth like this?
> At Coronation of a King or Queene,
> No Marvell he's elected King of blisse.
> […]
> But [God] say'st no, for by thy mighty hand,
> What she and hers intended to performe
> In JAMES his honour thou dost countermaund.
> And mak'st her know, that she is but a Worme.

[254] Petowe, *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, B1r.

As the readers knew, James's coronation ceremonies were cancelled three weeks before the event on account of the plague (here, a 'scourge' for London's 'masse of sinne'), a terrible blow for the initial state propaganda confirming the validity and authority of the new king. Instead:

> Thousands of treasure hath her bounty wasted
> In honour of her King to welcome him:
> But woe is she, that honour is not tasted,
> For royall JAMES on silver *Thames* doth swim.
> The Water hath that glory, for he glides
> Upon the pearly mayne unto his Crowne:
> And lookes with pittie on London as he rydes,
> Saying, alas thou should'st have this renowne.[255]

These disappointing facts are revealed at the very end of the poem. Yet Petowe has presented an imaginary coronation that will allow it to exist for posterity in its desired form and, like the figure of Elizabeth at her funeral, to become potentially more real than the unsatisfactory coronation which actually took place, thus fulfilling its protective and persuasive wants and needs.

The purpose of any coronation, according to Roy Strong and others, is to invest the sovereign with his state and status in the view of his subjects, and this gained particular currency in the accession poetry of James owing to the peculiarly difficult circumstances surrounding his accession.[256] For his coronation, James reinstated the 'fourth recension of the English coronation', taken directly from the *Liber Regalis* of Westminster Abbey and first used by Edward II, although for all of

[255] Petowe, *Englands Cæsar*, C3v, C4r, D1r, D3r.

[256] Strong, *Coronation*, p. 237; Andrew Hughes, 'The Origins and Descent of the Fourth Recension of the English Coronation', *Coronations*, p. 212; McCoy, 'The Civic Progress of Elizabeth I and the Troublesome Coronation', C*oronations*, p, 223.

Henry VIII's children, the service had been dramatically altered.[257] He supervised its translation into English for the first time, although the oath was administered in Latin, English and French.[258] James was clearly determined that the coronation's legitimacy could not be called into question, while also stating his Plantagenet heritage and Protestant stance, but he also opened the text to a wider audience of ordinary subjects.[259] Andrew Hughes explains that in the Fourth Recension:

> the acclamation by popular recognition, was reinstated after two centuries of absence, and placed prominently at the beginning of the service.[260]

That is, 'recognition takes place as preliminary to the rite'. Acclamation as a 'legitimating device' for the monarch, Richards and Norbrook both explain, 'survived from the days when monarchs were elected'.[261] James recognized its importance, as Sybil M. Jack's research has disclosed that he was 'anxious that the whole nobility of the realm attend his English coronation', and that it was viewed by his common subjects.[262] But this accessible public show of loyalty and legitimacy was denied him

---

[257] 'recension, n.' 2(a): the revision of a text (especially a theological text); a particular form or version of a text resulting from such revision. *OED Online* (online edn. 2009) www.oed.com/view/Entry/159423 [accessed 12 May 2014].

[258] The coronation service survives in several MSS: Lambeth Palace MS 1075b (transcribed in John Wickham Legg [ed.], *The Coronation Order of King James I* [London: F. E. Robinson, 1902], pp. 13-16); Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson B.40 f. 4; and British Library MS Add. 39139 f. 205-14. A short version of the order of service also survives in British Library MS Add. 6284 f. 36-39.

[259] L. G. Wickham Legg, *English Coronation Records* (London: A. Constable & Co., 1901), pp. 81ff; Reginald Maxwell Woolley, *Cambridge Liturgical Handbooks: Coronation Rites* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915), pp. 69-75; Matthias Range, *Music and Ceremonial at British Coronations: From James I to Elizabeth II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 33.

[260] Hughes, 'The Origins and Descent of the Fourth Recension', *Coronations*, p. 197.

[261] Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI', *EHR*, p. 521; Norbrook, 'Panegyric of the Monarch', p. 15.

[262] Jack, '"A Pattern for a King's Inauguration"', *Parergon*, p. 80.

– and his subjects. In the event, this feudal hangover of the coronation, already slightly absurd (as 'popular' acclamation was given by select clergy and nobility), became even more restricted in 1603. Dudley Carleton wrote on 10 July that 'because of the plague the coronation would be "so private" that he himself would not stay in town.'[263] The acclamation of the poetic texts, sanctioning their 'created King', makes them in effect a literary coronation performed by the people deprived of the reassurance of the coronation proper. They are the *recognitio* of the coronation service, in which the ruler was presented to his people 'not for their approval but to call them to render fealty. […] Those present signified their willingness by crying out, "Yea yea God save Kinge James".'[264] *Englands Cæsar* actually presents itself as the coronation, when the text is introduced with the enigmatic statement 'This is the day that should have fam'd our City'.[265]

These texts ensure that James, like his poets' verse, 'is armed with the greeting tongues of men' for all to see and all to hear, implying a Protestant faith in the power not only of the Word, but of words, to overawe any not assured of the king's security, whether wilfully or through ignorance.[266] Paradoxically, the words make the Truth, by glossing over unsatisfactory events and replacing them with satisfactory ones which they have provoked. As engaging and exciting written texts, they continue to provoke the same feelings long after the event, constantly reinforcing loyalty on every reading. The words inspire, record, reinforce actions; they also idealize both the actions and the record. Through the fiction of the ideal

[263] Jack, '"A Pattern for a King's Inauguration"', *Parergon*, p. 80.
[264] Strong, *Coronation*, p. 237.
[265] Petowe, *Englands Cæsar*, D4r.
[266] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, C1v, C3v.

reception they create a receptive audience of readers and actors. Visions of the reception – whether written by the poets, or recording actions inspired by the poems – will be carried around the country, and around the world, in letters, diplomatic reports, the attestations of the English. Thus, they fulfil their aim to protect the nation and its king through persuasive representation of the ideal England. They have influence and power.

5: CONCLUSION

In conclusion, printed poetry of 1603-4 responding to the accession of James I recognizes and attempts to overcome popular concerns. It does this by shaping national perceptions using a persuasive, idealized representation of the king configured to dismiss fears of invasion, unrest, rivals, and the legality of James's own claim, a Jacobean development of what E. C. Wilson recognized as 'a good device for strengthening the place of the prince who is to rule.'[267] Using this positive representation, the subjects are enabled to feel their way towards a Jacobean icon that can fill the breach in the national walls left by the late queen, and this figure of James constructs consent to his rule by answering his subjects' fears: he represents Tudor dynastic security, continuity, peace, and strength, all strong foundations for British political and religious hopes for the future. The poetry is, in a manner of speaking, an example of national self-fashioning; it 'occurs at the point of encounter between an authority and an alien', and:

> what is produced in this encounter partakes of both the authority and the alien that is marked for attack, and hence that any achieved

[267] Wilson, *England's Eliza*, p. 409.

> identity always contains within itself the signs of its own subversion or loss.[268]

These poems cannot be seen as a conscious literary movement. However the very fact that they are so numerous and so similar without being part of a movement indicates that they are responding to the *Zeitgeist*, what Jacques Ellul calls 'fundamental currents of society'.[269] As Alistair Fox explains in the context of the Tudors:

> Literature is potentially a very powerful tool in the political process, for it can imaginatively articulate prevailing cultural, ideological and social values in such a way as either to elicit assent to them, or else to serve as a focus for questioning, dissent and resistance. The early Tudor monarchs seem fully to have appreciated this, as both Henry VII and Henry VIII took pains to harness the political potentiality of writers.[270]

It is clear that the poets of 1603-4 appreciate this. They seek to create an active audience, and, though not a movement, use shared *group norms* and *anchors* to effect response. This in itself creates more evidence of the *group norm*, by referring to external evidence in other poetry.

Failure to recognize the socio-political motivations within the texts causes readers to lose much of their power and meaning. By reading them only as elegy or panegyric, their primary politically innovative and persuasive aspects go unrecognized. New Historicist methodology tends to read such texts as evidence for circulation of social energy, but these texts are primarily about perception rather

---

[268] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 2005), p. 9.

[269] Ellul, *Propaganda*, pp. 38-41. It 'must not only attach itself to what already exists in the individual, but also express the fundamental currents of the society it seeks to influence. […] A propaganda pitting itself against this fundamental and accepted structure would have no chance of success. Rather, all effective propaganda is based on these fundamental currents and expresses them.'

[270] Fox, 'The decline of literary patronage', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 229.

than negotiation between James and his subjects. Projection of an icon cannot solve a factual problem, but it can solve a perceptual one. As has been already noted, many of the dangers that were apparent in the summer of 1603 had not dissipated entirely by 1604; however, perception of them (based on literary evidence) had. A representative late response to the accession (from late spring 1604, when the flood of texts had abated) reads:

> *Allin* of Rome by title Cardinall,[271]
> The scourge & shame of England thus doth write,
> ["]All Englands hopes rest but in one female:
> Shee dead, all sorowes must on England light,
> All that have title or the crowne may claime,
> With all their friends and force will thereat aime.
> Then nought but civill warres and furious rage,
> Then horror, bloud, invasion you shall see,
> On this one thread religion in this age
> Depends alone, it cannot better be,
> But if the Romane faith England accept,
> From all these ils she shall be safely kept.["]

This poet confidently responds to each of the Cardinal's predictions in turn:

> We have no civill war, no cruell rage,
> None uprores, bloud, invasion nor ought ill,
> Our faith hath most strong hold this latter age,
> And hath for ground worke sure Gods holy will,
> Our peace is sure, although Eliza sleepe,
> They shall be safe, whom God doth safely keepe.

'Our peace is sure' because:

> Th' undoubted heire our King doth Scepter sway,
> And rules his land with all his subjects love.[272]

[271] The poet is referring to Cardinal William Allen, who in his famous *Admonition to the Nobility and People of England* (Antwerp: A. Coninnex, 1588) called passionately for Elizabeth's overthrow. An ally of Robert Persons, Allen worked hard for the creation of the Spanish Armada, and sought to influence successive Popes against Elizabeth, and on his encouragement Pius V published the famous 1570 Bull Regnans in excelsis, which absolved the English of their allegiance to Elizabeth.

The anonymous collection hails insistently from the north of England which had, in recent history, been an area prone to rebellion (far from London, among a large, albeit now loyal, Catholic population).[273] In the aftermath of the anti-Catholic government reactions to the Main and Bye Plots, agitation might be expected. However, *Northern Poems* radiates unambiguous optimism and faith in the strength of the king, comparable with the then-atypically upbeat *The Kings Prophecie* one year before. James is 'th'undoubted heire'; in possession of 'all his subjects love' and, by inference, their belief in his right to the crown. *Northerne Poems* acknowledges the influence of other accession literature, using much of the same language and imagery, and even opens:

> England seemes fertile onely in the South,
> These North parts yeelde but few things that are good.
> The learned Schools have filde their flowing mouth
> With *James* his prayse, in verse and pleasant moode;
> Unlearnd with learnd have sundry poems wrote,
> From Norths cold clime the muses have sent nought.
>
> This grievde my thoughts, with sighes I cald at last,
> Upstart a rurall Muse and brake the ice
> With these unpolisht verses made in hast
> And sends to thee (O King) her weake devise.[274]

The persuasion of 'The learned Schools' has succeeded, leaving both the king, and his icon, securely in control.

---

[272] Anon., 'Allin of Rome by title Cardinall', *Northerne Poems*, pp. 18-19. Entered into the Stationers' Register on 14 May 1604, it was also published with a 1604 colophon.

[273] Questier has found that 'Nearly one sixth of all those recusants who registered their full statutory conformities at the exchequer between 1590 and 1625 were from Yorkshire.' ('The Politics of Religious Conformity and the Accession of James I', *Historical Journal* 41 [1998], p. 15).

[274] Anon., 'England seems fertile onely in the South', *Northerne Poems*, A3rv.

PART 2: 'Now commeth in our Long-Detained Spring': personal ambition, cultural rejuvenation, and the presentation of the Poet-King.

The successful, and subjective, Jacobean icon discussed in Part One relies in part on the fact that King James was a relatively unknown figure to his new English subjects; as such, he was iconographically malleable. However, at the same time the English – and many of the same poets – seem to long for any disclosure of their new monarch's beliefs and character, and consequently of his plans for the country now under his rule. This represents the other side of the perceived precariousness, hopes and fears, of the accession. Their desire is illustrated by the considerable interest shown in James's own writing, especially any which might reveal his political and religious mind. In 1603 alone, multiple commercial London editions appeared of the King's prose treatises, *Basilikon Doron or His Majesties instructions to his dearest sonne*, *Daemonologie*, *A Fruitefull Meditation [...on] Revelation* and the somewhat-ominously titled *The True Law of Free Monarchies: or the Reciprock and Mutuall Dutie betwixt a Free King and His Naturall Subjects*, as well as of his acclaimed epic poem 'The Battle at Lepanto'.

But it was not just his major works that were of interest; in April 1603, for example, the anonymous *Englands Welcome to James* includes a 'Copie of the K[ing's] Majesties letter to the L[ord] Mayor of the Citie of London, and to the Aldermen and Commons of the same'. Although the miscellany is addressed nominally to the King, the letter reassures other readers by repeating the James promise that 'ye may be fully assured of our gracious favour towards you in the highest degree'.[1] The letter is inserted on leaves 2A1-2r, an additional A signature

[1] Anon., *Englands Welcome to James*, 2A1-2r.

found between 1A4v and B1r, which has gone unrecognised in the Short Title Catalogue's bibliographic description. The second signature reveals that the text was considered important and interesting enough to be inserted by the printer Edward Allde at a late stage of the pamphlet's production: after the composition (when the original signature was set), perhaps even after the initial printing (when the signatures could no longer be adjusted). The English ignorance about James – or, rather, the obscurity that surrounded him – permitted the iconographic innovation which could transform him into an idealized figure that addressed and undermined English fears. However, it is clear that (at the same time) his new subjects hoped to clarify that obscurity to dispel any tensions and concerns – or indeed prepare for any promise – that might attend their perception of the King himself. His own unprecedented and occasionally contradictory writing only deepened the uncertainty that surrounded him.

Where PART ONE looked at the appropriation of the King as a figure of hope and promise for the country as a whole in response to popular fears about the accession, PART TWO looks at how the image of the King affected more personal hopes and fears (albeit within the national context). These ideas develop in particular out of the concepts of the Jacobean golden age, and the appeals to self-interest, discussed in PART ONE, that seek to win or bolster the reader's support for the King. This chapter considers how the poets engage with King James's established personal iconography and intentions, publicly available to view in his actions and especially in his writing. The (often contradictory) figure presented there has the potential to obstruct their personal causes and ambitions (whether political, religious, or cultural): firstly, because the figure he proffers is opaque and

inconsistent and, secondly, because he is a poet. It begins with an overview of James Stuart's poetic career and self-fashioning as a poet before 1603, focusing on the ways in which this was (or was not) a 'phenomenon', and its propagandist value to the King and his allies. It surveys the acceptance and influence of this image in Scotland and in Europe more widely – and specifically in England in the 1580s, 1590s and the final years of Elizabeth's reign. From there it considers how the poets engage with the image of the King as Poet, and with his writing more generally, debating the critical arguments that this dual role was destabilising and unwelcome, the effect of his textual ambivalence and ambiguity in both private and public spheres, and examining the strategies employed by many accession poets to adapt the representation for their own ends. Ironically, James's own persuasive texts are manipulated as the poetry develops strategies to negotiate with, and eventually appropriate, the King's literary self-fashioning, once again fighting to transform an insecure and undetermined figure into a symbol that stands instead for promise and hope. This time, however, the audience to be persuaded is indeed the King himself; and, this time, their re-fashioning does not necessarily succeed in enabling their hopes. At the very last, a short coda: the chapter considers the extent of their success or failure in the light of the extraordinary and unrecognised poetomachia which broke out once again on the death of the old Queen.

1: JAMES STUART, THE 'FAMOUS KINGLY *POET*', 1584-1603.

With this epithet, Samuel Rowlands 'honour[s]' James VI and I in *Ave Cæsar = God Save the King*, a panegyric published in the late spring of 1603.[2] In doing so, the established satirist captures a trend in poems written in 1603-4 to celebrate the King's English accession. The image is ubiquitous, and this was not just sycophancy. By March 1603, James could boast a substantial – and public – literary career spanning two decades. Manuscript copies of his poetry and prose had circulated among his diplomatic, social, and intellectual networks since the early 1580s, and his writing had also reached a much wider audience in Scotland and England.[3] It had been published in Edinburgh by trusted royal printers, and also in English commercial miscellanies and pirated editions, that were not instigated by the Scottish King. From the Edinburgh presses of Thomas Vautrollier, Henry Charteris, and Robert Waldegrave had come *Essayes of a Prentise, in the divine art of poesie* (in 1584 and 1585), *Ane fruitfull meditatioun contening ane plane and facill expositioun of […] Revelatioun* (in 1588 and 1589), *His Majesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Hours* in 1591, *Daemonologie* in 1597, *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* in 1598, and *Basilikon Doron* in 1599.[4] In London, the King's

---

[2] Rowlands, *Ave Cæsar*, B3v.

[3] For the manuscript circulation of James's early work, see *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. James Craigie, 2 vols. (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons, 1955-1958), especially regarding the autograph poetry collection Bodleian Library MS Bodley 165 ff. LXXI-LXXVII, and *King James VI and I: Selected Writings*, ed. Neil Rhodes, Jennifer Richards, and Joseph Marshall (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 121.

[4] James VI, *Essayes of a Prentise, in the divine art of poesie* (Edinburgh: Thomas Vautrollier, 1584 and 1585); *Ane fruitfull meditatioun contening ane plane and facill expositioun of […] the Revelatioun* (Edinburgh: Henry Charteris, 1588 and 1589); *His Majesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Hours* (Edinburgh: Robert *(cont.)*

poetry had been included in a 1587 Cambridge University volume of elegies for Sir Philip Sidney, and two popular anthologies of 1600, Robert Allott's *Englands Parnassus: or the choysest flowers of our moderne poets* (which had two impressions within a year) and John Bodenham's *Bel-Vedére or The Garden of Muses*.[5]

The popular idea of King James as 'not only a favourer of Poets, but a Poet' (in the words of the contemporary translator and critic, Englishman Francis Meres) was established before his accession in England, originated with James himself, and was unique to him.[6] All of these points are crucial. It was on account of such recognition that the idea becomes an *anchor* for many poets' personal optimism, in the face of uncertainty about what Jacobean England would look like, in the accession poetry of 1603-4. This opening section therefore explains how the idea of James Stuart as the 'Kingly *Poet*' had become established in England by March 1603 (focusing on his strategies of distributing this image, rather than the verse itself). The image is first seen in James's writing in the 1580s and 1590s. It was (at least in part) an innovative and extraordinary act of public self-fashioning, developing strategies used by former monarchs, to control representation of the

Waldegrave, 1591); *Daemonologie* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave , 1597); *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1598); *Basilikon Doron* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1599).

[5] Var., *Academiæ Cantabrigiensis lachrymæ tumulo noblissimi equitis, D. Philippi Sidneii sacratæ per Alexandrum Nevillum* (London: John Windet, 1587); *Englands Parnassus* (London: Nicholas Ling, Cuthbert Burby, and Thomas Hayes, 1600); *Bel-Vedére or The Garden of Muses* (London: Felix Kingston for Hugh Astley, 1600). Ling, Burby, and Hayes made at least two impressions of *Englands Parnassus* in 1600, while *Bel-Vedére* was reprinted in 1610.

[6] Francis Meres, *Palladis Tamia. Wits Treasury* (London: 1598).

monarchy. The image is then taken up by Scottish court poets to boast of the Court's sophistication, as well as to flatter their King; however, it is soon adopted in wider cultural circles as a focus of genuine admiration. Accordingly, as part of this, the idea of King James VI of Scotland as 'the soveraine of the divine art' (as the Cambridge scholar Gabriel Harvey would privately note) also becomes current in England. Indeed, it starts to become a symbol of hope for a future cultural and political rejuvenation several years before 1603.[7]

James VI's poetry received such widespread recognition because it was a 'phenomenon', to borrow a term used by both Maurice Lee Jr and Curtis Perry, among others.[8] However, although this concept has been stated several times, there is a lack of critical precision about *why* his poetry is a 'phenomenon'; that is, how it differs from that of his predecessors on the Scottish and English thrones and, consequently, why his role as a poet is so significant in the 1603-4 iconography. It is often asserted that it is unique because he 'always writes *as a monarch,* never simply as a poet'; that is, the reader's recognition of his kingship and power is made the deliberate key to understanding his poetry.[9] Jonathan

---

[7] Gabriel Harvey's adversaria (written 1598-1601) in his copy of Thomas Speght's edition of *The Workes of our antient and learned English poet, Geffrey Chaucer* (London: Adam Islip for Thomas Wight, 1598), 393r, in G. C. Moore Smith (ed.), *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia* (Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1913), pp. viii-xii.

[8] Perry, *Jacobean Culture*, p. 9; Lee, *Great Britain's Solomon*, p. 41 and p. 63. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, '"Enregistrate Speech": Stratagems of Monarchic Writing in the Work of James VI and I', *Royal Subjects*, p. 41. Jenny Wormald discusses the lack of precedent for the King's prose in 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron*, and The *Trew Lawe of Free Monarchies*', *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, pp. 36-54.

[9] Herman, '"Best of Poets, Best of Kings"', *Royal Subjects*, p. 93. See, for example, Lee, *Great Britain's Solomon*, p. 63; Goldberg, *James I*, p. 56; Carolyn Ives and David *(cont.)*

Goldberg pioneered this reading, contending that the 'poems attempt to impose the royal view and recast the world in the shape of the King's desires'. For Goldberg, the 'powers of poet and King are parallel' and so 'the same language celebrates the power of both roles', thus 'exercis[ing]' what he called 'the discourse of power and the power of discourse'.[10] More recent critics like Peter C. Herman and Jane Rickard present a more nuanced argument. James writes, Rickard explains, as 'both an author and a source of authority' and so

> his writing was a means of expressing and enacting his political power (of influencing conduct and inspiring belief), while his political power was a means of controlling interpretation of his writing.[11]

To give an example of this: in the King's translation of Psalm 104 (published in *Essayes of a Prentise* in 1584), Carolyn Ives and David J. Parkinson's perceive the 'authorization for James's sovereignty' in 'the "monstrous whaile" [which] threatens the lesser sea creatures "with his ravening lawes"'.[12]

In fact, there is nothing phenomenal about a strategy of monarchic self-fashioning in which poetry enacts power. Henry VIII, for instance, composed court lyrics – verse set to music – which assert 'thus live will I':

> For my pastance
> Hunt, song, and dance.
> My heart is set:

J. Parkinson, '"The Fountain and Very Being of Truth": James VI, Poetic Invention, and National Identity', *Royal Subjects*, p. 104-5.

[10] Goldberg, *James I*, pp. 18, 22.

[11] Jane Rickard, *Authorship and Authority: the Writings of James VI and I* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), p. 9.

[12] Ives and Parkinson, '"The Fountain and Very Being of Truth"', *Royal Subjects*, pp. 104, 112.

> All goodly sport
> For my comfort,
> Who shall me let?[13]

When the composer (and, on most occasions, the singer) is the King, lines such as 'My heart is set […] Who shall me let?' and 'Grudge who list, but none deny, | So God be pleased thus live will I' become forceful declarations of supremacy over those who might seek to control or influence him. In the guise of an entertaining lyric, Henry reminded an audience of courtiers and diplomatic visitors of his power, while also presenting himself (through his artistic skill) as a Renaissance prince and indeed, Herman deduces, as 'the ideal chivalric king'. According to Herman, such attractive self-fashioning helped Henry to secure support for his French wars, and his government as a whole, in a political context where

> many of the old[er courtiers] were particularly unhappy with the young King's desire to reverse his father's pacific policies and go to war for the sake of chivalric honor.[14]

It may be for this reason that Henry's lyrics only date from the first decade of his reign. Once his monarchy was established and unfettered (and Cardinal Wolsey had arranged the 1518 Treaty of London, calling an end to the European wars in the face of an advancing threat from the Ottoman Empire), his lyric expressions of supremacy are no longer necessary. The 'making of balettes' [ballads] was merely one of several, diverse strategies to fashion this chivalric Henrican image; the lawyer and historian Edward Hall chronicles that the King could be seen at public

[13] Henry VIII, 'Pastime with Good Company', British Library MS Add. 31922, ff. 14v-15.

[14] Peter C. Herman, *Royal Poetrie: Monarchic Verse and the Political Imaginary of Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010), pp. 31, 37.

'pastime[s]' (no doubt 'with good companye' or, at least, perceptive or influential company), such as

> setting of songes, […] shotyng, singing[,] da[n]syng, wrastelyng, casting of the barre, plaiying at the recorders, flute, virginal […&] set[ting] goodly masses.[15]

His younger daughter, Edmund Spenser's 'most peerless Poetesse!', likewise used poetry to 'exercise the discourse of power and the power of discourse' (as Goldberg writes of James).[16] During the 1570s and 80s, Elizabeth answered the poetry of favourites like Sir Thomas Heneage (in 1572) and Sir Walter Ralegh (in 1587), as well as the poet laureate of Emperor Maximilian II, Paul Melissus (in 1577).[17] These exchanges display, and so reinforce, the perceived authority of the Queen (who herself implicitly represents the strength of English government) through expressions of mutual regard which call attention to the reciprocal but unequal duties of the monarch and her subjects. For example, Heneage begs his Queen to 'mark the labors of [a subject's] life' (they 'strive' for 'honors' and 'riches', wasting their lives 'whilst with cares we travail to content us'), but in reply she asks him to consider that such 'pains' are nothing to '[en]dure' compared to those of a monarch:

> To others' will my life is all addressed,
> And no way so as might content me best.

---

[15] Sir Henry Ellis (ed.), *Edward Hall's Chronicle Containing the History of England during the Reign of Henry the Fourth and the Succeeding Monarchs to the end of the Reign of Henry the Eighth* (original title: *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre & Yorke*) (London: J. Johnson et al., 1809), p. 515.

[16] Goldberg, *James I*, p. 18.

[17] Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. Leah S. Marcus, Janel M. Mueller, Mary Beth Rose (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002), p. 409.

That Elizabethan readers recognized the political significance of such exchanges is suggested by the contexts in which the holographs and copies are preserved. A copy of the c. 1587 Ralegh exchange is found in MS Petyt 538. This large composite folio manuscript is otherwise made up of duplicate state papers of the 1580s and 1590s, except for a prefatory sheet of verses on government or self-government.[18] Occasionally, Elizabeth also exercises her power through poetry to confront specific political and diplomatic problems. Nowhere is this more dramatically expressed than 'The Doubt of Future Foes' (c. 1571), which seems to answer the danger attending Mary Queen of Scots' 1568 flight into England in the midst of the Scottish Civil War (and, perhaps specifically, the 1569 Northern Rebellion that her arrival inspired). As George Puttenham relates, 'this was the occasion':

> our soveraigne Lady perceiving how by the Sc. Q. residence within this Realme at so great libertie and ease (as were skarce meete for so great and daungerous a prysoner) bred secret factions among her people, and made many of the nobilitie incline to favour her partie: some of them desirous of innouvation in the state: others aspiring to greater fortunes by her libertie and life. The Queene our soveraigne Lady to declare that she was nothing ignorant of those secret practizes, though she had long with great, wisdome and pacience dissembled it, writeth this ditty most sweet and sententious, not hiding from all such aspiring minds the daunger of their ambition and disloyaltie: which afterward fell out most truly by th'exemplary chastisement of sundry persons, who in favour of the sayd Sc. Q. declining from her Maiestie, sought to interrupt the quiet of the Realme by many evill and undutifull practizes.

[18] Carlo M. Bajetta goes into detail on the contents of the manuscript, ('"Most peereles Poëtresse": the Manuscript Circulation of Elizabeth's Poems', *Representations of Elizabeth I in Early Modern Culture*, ed. Alessandra Petrina and Laura Tosi [London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011], pp. 110-111).

Puttenham offers the poem up as the best example in English of what he terms 'the *Gorgious*' (or, in more recognizable rhetorical terms, *exergasia* or *expolicio*), which 'doth' (he explains)

> polish our speech & as it were attire it with copious & pleasant amplifications and much varietie of sentences all running upon one point & to one intent: so as I doubt whether I may terme it a figure, or rather a masse of many figurative speaches, applied to the bewtifying of our tale or argument.[19]

That is, it is a figure of amplification, of variation, and explanation, designed to make a point with the greatest possible strength and clarity, but at the same time with a veil of 'polish' and 'pleasant[ness]' that prevents it from being stark or unpleasant (depending on the topic). To give just one of several possible examples from this striking poem, Elizabeth concludes:

> No foreign banished wight shall anchor in this port;
> Our realm brooks not seditious sects, let them elsewhere resort.
> My rusty sword through rest shall first his edge employ
> To poll their tops that seek such change or gape for future joy.[20]

Her meaning is unmistakable. Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, like James, use their poems to 'impose the royal view' using 'the discourse of power and the power of discourse'; in doing so, they prefigure and influence his supposedly distinctive strategy.[21] Indeed, the Scottish King's awareness of Elizabeth's political and diplomatic poetry is unmistakably demonstrated by a sonnet he addressed to her in a 1586 letter.[22] If James was hoping to elicit a poetic exchange, he failed, but

---

[19] Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, III.207.

[20] Elizabeth I, *Collected Works*, pp. 299-300, 133.

[21] Goldberg, *James I*, pp. 18, 22.

[22] Akrigg, *Letters of King James*, pp. 71-2. The letter was written in that aftermath of the Anglo-Scottish Treaty of Berwick (a 'league of amity' which James hoped *(cont.)*

Herman has argued convincingly that the poem's use of 'political Petrarchism', or 'politiciz[ed] erotic discourse', imitates the style of her exchanges with courtiers.[23]

Yet the poetry of James VI remains a 'phenomenon' in one respect: no previous monarch had (as he wrote in *Poeticall Exercises*) deliberately 'se[n]t out [their poetry] to the publick view of many' and, consequently, no monarch had been popularly perceived as a famous poet.[24] There was precedent for the distribution of manuscript poetry by James's royal antecedents, and this has been comprehensively surveyed by Herman and Ray G. Siemens. Their research has uncovered poems (or more frequently, references to poetry, and unconfirmed or suspect attributions) by Richard I, Edward II, Richard II, Henry VI, Elizabeth of York, Katherine of Aragon, Margaret of Austria, Margeurite de Navarre, Henry VIII, Mary Queen of Scots, and Elizabeth I, before James VI/I.[25] It also seems likely that

might portend his nomination as Elizabeth's heir as, among other clauses, it assured him an annual pension of £4 000 from the English state).

[23] Herman, on this poem, elucidates: 'a host of critics have shown, from the 1570s onward the rhetoric of love in the Elizabethan court became deeply entwined with the rhetoric of politics. Not only love lyrics but indeed the language of love itself, as Marotti writes, "could express figuratively the realities of suit, service, and recompense with which ambitious men were insistently concerned as well as the frustrations and disappointments experienced in socially competitive environments."' (Herman, '"Best of Poets, Best of Kings"', *Royal Subjects*, p. 65, discussing Marotti, '"Love is not Love": Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order', *ELH*, Vol. 49 No. 2 (Summer 1982), p. 398).

[24] James VI and I, *Poeticall Exercises*, G4r.

[25] Peter C. Herman and Ray G. Siemens, *Reading Monarchs Writing: The Poetry of Henry VIII, Mary Stuart, Elizabeth I, and James VI/I* (San Diego: San Diego State University, 2002), pp. 2-3. For a brief introduction to the poetic careers of these monarchs, see Herman, '"Best of Poets, Best of Kings"', *Royal Subjects*, pp. 67-8.

James V wrote occasional Court poetry, since Sir David Lindsay of the Mount included an 'Answer to the Kingis Flyting' in *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitiss*.[26]

However, these earlier monarchs had written for private purposes and limited distribution. 'The Kingis Quair' by James I of Scotland (1394-1437) is representative of the pattern of earlier monarchic poetry.[27] 'The Kingis Quair' is almost certainly a private philosophical and poetic exercise to console and occupy the captive King, since the poem was 'maid quhan his majestee wes in Ingland' as a 'prisoner', and explicitly and appropriately responds to the 'counsele of Philosophye' by 'Boece' (Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiæ*, written during the philosopher-statesman's detention in exile, c. 524 AD).[28] It survives in a single fifteenth-century manuscript, an anthology compiled c. 1489 for Henry, Lord Sinclair.[29] Julia Boffey suggests that its appearance in only one manuscript copy indicates that the poem was 'confined in circulation to a delimited coterie'; her proposal is supported by the fact that Lord Sinclair was the King's great-nephew.[30] Derek Pearsall and Matthew McDiarmid do argue for the poem's wider influence

---

[26] David Lindsay, *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaits* (Edinburgh: H. Charteris, 1602).

[27] The title is not authorial, but a manuscript description; 'Quair', as in a quire of paper, giving the meaning of 'The King's Pamphlet' or 'Poem'.

[28] James I of Scotland, 'The Kingis Quair', *The Kingis Quair and Other Prison Poems*, ed. Linne R. Mooney and Mary-Jo Arn (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2005), subtitle and ll. 305, 16-17. The text is available online as part of the *TEAMS Middle English Texts Series* (University of Rochester: Robbins Digital Library Projects, 2005), http://d.lib.rochester.edu/teams/text/mooney-and-arn-kingis-quair-and-other-prison-poems-james-i-scotland-kingis-quair [accessed 4 August 2014].

[29] Bodleian Library MS Arch. Selden B.24.

[30] Julia Boffey, 'Manuscript and Print: Books, Readers and Writers', *A Companion to Medieval Poetry*, ed. Corinne Saunders (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010), p. 547.

on some Chaucerian poetry (namely the anonymous *Isle of Ladies*, *Lancelot of the Laik*, *The Court of Love*, and *The Quare of Jelusy*, and work by Robert Henryson and John Lydgate) but, while this might seem to contradict Boffey, these poems all post-date the anthology and consequently do not alter the case for its restricted contemporary circulation.[31]

Unlike James I of Scotland, Henry VIII and Elizabeth I had used their poetry to advance their political ends and monarchic self-fashioning, and so necessarily sought its dissemination. In both cases, however, this still constituted a limited audience. Herman and Siemens have gathered substantial evidence that the lyrics of Henry VIII

> constituted public *performances* – even more specifically, monarchic performances – with accompaniment of at least two other singers (as evidenced by the settings in the manuscript […]) for the whole court, which would also include ambassadorial retinues.[32]

His audience then relayed the lyrics in their own performances; they are quoted, for example, in the anonymous court entertainment *Youth* (c. 1514) and a sermon of 4 March 1521 to the King's household by an unnamed royal almoner.[33] Yet Herman and Siemens's use of the word 'public' is misleading: the transmission

---

[31] Mooney and Arn, 'Introduction', *The Kingis Quair and Other Prison Poems*, for a summary of perceived influence. Matthew McDiarmid (ed.), *The Kingis Quair of James Stewart* (London: Heinemann, 1973), pp. 34-7; Derek Pearsall, 'The English Chaucerians', *Chaucer and Chaucerians: Critical Studies in Middle English Literature*, ed. Derek Brewer (Mobile, AL: University Press of Alabama, 1966), pp. 201-39.

[32] Peter C. Herman and Ray G. Siemens, 'Henry VIII and the Poetry of Politics', *Reading Monarchs Writing*, p. 17.

[33] Richard Pace to Thomas Wolsey (5 March 1521), in J. S. Brewer (ed.), *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII Vol. 3: Part I: 1519-21* (London: Longman, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1867), p. 447. British Library MS Cotton Titus B.1 f.294.

is plainly restricted to the Court. There is, on the contrary, limited evidence to suggest that any of Henry's lyrics actually 'circulated widely in both popular and courtly circles in England, Scotland, and the continent', as they suggest.[34] 'Pastyme with Good Companye' is given as representative of the dissemination of Henry's lyrics, with four citations apparently demonstrate its transmission in England and wider Europe. Yet on closer inspection three of these cited texts contain the melody alone, and the fourth refers in passing to a 'sueit sang' of the 'scheiphirdis' called 'Pastance vitht gude companye' – not attributed to Henry.[35] Instead, like 'The Kingis Quair', almost all Henry's lyrics are preserved in a single manuscript created in about 1518 for one of his closest companions, Sir Henry Guildford.[36] British Library MS Ad. 31922, usually called *The Henry VIII Songbook*, is a large illuminated volume (309mm x 211mm), containing twenty songs and thirteen instrumentals by the King, alongside seventy-six others by English courtiers or

---

[34] Herman, '"Best of Poets"', *Royal Subjects*, p. 67; Robert E. Jungman, 'Pastime with Good Company', *Notes & Queries* (October 1979), 26 (5), pp. 397-399; Ray G. Siemens, 'Revisiting the Text of the Henry VIII Manuscript (BL Add. MS 31,922): An Extended Note', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14.3 (January 2009), pp. 31-36.

[35] That is: a late-sixteenth-century transcription in the commonplace book of Alexander of Dundee, inherited by his son Robert Edward (National Library of Scotland MS Panmure 9.450, f. H14v-15r 'Passe tyme with good companie'); BL Additional MS 5,665 (The Ritson MS, c.1511), comprised of sacred music (Latin, English) and settings of secular lyrics (French, English) by courtiers of Henry VIII; Melchiore de Barberiis's tenth lute book (Venice, 1549), as 'Pas de mi bon compagni.' See Herman, '"Best of Poets"', *Royal Subjects*, p. 95 n. 18. Anon., *The Complaynt of Scotland* [Paris: n.p, ca. 1550], p. 59.

It seems likely, given the other examples, that 'Pastance' also refers only to the tune. The spread and popularity of the melody, but not the lyrics, is understandable: a tune was easy to overhear and repeat, and to set with new words in a new language.

[36] Keith Dockray, 'Guildford, Sir Henry (1489–1532)', *ODNB* www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11721 [accessed 1 December 2014].

court musicians, and some popular foreign pieces. The content places the King in the company of acclaimed composers, in a prestige volume, apparently preserving his works in high esteem. Moreover, the size, expense, and elaborate decoration of the volume firmly indicate that this was not a copy intended for circulation or reproduction. Like Henry's original performances, the single manuscript owned by Guildford offered a tightly controlled experience of the lyrics held firmly within the King's grasp.

The majority of extant sixteenth-century copies of Elizabeth I's poems, by contrast, are found outside the physical Court, albeit only within the private manuscripts of the nobility and gentry. A representative example is provided in the sole surviving contemporary version of the c. 1587 reply to Ralegh ('Ah, silly Pug, wert thou so sore afraid?'). MS Petyt 538 was compiled largely by the MP and lawyer Francis Alford, and supplemented by Montgomeryshire landowner Thomas Aldwell after Alford's death in 1592. Neither of these gentlemen can be connected with Ralegh beyond (tenuously) their probable attendance at Court, indicating that the poem did circulate beyond its original audience of Ralegh and his intimates during the Queen's lifetime.[37] Leah S. Marcus and Carlo M. Bajetta have both

[37] Inner Temple Library MS Petyt 538 Vol. 10; *Montgomeryshire Gent. Will 1620, Vol. XXVI* (London: Charles J. Clark for Powys Land Club, 1892), pp. 41-42. (ff. 3 and 81 are inscribed 'Thomas Aldwell me possidet'). Alford and Ralegh were both called to the bar and so may perhaps have know each other at the Inns of Court – although there were more than two decades between them in age; they may have known each other as courtiers. T. E. Hartley, 'Alford, Francis (c.1530–1592)', ODNB, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37107 [accessed 30 December 2014].

Replies to verse exchanges were understandably passed to the addressee (the exchange with Heneage for example exists in just one copy, in his possession – an *(cont.)*

wondered whether the potentially transgressive nature of this circulation is suggested by a scribal cancellation which crosses through the poem and its attribution ('per reginam', by the Queen).[38] However, the poem remains in the manuscript, and it remains legible. If, as Bajetta suggests, the cancellation indicates that 'the compiler of the manuscript had second thoughts' about including a poem by the Queen, it could have been cut from the single, unbound sheet on which it appears (f. 3r) with ease. Perhaps, instead, the scribe may in fact be drawing attention to the nature of the copy and thus the owner's (and reader's) privilege in gaining access to it in sort-of bibliographic *paralipsis*.[39]

Again contrary to the initial impression, the Queen seems largely to have controlled access to her poetry, and her poems (when released) are unambiguous in their signification. 'The Doubt of Future Foes' is associated with an impressive and much-quoted tale of illicit transmission – and is Elizabeth's most prevalent poem in contemporary manuscript forms and as such offers the most fit example. According to Sir John Harington:

> My Lady Willoughby did covertly get it on her majesty's tablet and had much hazard in doing so, for the queen did find out the thief and chid for spreading evil bruit of her writing such toys when

autograph on the endpapers of Henry Bull's *Christian Praiers and Holy Meditations*, immediately after Heneage's original poem (now Pierpont Morgan Library 7768). This form of distribution was traditional, but even if the addressee was clearly proud of the gift it might not circulate: none of the work of James V (1512-1542) survives, although we know that he wrote to David Lindsay of the Mount because *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* contains 'the Answer to the Kingis Flyting'.

[38] Elizabeth I, *Collected Works*, p. 139.

[39] Bajetta, '"Most peereles Poëtresse"', *Representations of Elizabeth I*, p. 112.

> other matters did so occupy her employment at this time, and was fearful of being thought too lightly of for so doing.[40]

Yet stemmatic analysis by Steven May 'has identified three lines of descent' in the contemporary copies.[41] If the anecdote is to be believed, this would mean that (at least) three copies were taken, covertly, from the 'tablet', or that the Queen wrote three variants which were all then copied. While this is of course possible it seems unlikely, particularly when considered alongside four other pieces of evidence. The speed of its dissemination, and the accurate provenance in all the copies, are unusual. It began to appear in miscellanies almost as soon as it had been composed and, according to the modern editors of Elizabeth's *Works*, it is the only poem that is 'uniformly assigned to her in manuscript collections'.[42] In these respects, it is reminiscent of the Queen's public speeches, which she 'circulate[d] in multiple copies' in manuscript form. Finally, Harington, the Queen's godson and favourite, is the only source of the distribution account. Given this evidence, it seems probable that Elizabeth may have curated the poem's release, as well as the story of the 'covert […] spreading'. Such a strategy would have allowed her to make an immensely powerful statement: she could warn 'seditious sects' or 'subjects [whose] faith doth ebb', and reassure 'worthy wights', that she is alert to

---

[40] Marcus et al., 'Introduction', *Elizabeth I: Collected Works,* xiii, and Marcus, 'Queen Elizabeth I as Public and Private Poet: Notes towards a new edition', *Reading Monarchs Writing*, pp. 140, 133; Bajetta, '"Most peereles Poëtresse"', *Representations of Elizabeth I*, p. 113.

[41] Bajetta, '"Most peereles Poëtresse"', *Representations of Elizabeth I*, p. 113; Steven May, 'Queen Elizabeth's Future Foes: Editing Manuscripts with the *First Line Index of Elizabethan Verse* (a Future Friend)', W. Speed Hill (ed.), *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts III: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1997-2001* (Tempe: Arizona Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2004), pp. 1–12.

[42] Marcus et al., 'Introduction', *Elizabeth I: Collected Works,* p. 139.

the potential 'discord' brought by 'The daughter of debate', while also maintaining a diplomatic front of equanimity, and plausible deniability of what could almost be considered a war cry.[43] This is the transmission equivalent of 'the *Gorgious*' figure employed throughout the poem. Of course, Puttenham somehow had access to the poem, and with his reading of it intentionally brings the poem to a wider audience through publication. Between the execution of Mary and the publication of *Arte of English Poesie*, Puttenham wrote 'A justificacion of Queene Elizabeth in relacion to the affaire of Mary queene of Scottes':

> a prose defence of Mary's execution presents sophisticated legal and political arguments in support of the government's decision to condemn Mary to death.[44]

It seems clear that he is complementing this with the Queen's own account, under the guise of poetic instruction. In doing so he ensures that the Queen's powerful but twenty-year-old warning circulates again, at a time when it can again aid the Queen against those who might feel sympathy for Mary. The example of Puttenham is, without a doubt, a confirmation of the success of the Queen's strategy, even if she herself brilliantly had little to do with its printed dissemination.

A similar ruse may have been employed with poetry written by Elizabeth in books, on windows, and on walls at the royal palaces of Whitehall and Woodstock. Marcus writes that they were 'publicly available for inspection' at the palaces, but in practice they must only have been visible, *in situ*, to those who

---

[43] Bajetta, '"Most peereles Poëtresse"', *Representations of Elizabeth I*, p. 113.

[44] Steven W. May, 'Puttenham, George (1529–1590/91)', ODNB (online edn, 2008) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22913 [accessed 11 June 2015].

attended the Court at Whitehall or had the resources to arrange a visit to Woodstock.[45] Given their locations, Elizabeth could have arranged the erasure of these texts, or restricted access to them still further. Instead, the two-line Woodstock epigram 'Much suspected by me, | Nothing proved can be' was quoted in private manuscripts and several publications, including John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*, before the early 1590s.[46] Apparently composed during her imprisonment under her Catholic sister Queen Mary, the epigram shows the Queen as shrewd and resolute in a time of trial.[47] Like 'The Doubt of Future Foes', this contributes to the hagiographic representation of Elizabeth, and accordingly of English Protestantism, showing their courage, resilience, and wit in the face of heightened and mortal Catholic danger. These two iconographically and politically powerful verses alone reach print in England, under the Queen's name, during her lifetime – a situation that strongly implies Elizabeth's control over the distribution of her poetry.

James did something radical, therefore, in publishing his poetry, and in doing so extensively and consistently. He transformed the tradition of royal poetry by relinquishing control of its distribution and interpretation, giving his work (as he himself recognized) 'to the publike view of the world, and consequently subject

[45] Elizabeth I, *Collected Works*, p. 139.

[46] John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments of Matters* (London: John Daye, 1583), 5S2; Anthony Munday, *A Watch-Woord to Englande* (London: [John Charlewood] for Thomas Hacket, 1584), I1; Lodovico Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, trans. John Harington (London: Richard Field, 1591), 4N7v.

[47] In British Library MS Add. 18920 (f. 322r), a largely autograph manuscript (338 quarto leaves) by John Harington, ca. 1590-1.

to every mans censure'.[48] Several critics have sought to explain the eighteen-year-old King's singular decision to begin publishing his verse in 1584. Two basic circumstantial factors likely contributed to his general interest in publication. First, Neil Rhodes, Jennifer Richards, and Joseph Marshall observe that his early life 'coincided with the massive expansion of the book trade in the late sixteenth century', including publications by members of the major aristocracy (such as the Earls of Surrey and Oxford, with the late Henry Howard's translation of *Aeneid* IV published in 1554, followed by original verse in 1557, and poems of Edward de Vere appearing in miscellanies from the mid-1570s).[49] Second, Jane Rickard has drawn attention to the large printed library assembled for the young King by his co-tutors George Buchanan and, especially, the diplomat Peter Young.[50] A more grave incitement may have been that, during the same years, Scottish poetry flourished as an arena for political debate, which, according to Michael Lynch, 'had tangible political effects'.[51] In April 1567, for example, Mary's government 'legislated against the broadside ballads, fearful that they might destabilize the realm.'[52] As James grew up, therefore, he saw published poetry 'being used to satirise and condemn the monarchy'.[53]

---

[48] James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* (1603), A2v.

[49] James VI and I, *Selected Writings*, p. 2.

[50] Rickard, *Authorship and Authority*, p. 36. See also Davie Horsburgh, 'Young, Sir Peter (1544–1628)', *ODNB* www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30277 [accessed 18 December 2014].

[51] Michael Lynch, *Scotland: A New History* (London: Pimlico, 1991), p. 213; see Rickard, *Authorship and Authority*, p. 37.

[52] Tricia A. McElroy, 'A "Quarrell sett out in metre": Towards a New Edition of Scottish Reformation Satirical Literature', *Studies in Scottish Literature* Vol. 39 Issue 1 (2013), p. 25, quoting Thomas Thomson and Cosmo Innes, *The Acts of the*

(cont.)

In the most severe instance, his mother Mary Queen of Scots was disastrously undermined by the discovery in late 1567 of 'diverse fonde ballades of her owne hande' (as the Duke of Norfolk described them to Elizabeth).[54] Although Mary insisted they were forgeries, the twelve *Casket Sonnets* (as they came to be known) were 'widely' received 'as the authentic voice of the Scottish queen', and the weight of modern critical opinion supports this judgment.[55] Jenny Wormald summarizes:

> What it all amounts to is this. Outright forgery of the originals – as opposed to the odd interpolation in the copies – can only have been done by the Scots; and to suggest that her Scottish enemies forged something that they were then very unwilling to use, and managed in the process to fool Mary's own son[,] and cousin, both of whom

---

Parliaments of Scotland, 1424-1707, 12 vols. (Edinburgh: Record Commission, 1814-75), II:552.

[53] For a full discussion, see McElroy, 'A "Quarrell sett out in metre"', pp. 22-30, and James Cranstoun (ed.), *Satirical Poems of the Time of the Reformation* (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1891).

[54] Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk to Elizabeth I (11 October 1568), BL MS Cotton Caligula C.I f. 260, and Joseph Bain (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547-1603. Vol. 2: 1563-1569* (Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1900), p. 526 (both through *State Papers Online*) [accessed: 29 December 2014].

[55] On sixteenth-century reception, see John Guy, *My Heart is My Own: The Life of Mary Queen of Scots* (London and New York: Fourth Estate, 2004), p. 435. Herman summarizes the contemporary view:

> no-one involved with their original discovery and dissemination considered them fakes, including those who had a vested interest in declaring them forgeries, such as the French ambassador La Mothe Fénelon.

('"mes subjectz, mon ame assubjectie": The Problematic (of) Subjectivity in Mary Stuart's Sonnets', *Reading Monarchs Writing*, p. 53.) Lisa Hopkins explains why mainstream critical consensus believes that the poems are at least largely written by Mary (*Writing Renaissance Queens: Texts by and about Elizabeth I and Mary Queen of Scots* [Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002], pp. 46-7). See also George Malcolm Thomson (*The Crime of Mary Stuart* [London: Hutchinson, 1967], pp. 148–153, 159–165) on the compatibility of the Sonnets with Mary's style.

> knew her handwriting [and her style], into believing that they were undoubtedly genuine, simply does not make sense.[56]

The *Sonnets* were produced as evidence at the Anglo-Scottish York Conference of 1568, where (Norfolk continued) they were seen to 'condempne [sic] the Quene of Scottes of the murdre of her husband' (James's father, Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley), and of complicity in her 'counterfeicted and c[e]n[s]orable taking' (that is, kidnap) 'by [James Hepburn, Earl of] Bothayll', since they

> do discover suche inordinate love betwene her and Bothaill […] and abhorringe of her husband that was murdered, in suche sorte, as every good and godlie man cannot but detest and abhorre the same.

The content was incendiary, in both erotic and political terms, but perhaps most shocking (and demonstrative of the Queen's 'inordinate love' for the Earl) was her offer to place 'Entre ses mains & en son plein pouvoir' ' ('Into his hands and into his full power') not only 'mon filz, mon honneur, & ma vie' ('my son, my honour, and my life') but 'Mon pais, mes subjectz' – her country, and her subjects.[57]

The character of Mary that appeared in the *Sonnets* was used, publicly and officially, to justify her incarceration. Beyond the York Conference, they circulated among the English Privy Council, the Scottish Court, and the Kirk, but in 1571 – in the aftermath of the Northern Rebellion (1569) and the Ridolfi Plot (1571), both of which sought to place Mary on the English throne – they were also published to demonstrate the Scottish Queen's guilt as widely as possible. Consequently, the *Sonnets* were translated from their original French, into Latin for publication in

---

[56] Jenny Wormald, *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (London: George Philip, 1988), pp. 177-8.

[57] Herman, '"Best of Poets, Best of Kings"', *Royal Subjects*, pp. 69, 77; Hopkins, *Writing Renaissance Queens*, p. 47.

Europe (*De Maria Scotorum Regina totaque eius contra Regnum coniuratione*, trans. Buchanan), and into anglicised Scots for the English and Scottish markets (*Ane Detectioun of the duinges of Marie Quene of Scottes*, trans. Thomas Wilson). The success of the publications is shown by the fact that they were collectively reprinted six times before the end of the century. Influencing the minds of her subjects as well as her peers, and read by them as her 'true voice', the content of the *Sonnets* destroyed Mary's reputation and with it any real chance of regaining her throne or her freedom, let alone of winning the English crown.

His mother's experience of the *Casket Sonnets* and of hostile poetic satire more generally, may seem at first a flawed and counterintuitive reason for the young King to choose to publish his poetry. Mary's misuse of her royal poetic image, and its release not only beyond its intended intimate audience but even into widely distributed print had been disastrous. However, the case of the *Casket Sonnets* (alongside the other lesser examples of poetic debate) also demonstrated irrefutably that publicly circulated poetry could be harnessed and manipulated to control the image of the monarch and, through that, their political power and security. Rickard suggests that James tried instead to 'guide' the 'Scottish poetic Renaissance', and thus 'ensure that Scottish poetry would be predominantly royalist'.[58] The fact that his very first publication (ironically, titled *Essayes of a Prentise*) contains a 'treatise' of 'Reulis and Cautelis to be observit and eschewit in Scottis poesie' would seem to support this argument. Likewise, the fact that (during the same period that he was publishing poetry, the 1580s and 1590s)

[58] Rickard, *Authorship and Authority*, pp. 37, 53-69.

James fostered a circle of Court 'makars' or 'makers', poets writing in Scots, who he encouraged to publish their poetry as well.[59] In James's own words, these were some of the 'best skilled men in that craft', and the fact that they were drawn from the aristocracy (like Alexander Montgomerie and John Stewart of Baldynneis), gentry (like William Fowler and Sir Patrick Hume), and professional classes (such as the poet-musicians from the north of England, Thomas and Robert Hudson) suggests that they were indeed chosen on skill.[60] In 1584, Thomas Hudson thanked the King, in his preface to *The Historie of Judith*, for the 'delite your Majest[ie] tooke in the Jautie stile of the most famous Writers' but also for the 'assured confidence which I ankred on your highnesse helpe and correction'.[61] That is, James was enjoying the work of his poets, but he was also managing their output and its modes of distribution.

This does not yet explain why the King himself would risk the dangerous course of making his own work, and with it his tender image, 'subject' (a word shared with the *Casket Sonnets*) 'to every man's censure'. The *Casket Sonnets* had

---

[59] 'maker, n.5': a poet, specifically with reference to a poet writing in Scots, especially one of the 15th cent. or early 16th cent. From the transfer of sense (within Greek) of *ποιητής* from 'maker' to 'poet' (www.oed.com/view/Entry/112660 , *OED Online* [accessed 14 March 2013]).

[60] 'The Castalian Band' was proposed, in modern scholarship, by Helena Mennie Shire (*Song, Dance and Poetry at the Court of Scotland under King James VI* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969]) and Kenneth Elliot (*The Music of Scotland* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964]). However, Priscilla Bawcutt's essay 'The Castalian Band - a modern Scottish myth', *Scottish Historical Review* (October 2001) LXXX, 2 (210), pp. 251–259, argues persuasively against the self-conscious of the Scottish grouping.

[61] Thomas Hudson, 'Epistle Dedicatorie', Guillaume de Salluste, seigneur Du Bartas, *The Historie of Judith*, trans. Thomas Hudson (Edinburgh: Thomas Vautroullier, 1584), A2r-3r.

demonstrated irrefutably that the image of a monarch drawn from their own poetic voice was almost impossible to refute – even by the real person of the monarch. This aspect of the established critical concept of the poet-monarch as 'author' and 'authority' has not hitherto been recognized, but seems paramount to James's public poetic self-fashioning. As both a monarch and a celebrated public poet, the King could synthesize political as well as cultural leadership, allowing him to 'guide' Scottish poetry but also to set the terms and parameters of his own image. If poetry attributed to a monarch would always be interpreted with that monarchy as a paratext and therefore as a true royal statement – as earlier examples of monarchic verse had shown to be the case without question – then King James could turn that to his advantage and create a representation that could not easily be disproved (unlike the work of even the best and most loyal attendant poet who could be accused of, at best, abiding by the customs of encomiastic poetry or, at worst, servile flattery).

Consequently James not only prints his poetry, but manifestly advertises his royal poetic authorship. His authorship is clear to anyone who could recognize a title page, not just to those who might read the poetry itself. The title pages of *Poeticall Exercises*, *Lepanto*, and *Basilikon Doron* (which, though largely prose, opens with some of the King's most influential and well-recognized poetry) all begin with the typographically prioritised words 'His Majesties [...]'.[62] Given the documented control over the typography of their printed texts exercised by poets

[62] That is, the sonnet 'God gives not Kings the stile of Gods in vaine' and, in the 1599 edition, an additional sonnet to Prince Henry, 'Lo heere (my Sonne) a mirrour vive and faire'.

such as Samuel Daniel and Ben Jonson, it can be assumed that this was influenced by the King. *Essayes* does not in fact declare its royal authorship on its modest title page, perhaps because it was the King's first publication, but this apparent anonymity is a front, as the prodigious prefatory material reveals. Five sonnets identify *Essayes* as (for example) '*Cæsars* works', by a 'King' or 'Prince'; a Latin verse declares 'hoc sic Regis oportet opus' ('this must be the work of the King'); a final acrostic reads 'IACOBVS SExTVS'. In eight leaves, anonymity has evaporated.

Such frankness is significant because James did use a pseudonym when it was tactically advantageous to do so. The King's own pamphlet contribution to the English succession debate, *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies*, is ascribed the alias 'C. Φιλοπατρις' (somewhat suggestively, given the established royal iconographic and metaphorical role of the monarch as spouse of the kingdom, meaning 'lover of his country'). The pseudonym is useful in this instance because the King could not defend his own cause effectively. Instead, it allows the tract to appear as the considered opinions of an initially impartial patriotic man, persuaded by the strength of the arguments he now repeats to an audience of equals, his 'deare countrimen'. This compelling argumentative stance is the same technique used so effectively by Robert Persons ('R. Doleman') in *A Conference about the Next Succession of the Crown of England* (to which Susan Doran, Pauline Croft, and Rei Kanemura have persuasively argued *True Lawe* may be a direct response[63]). James cannot defend his own right to the English Crown (or, more generally, even his rights as a '*free King*') as effectively as an independent observer, just as (in the case

[63] See PART 1.1.

of Persons' *Conference*) a known Jesuit provocateur would be unlikely to convince anyone beyond an audience of those who were already sympathetic to his cause. On the topic of succession, Persons wrote as Doleman, James as Φιλοπατρις. And just as James formulated the treatise to defend himself from verbal attack in prose, so it seems likely that he formulated his public poetic persona at least in part to defend against attack in poetry. Like the idealized accession events and displays of loyalty found in the accession poems of his English subjects in 1603-4, published versions of the King had a wider and more permanent reach than James himself, and, as he would explain to Prince Henry in *Basilikon Doron*, they would remain to state his case for 'all posterities'.[64]

The publication of his poetry provided James with a sphere for performing his ideal (and desirable) self not only to his Scottish subjects, but also to potential supporters of his claim for the English succession. From his earliest public poetry, James recognises that he is 'publishing […] to this yle of *Brittain*' (in his own words in the Preface to 'Urania' in *Poeticall Essayes*).[65] Bibliographic evidence confirms the sincerity of this statement; Rhodes, Richards, and Marshall have shown that

> the translation [of James's work] from manuscript to print usually involved a process of anglicisation [by his English printer in Edinburgh, Robert Waldegrave], presumably on James'[s] own authority.[66]

Another example can be found in his contribution to the English volume of elegies for Sir Philip Sidney edited by Alexander Neville in 1587, *Academiæ*

[64] James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* (1599), p. 140.

[65] James VI and I, 'Preface' to 'Uranie', *Poeticall Essayes*, C3r.

[66] Rhodes, Richards, and Marshall, 'Introduction', *King James VI and I*, p. 2.

Cantabrigiensis Lachrymæ Tumulo Noblissimi Equitis, D. Philippi Sindeii Sacratæ.[67] The King's poem, alongside elegies from his circle of Scottish poets, makes an unlikely addition to this Cambridge University volume. Moreover, their contribution is printed on two distinct sheets of the 2° volume (signatures k-l) that are inserted between Neville's introductory epistle (signatures a-j) and the remaining elegies (sig. A-M), which follow a second half-title and begin on a page numbered '1'. The irregularity of signature and pagination suggests that the Scottish contribution arrived at a late stage in the printing process, and was therefore set on its own after the major composition of the volume had been completed, and perhaps even after the printing had begun (much like the King's letter in *Englands Welcome to James*). In both cases (the translations and the Cambridge volume), it seems that James is projecting an image of himself, and of the Scottish court, as something reassuringly familiar, and engaged in English affairs, as much through his appearance in publications (the idea of the King as a poet) as through his poetry itself.

His efforts are successful: by the late 1580s the image of the King as a poet is beginning to appear outside his original sphere of patronage, in England. By the early 1590s, it is discussed in English publications as a recognized and attractive aspect of the King. In one of the earliest extant references Francis Thynne recorded, in *The Historie of Scotland* (1587), that

> James the sixt of that name king of Scots now living, a toward yoong prince, and one well furnished with the gifts of nature and learning

[67] Var., *Academiæ Cantabrigiensis lachrymæ*, k-l; Rickard, *Authorship and Authority*, p. 41; Herman, '"Best of Poets, Best of Kings"', *Royal Subjects*, p. 73.

> by birth and instruction, did in his yoongest yeares, about the age of seventeene or eightteene, write a booke of verses in his mother toong, conteining manie matters of sundrie rare inventions, and of sundrie forme of verses both learned and eloquent; which booke was after published to the world.[68]

Thynne's inclusion of this passage shows that James's public literary aspect is deemed worthy of record in England, but also that it has literally become part of the monarch's biography. It is now firmly a party of his image and representation. In 1593, much more specifically, Gabriel Harvey praised 'the ever-renowned *Lepanto*' (in *A New Letter of Notable Contents*) and names James 'a Homer to himselfe' for having:

> not onely translated the two divine Poems of Salustius du Bartas, his heavenly Urany, and his hellish Furies, but hath readd a most valorous Martial Lecture unto himselfe in his owne victorious Lepanto, a short, but heroicall, worke, in meeter, but royal meeter, fitt for a Davids harpe – Lepanto, first the glory of Christendome against the Turke, and now the garland of a soveraine crowne.[69]

Harvey has a familiarity with the King's poetry that extends beyond rumour: he names several of the King's poetic works, drawn from both *Essayes of a Prentise* and *Poeticall Exercises* (and which were not named on the title pages), and he is able to discuss not only the subject of 'Lepanto' but its 'meeter'. Harvey's public protestations of interest and admiration are supported by his private adversaria. Between 1585 and 1596 the Cambridge scholar annotated his copies of *Essayes*

[68] Raphael Holinshed et al., Abraham Fleming, Francis Thynne, and John Stow, *The First and Second Volumes of Chronicles, comprising the description and historie of England, the description and historie of Ireland, the description and historie of Scotland: first collected and published by Raphaell Holinshed, William Harrison, and others: now newlie augmented and continued* ([London]: John Harison, George Bishop, Rafe Newberie, Henrie Denham, Thomas Woodcocke, [1587]), III.1592.

[69] Harvey, *Pierce's supererogation*, *The Works of Gabriel Harvey*, II. 326.

and *Poeticall Exercises*.[70] (The very fact that he possessed them itself confirms that James's poetic texts were available to Englishmen even if they had not actually been printed in London.) He found them, for example, 'worthie the pen, & industrie of a king', and later lamented between 1598 and 1601 (in his copy of Thomas Speght's 1598 *Chaucer*) that 'the King of Scotland' had not publish more 'dainties':

> [H]ow few Aschams, or Phaers, Sidneys, or Spensers, Warners or Daniels, Silvesters or Chapmans, in this pregnant age. But when shall we tast the preserved dainties of Sir Edward Dier, Sir Walter Raleigh [sic], M. secretarie Cecill, the new patron of Chawcer; the Earle of essex, the King of Scotland, the soveraine of divine art; or few such refined wittes & surprising spirits?[71]

The King's representation as a poet also begins to be used for subjective and acquisitive purposes. Anthony Monday's letter 'To The Reader' at the start of the anthology *Bel-Vedére or The Garden of Muses* (1600) (the second English publication, after the Sidney volume, to include James's poetry) ends with the acclamation:

> Looke what workes of Poetrie have been put to the worlds eye, by that learned and right royall King and Poet, JAMES king of Scotland, no one Sentence of Worth hath escaped, but are likewise here reduced into their right roome and place.[72]

Munday's boast indicates that 'Poetrie […] by that learned and right royall King and Poet' is a prestigious and desirable addition helping to promote and legitimize the volume. However, the texts within *Bel-Vedére* – excerpts, organized

[70] See Rhodes et al., *James VI and I*, p. 5; Eleanor Relle, 'Some New Marginalia and Poems of Gabriel Harvey', *Review of English Studies* 23 (1972), pp. 401-16; although Harvey's reading is dated 1585, Eleanor Relle argues 'the marginalia were probably written over a period of ten years, 1585-96.'

[71] Moore Smith, *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, viii-xii.

[72] Var., *Bel-Vedére,* A4v.

by subject – are unallocated, which could support contradictory arguments either for the recognition of their poetical value independent of royal authorship, or for lack of concern about the poem itself beyond the title page advertisement. The interest in, and use of, the idea of James as 'King and Poet' by Thynne, Harvey, and Munday most likely reflects English anticipation of a possible Jacobean succession. Munday may have chosen to include an otherwise unlikely author (within an English poetic collection dedicated to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the literary patron John Bodenham, a rich London grocer) because of growing general interest in the Scottish King. Around this time, there is a swift increase in public praise of the King as poet, which – unlike Harvey – does little to suggest that the commentator has read James's verse. Reinforcing this association, Munday's 'To The Reader' was cancelled at some point: leaves A2-6 appear in STC (2nd Edition) 3189, but not in the later state 3189.5. It is plausible that the connection of praise of James's poetry with the possible Jacobean succession fell foul of Elizabethan restrictions on discussion of the succession.

Most famously, 'King James of Scotland' sits amid a pantheon of poetic worthies in Sir Philip Sidney's c.1579-80 prose work *The Defence of Poesy*. Published in 1595, this central work of English Humanism brings together for the first time the English reception of the idea of James-as-poet with a wider Humanist concept of the poet-as-leader. Sidney's allusion combines the scholarly record of Thynne, the critical appreciation of Harvey, and the flattery and need for endorsement of Munday, to forge in the representation of the King a figure of hope for both personal and national advancement. In doing so, he inaugurates how the

literary aspect of 'King James of Scotland' is developed in 1603-4, when he is newly England's King:

> Sweet poesy, that hath anciently had kings, emperors, senators, great captains, such as, besides a thousand others, David, Adrian, Sophocles, Germanicus, not only to favour poets, but to be poets; and of our nearer times can present for her patrons a Robert, King of Sicily; the great King Francis of France; King James of Scotland; such cardinals as Bembus and Bibbiena; such famous preachers and teachers as Beza and Melancthon; so learned philosophers as Fracastorius and Scaliger; so great orators as Pontanus and Muretus; so piercing wits as George Buchanan; so grave counsellors as—besides many, but before all—that Hospital of France, than whom, I think, that realm never brought forth a more accomplished judgement more firmly builded upon virtue; I say these, with numbers of others, not only to read others' poesies but to poetize for others' reading.[73]

Taking James as one of his examples, Sidney asserts that a leader well-versed in both poetic composition and critical appreciation engenders in his government 'a more accomplished judgement more firmly builded upon virtue'. The wider argument teaches us that this is because poetry constitutes the 'feigning notable images of virtues, vices, or what else' in the form of 'delightful teaching', the 'end' (or goal) of which is 'virtuous action'. As a result the 'judgement' of any mind capable of both composing and comprehending poetry could (as a leader) inspire popular 'virtuous action' through precept and example. The quintessence of such a man is 'that Hospital of France' (Michel Hurault de l'Hospital, a sixteenth-century Chancellor of France, poet, and literary patron, who reformed the administration and attempted to promote religious tolerance). This primary example is supported by others of 'kings, emperors, senators, great captains',

[73] Sidney, 'The Defence of Poesy', *Sir Philip Sidney: The Major Works*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 217.

'cardinals' and 'preachers and teachers', 'orators' and 'wits', drawn from Biblical to recent history, and all civic spheres of action in an overwhelming catalogue, to demonstrate the strength and general applicability of Sidney's position. Further rhetorical techniques compliment this to create a mounting energy amplified by the single-sentence structure of the paragraph. The clauses of the argument demonstrate *asyndeton* (the absence of connecting particles), *anaphora* (repetition of same opening words), and *parison* (corresponding structure) in the 'such' or 'so [adjective, noun] as [proper noun]' constructions of lines 5-8 which build from the exemplary and persuasive 'such' to the exclamatory 'so', in a climactic move paralleled in the 2/4 distribution between 'such'/'so'. This mounting energy impresses upon us the number and accomplishments of these exemplary figures, leaving the consequential perception of individual capability which, in turn, supports the paragraph's central point: that the literary facet of strong leadership is dependent not only upon the reading of educative verse but upon its creation. The message is repeated at both the beginning and end of the passage's single sentence to maximise its impact. Following a short list of those whom 'Poesy [...] hath anciently had [...] not only to favour poets, but to be poets', Sidney recounts a list of comparable modern 'patrons', who offer both financial and intellectual commitment to the works of others. Such talented and admirable leaders, he reveals with a flourish, likewise support their government with their own original poetry: 'I say these, with numbers of others, [were accustomed] not only to read others' poesies but to poetize for others' reading.' That is, they are 'Poesy''s 'Patrons' in several senses – not only with tributes of money and intellectual interest, but with their own pens. Sidney's use of the image of James as King

promotes national advancement (cultural, moral, and political) but also personal advancement. Sidney was cultivating a connection with James and hoped to benefit from, and form a part of, this poetic-government.

By March 1603, James had successfully used his poetic self-image to address potential threats in Scotland and to create an attractive idea of Jacobean kingship in England as well. He did this not only by learning from the examples of established royal poetry in Scotland and England, but also through his innovation to publish and advertise his work. Thynne, Harvey, Munday, and Sidney (drawn from many other examples of English reception) indicate that the image of James as 'not only a favourer of Poets, but a Poet' was already starting to become a symbol of hope for cultural, political, and personal advancement and rejuvenation in England before March 1603. It is on account of this that representation of the poet-King becomes an *anchor* for optimism in the face of uncertainty about what Jacobean England would look like in the accession poetry of 1603-4. This was particularly necessary, if ironic, because the King's textual self-representation was at times dangerously contradictory and obscure.

2: 'NONE BUT THY SELFE, GREAT KING, CAN SING OF THEE': POETRY AND PERSONAL AMBITION IN 1603-4.

By March 1603, therefore, the English were familiar with the image of King James as a poet, and some writers had already begun to use it to support their personal endeavours. In direct contrast to PART ONE's arsenal, this innovative aspect of the King's public persona is the only established representation of King James (beyond his place in bland genealogies) with which the poets even engage, and they do so on a grand scale. The image of the King as poet is alone

appropriated and adapted in the accession poetry of 1603-4 to represent and enable personal ambitions among the poets. If, as James seems to have hoped, the image of the monarch drawn from their own poetic persona is impossible to refute, it must be negotiated, but it also offers to other poets the hope for security and advancement if connections and familiarity with it and with its strategies can be forged. James's poetic self-fashioning had addressed potential threats in Scotland and successfully created an attractive idea of Jacobean kingship. In England, in 1603-4, it is re-fashioned to encourage hope for patronage and advancement in three broad areas: first, financial; second, artistic and cultural; finally, moral, religious and political.

At the most basic level, the image of King James as a poet is predictably employed to fulfil the core encomiastic convention of flattery. Flattery is the keystone for all ambitions, through the medium of cordial reception and patronage. A pithy and satirical account is given in *Englands Welcome to King James*. The anonymous poet advises the reader:

> So he that spares the poole to lade,
> can hardly come by fish;
> Nor he that still conceales his griefe,
> can ever win his wish.[74]

A poet (the satire counsels) must 'lade the poole' to win the benefits of patronage. The pun 'to lade' wittily supports the message, meaning both 'to load' – here, with bait or flattery – and 'to draw up (from) water' – here, to receive the rewards or, as the metaphor has it, 'to come by fish'. Yet he should not 'conceale

[74] Anon., *Englands welcome to King James*, A2v.

his griefe' for the late Queen, as 'griefe' demonstrates a capacity for loyalty and so makes the mourning poet's services more attractive to any new potential patron who might observe and covet such devotion for themselves. In order to secure the attention of this imagined onlooker (and with it the potential to achieve contingent aims or benefits) he must mourn the old and flatter the new simultaneously.

As the General Introduction established, flattery may have been provoked first by the (perceived) parsimony of Elizabeth's final years, and second by the anticipated reshuffle of positions for the new reign. Specifically, according to Alistair Fox the late Queen had become 'less inclined to dispense' patronage 'by the final decade of her reign'; by March 1603 'very few writers were attaining the rewards they thought they deserved, whether financial or otherwise'.[75] In both cases, the smooth accession offered significantly improved opportunities for poets, just as it did to politicians and courtiers, at least in part because major national events afforded poets a wide potential readership (the public alongside potential patrons including but not limited to the King). Indeed, the strands were not distinct. Richard Helgerson has made clear that poetic success benefitted 'the Elizabethan system of literary careers'.[76] The 'amateur' poet attempts to display aptitude for civil office in their verse; their poetry is a means of statecraft and advancement. The professional poet seeks the 'laurels' – artistic recognition and attendant financial reward. Both ambitiously seek advancement in their chosen

[75] Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 173; Fox, 'The decline of literary patronage in the 1590s', *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 229.

[76] Richard Helgerson, *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), p. 25.

spheres and the attendant financial reward and recognition. Many poets unquestionably sought to take advantage of the hierarchical reshuffles which accompanied the change of government, as John Chamberlain contemptuously reported to Dudley Carleton on 12 April 1603. Discussing James's displays of generosity in the first fortnight of his English reign, Chamberlain wrote:

> These bountiful beginnings raise all men's spirits, and put them in great hopes, insomuch that [...] the very Poets, with their idle pamphlets, promise themselves great part in his favour'.[77]

Chamberlain is enjoying playing the wit and raconteur for his friend in France, but the issue is treated explicit elsewhere in the poetry itself. In *A Poets Vision, and a Princes Glorie*, Thomas Greene identifies (with more generosity than Chamberlain, or the satirist of *Englands Welcome*):

> How manie would by this their heavenly skill,
> (Having abilitie as great as will)
> Infinitely upraise themselves from earth,
> Making their beings farre higher then their birth?[78]

Direct requests for patronage and advancement take a variety of forms, ranging from dedications and prefatory letters, to invocations, and complex allegorical requests. In the boldest examples James is addressed or invoked within some accession verse as 'Patron', even (perhaps especially) when a particular poem avoids pairing this with blatant flattery.[79] Petowe meanwhile explicitly declares in *Englands Caesar* that, though he is a poetic novice, he 'worke[s] for the Garland, I meane the Laurell wreath', before demonstrating what he can offer in

---

[77] John Chamberlain, *Letters*, p. (12 April 1603), p. 192.

[78] Greene, *A Poets Vision*, C3r.

[79] Savile, *King James His Entertainment,* C4r.

return for patronage. As Part One shows, he had grounds to state his claim as a useful persuasive ally.[80] Unlike Petowe, writing with the courage and audacity of his first accession pamphlet's commercial success, Drayton does not specifically mention patronage until he fears he may not receive it and, indeed, that his contribution may have been lost in the flood. *The Owle* comes almost a year after *A Gratulatorie Poem*, in 1604. Set within the 'Oke' of England, it presents Drayton as 'The poore distressed bird' of the title, striving against 'the Birds that in his boughs did Shrowd' and

> Unto his praise continually did sing
> And kept their vigils to th'enamoured spring.[81]

Yet the presentation of James as a poet is set apart from other flattery within the poetic medium. Their focus is, against all critical suggestion, not entirely the attention of the King himself but much wider markets, using the King. The *anchor* of the King's poetry and his image as a poet, and a friend of poets is used to underscore and establish the value of the individual accession poets, both to King himself and (through his example) to other potential patrons and markets.

Curtis Perry has argued influentially that, throughout James's reign, 'the popular image of James-as-writer violates […] the reciprocal relationship between

[80] Petowe, *Englands Caesar*, D4r.

[81] Michael Drayton, *The Owle* (London: E[dward] A[llde] for E. White and N. Ling, 1604), G2rv.

poet and King', making it 'increasingly difficult for his panegyrists to justify their addresses to him.'[82] That is:

> The poet under the poet-king was in danger of seeming either redundant [...] or presumptuous (by aligning oneself with the King's voice).[83]

Perry's argument suggests that representing James as a poet was fraught with problems: an encomiastic writer suing for patronage might risk either failing to fulfil generic demands if he does not present the King's work as the epitome of its craft, or arguing his own work into redundancy if he does. When James must be represented as the best of poets, do his clients risk making themselves redundant by effacing the role of court poet? Likewise, if the 'Kingly-*Poet*' possesses all the secret insights of poetry (and more besides in the 'arcana imperii' and 'mysteries of state'), what place is there, and what audience, for the vatic or epideictic writer seeking influence as a counsellor?[84] This concern was exacerbated by the fact that this new supreme writer had actively sought the popular market and therefore could not simply be ignored. As they 'tried to adapt to the cues of the new king', he argues, Jacobean panegyrists and poets produced 'often awkward responses to the new king's self-presentation as both author and authority.'[85]

Perry's argument is initially convincing. Such a 'violat[ion]' seems to be apparent in several poems written in response to James's accession. Herbert praises James's 'excellency' in direct contrast with his own 'weake pen, badge of

---

[82] Perry, *Jacobean Culture*, p. 17. Although Perry says widely 'writer', he only ever uses this in the context of poetry.

[83] Perry, *Jacobean Culture*, p. 9.

[84] See Goldberg, *James I*, pp. 68-9.

[85] Perry, *Jacobean Culture*, pp. 16-17, 9, 32.

infirmitie'.[86] Augmenting and intensifying the motif, he shows James as a poet attended by the most famous poets English can offer, in a two-page catalogue including Chaucer, Lydgate, Gower, Sidney, Spenser; even these, he suggests, 'Could not unfold thy prayse in antique rime.' Comparably, Phineas Fletcher exclaims to the King 'thou thy selfe thy selfe historifie':

> Then will I sing, and yet who better sings
> Of thee, then thine owne oft-tride Muse? [87]

Fletcher's lines are monosyllabic, except for 'better' (figuring the 'better' ability of the King). He allows himself just two metrical feet to 'sing' and no sooner is the verb voiced in the first person, than it is taken over by third person. That subject is further prioritised by the repetition of 'thy selfe', combined through alliteration with 'thou', 'thee', 'thine'. In *Queene El'zabeths Losse. And King James his Welcome*, H. S. praises James as 'The Princely Poet, and the Poets Prince':

> Thy princely wisedome, or thy rightful claime,
> My infant Muse dares scarce presume to name:
> This, hath a riper penne alreadie donne, *3*
> And made apparent as the midday Sunne:
> For that, the spacious world full wel doth know
> Thy selfe (heroick Monarch) best can show.[88] *6*

H. S. seems to argue for his own silence on account of incompetence. He 'dares scarce presume to name' the virtues of the King on account of his modestly-described 'Infant Muse'. Yet none can take his place more effectively; H. S. is clear that none can represent 'princely wisedome' better than the King himself, as he alone can 'show' it in both poetry and life. (Indeed, perhaps the 'riper penne'

[86] Herbert, *Cadwallader*, H2rv.

[87] Fletcher, 'Now did the Sun like an Undaunted Hart', *Sorrowes Joy*, p. 29.

[88] H. S., *King James his Welcome*, B3r.

which has 'made apparent' the King's 'rightful claime' is James himself, in *A True Lawe*.) The initial description puns with the adjective 'Princely'; in not only a literal statement of James's roles, but a metaphorical indication that the King's poetry is sumptuous and magnificent. AS such, H. S. removes both metrical and conceptual space for other poets, excising the image of the poetic self, silencing 'infant Muse'.

Crucially however these same examples clearly and demonstrably undermine Perry's argument in relation to the poetry of 1603-4 (his argument draws much more widely on examples from outside the year where the case has a stronger footing). The poet's flattering and self-effacing representation of the King should not be taken at face value, but rather assessed as a poetic stance that forges a link between the experience, influence, and skills of James as a poet and their own work and position. It is, in fact, no different from Spenser's statement that Elizabeth is the 'most peerless poetesse', or Puttenham's praise of her as 'first in degree' among poets,

> whose learned, delicate, noble Muse, easily surmounteth all the rest that have written before her time or since, for sence, sweetnesse and subtillitie, be it in Ode, Elegie, Epigram, or any other kinde of poeme Heroick or Lyricke, wherein it shall please her Majestie to employ her penne, even by as much oddes as her owne excellent estate and degree exceedeth all the rest of her most humble vassalls.[89]

When Herbert presents James as an incomparable poet who makes others 'in untrode deserts lurke', 'for shame' at their inferiority, he continues:

> Me thinkes I do on *Claros* kingdome stand,

[89] Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, p. 51.

No marvaile, for *Apollo* rules the land.

James is the paragon of poets because he is both Claro, oracle of Apollo, and the god himself, but Apollo's presence provokes, rather than silences, other writing (after all, England is now '*Claros* kingdome', the grove of Apollo in Colophon where the oracle dwelt).

> On true obedience knee I pardon aske
> Of thy divine heroicke Majestie,
> It was thy merites great impos'd this taske *3*
> On my weake pen, badge of infirmitie,
> Too weake indeede to prayse thy excellency.
> Each *Cherrils* muse doth now salute thy grace, *6*
> Shall I alone be mute and hide my face?[90]

James's qualities of 'Majestie' are 'divine' (as Apollo) but also 'heroicke', the fit subject of poetry (as James himself had explained in both *Poeticall Exercises* and *Lepanto*). These 'merites great' – and later his 'grace', punning on both title and attributes – 'impos'd' writing 'On my weake pen' as a 'taske'. Herbert is nothing special – 'Each *Cherrils* muse' is inspired, no one is 'mute'; this is, after all a 'Kingdome' of poets. (The meaning of '*Cherrils*' is uncertain, but it may be a reference to the Wiltshire town now called Cherhill, which was part of the land of the Earls of Pembroke and not far from where Herbert himself was raised. If so, it supports the meaning that even ordinary and unsophisticated men from remote and simple English towns have begun to write.)

This is not an isolated example. A similar refutation is developed in 'Now did the Sun like an Undaunted Hard', which begged 'thou thy selfe thy selfe historifie':

---

[90] Herbert, *Cadwallader*, H1v, H2v.

> Then will I sing, and yet who better sings
> Of thee, then thine owne oft-tride Muse?

On the one hand, Fletcher does indeed allow himself just two metrical feet to 'sing', with the third person capturing the verb as soon as it has been voiced in the first person, metaphorically figuring his silence. On the other hand, James's 'Muse' offers Fletcher new poetic scope and liberty. 'Then will I sing' is metrically prioritised and, following a catalogue of James's heroic actions, mimics epic invocations. The lines display Fletcher's poetic talent with alliteration and enjambment which also emphasize the word 'Muse', striking out (with its position and initial letter) to demonstrate its importance. Fletcher concludes, with apparent fortitude and resolve, that on account of James's example,

> sing I will, though I sing sorrily,
> And thee, though little, I will glorifie.[91]

In Fletcher's poem, as in Herbert's, James's presence as both King and poet leads all attendant poets to greater work.

The same thread can be found again in *Queene El'zabeths Losse*. *And King James his Welcome*. H. S. praises James as 'The Princely Poet, and the Poets Prince':

> Thy princely wisedome, or thy rightful claime,
> My infant Muse dares scarce presume to name:
> This, hath a riper penne alreadie donne, *3*
> And made apparent as the midday Sunne:
> For that, the spacious world full wel doth know
> Thy selfe (heroick Monarch) best can show.[92] *6*

By referring to poets using vocabulary of age and experience rather than talent (an 'infant Muse', a 'riper penne'), H. S. suggests that James's influence and inspiration

[91] Fletcher, 'Now did the Sun like an Undaunted Hart', *Sorrowes Joy*, p. 29.

[92] H. S., *King James his Welcome*, B3r.

may lead the timid poet to improve. In keeping with the Jacobean poetic figure of pre-1603, the King is a poet in both his actions and his texts. His concise epithet exemplifies an ideal reciprocal concept of council and inspiration, poetic leadership and tribute, in its alliterative *antimetabole*, a rhetorical device in which two or more words are repeated in reverse order. This King is 'the Poets Prince' both literally and metaphorically, as their artistic leader and as an established 'Poet' (the couplet concludes 'That name thou art acquainted with long since').

This highly competent poetic figure is not threatening in tone: he is their opportunity and champion. After all, in spite of his supposed insecurity, H. S. does indeed 'presume to name' 'Thy princely wisedome, or thy rightful claime', just as Herbert is not 'mute' and Fletcher 'sings'. (The 'riper penne' should be no distraction in this case: it refers to the verse genealogies discussed in PART ONE, which would lack potency if argued by the King himself, and so given their importance merit a defence from the poet in this context as texts that remain valuable even if not by James.)

Contrary to Perry's argument, in 1603-4 at least the idea of James as poet and King(as opposed to as monarch alone) is repeatedly claimed to inspire and improve poetic composition. The new King represents an opportunity as poetry's champion; indeed, such examples are widespread and entirely lacking the ambiguity of Herbert, H. S. and Fletcher. One of the most striking is found in T. W.'s *The Lamentation of Melpomene*, usually dismissed in criticism for its absurdity in presenting a male muse. In T. W.'s account, the revival of English poetry is inexorably metaphorically linked with the revival of this Muse, Melpomene, and his return to his peers on Parnassus in a wider allegorical variation of the apotheosis

of the poet-king and concurrent elevation of ordinary poets imagined by Fletcher. Melpomene (as Muse of Tragedy) had fled and fainted in grief at the death of Elizabeth, leaving Parnassus weak as well as grieving:

> Now whilst *Melpomene* lay in a sound,
> Dewing with teares [the] melancholy ground,
> His absence was deplor'd on *Parnass* hill,
> Teares did from every Muses eyes distill.
> Some hang'd the head, some stampt, the brest some knocks, *5*
> Some inly sigth, and others wrong their handes,
> To shew their state wherein their sorrow standes.
> At length in secret Synod they decreed,
> To sende *Terpsicore* abroad with speed,
> To search remote, and melancholy nookes: *10*
> Which his sad humour with contentment brookes,
> Much ground he traverst over hill, and daile:
> Twas long eare aught his travaile did availe.
> [...]
> At last directed by the powers Divine,
> He saw wheras the wandring Muse did pine: *15*
> Goodly he louted, and soone him bespake,
> That to *Parnassus* he would journey make.
> To take possession of his long voyde place,
> And live among'st the rest of heavenly race.[93] *19*

The Muses seek to improve their state, and the ensuing search for Melpomene closely echoes how James came to the throne. '*Terpsicore*' is 'directed' to Melpomene 'by the powers Divine' just as the 'Nobles' had 'elect[ed]' James. The 'secret Synod' can be considered a representation of the Privy Council and their actions on the night of Elizabeth's death. Lines 9-13 may refer to the journey of Sir Robert Carey, who took the news of James's accession to the new King, on 24-26 March. The King's summons and long journey to his London throne becomes, in lines 14-15, the Muse's summons and 'journey' 'to *Parnassus* [...] To take possession of his long voyde place'. ('Long voyde' suggest that Elizabeth's court

[93] T. W., *The Lamentation of Melpomene*, B3rv.

has not provided Muses with much fodder, but also the uncertain and tense period between the death of the Queen, and James's arrival in London, discussed in PART ONE.) The 'heavenly race' is both the English, in a little joke, and the newly reformed poetic scene. '*Melpomene*' is at once the Muse, the writing community, but also a fictive double for the King. It may be for this reason that T. W. has made Melpomene, alone among the Muses, male rather than female – in which case he was unfairly mocked for a meaningful and complex metaphorical decision.

T. W. is not alone, but deploying a trope of Jacobean accession literature which diverges from the mere flattery and seeking of patronage, to cast James as the symbol and instigator of the renewal of the English poetic landscape. For instance, Samuel Rowlands invokes:

> Descend you Muses from Parnassus hill;
> Bring Art in librall handes, and now bestow it:
> Let every one present a flowing Quill,
> In honour of our famous Kingly Poet:
> And as the chearefull Larke doth mounting sing,
> So elevate the honour of the King.[1]

The '*Muses*' will accept the invitation to 'Descend […] from Parnassus Hill' to England 'in honour of our famous Kingly *Poet*', because only his arrival 'bring[s]' the right conditions for their gift of 'Art'. It is cynically tempting to read these lines as an unintentional bathetic inversion denigrating Rowlands' own poem (that 'Art' is currently absent from the kingdom, and that the 'Muses' must 'Descend' to reach the English level). Yet they also portray in a performative utterance the burgeoning of a new artistic state around James. The 'Muses' are newly 'librall' with their store of 'Art': the arrival of the artistic and inspirational James stirs within 'every one', regardless of talent or experience, the desire to 'present a

flowing Quill | In honour of the King' ('flowing' being the mortal equivalent of 'librall'), and so a poetic age has begun which must only improve under such a ruler.

Many more examples can be found, abundant with enthusiasm and hope, and in this context the apparently simple flattery of James as 'patron' becomes something more interesting. James is the ideal patron precisely because of – not in spite of – his poetry, and the patronage he offers is not competitive but enriching in both artistic and material terms. In the clearest explanation available, Savile thankfully concludes:

> Now to returne where first I did beginne,
> Mongst all estates Poets have cause to sing
> King *James* his welcome; for hee doth excell
> As his *Lepanto* and his *Furies* tell
> In Poesie: all Kings in Christendome, *5*
> Then welcome him (quick spirits) blush to be dumbe
> And pardon him that boldlie makes this suite
> Forc'd by some Furie, scornes to bee longer mute,
> Rejoyce your Patron is your countries King,
> Judge of all states, have not you cause to sing?[94] *10*

Unlike the tropes and images of dynastic security and confidence in Part One, however, those of James as poet-King develop with remarkable idiosyncrasy. There is one popular surprising thread, however. While it is difficult to find examples expressing any anxiety about the arrival of a royal poet among them, there are instances of poets appropriating and refashioning the idea of James as poet, muse, and critic in competition in a quite different direction to that suspected by Perry.

[94] Savile, *King James His Entertainment*, C4r.

In *The Kings Prophecie*, Hall tells the King:

> So may thy worth my lowly Muse upraise,
> So may mine hie-up-raised thoughts aspire
> That not thy *Bartas* selfe, whose sacred layes *3*
> The yeelding world doth with thy selfe admire,
> Shal passe my song, which nought can reare so hye,
> Save the sweete influence of thy gracious eye. *6*

The poet believes that James's 'worth' as a figure of inspiration will 'my lowly Muse upraise', making him 'aspire' to write incomparable 'song[s]'. The rhymed pairs – 'upraise' and 'layes', 'aspire' and 'admire', 'hye' and 'eye' – are revealing, displaying what Hall sees as the subject-poet's ideal path to social and artistic prominence through the attentions of James as reader. The 'sacred layes' of Du Bartas represent the 'hye[ght]' to which the King's 'sweete influence' alone 'can reare' poetry. Hall covets Du Bartas's status as a poet who the 'world' (and King James) 'admire', and longs to be brought to an artistic peak at which even Bartas could not 'passe' him. Yet Hall's primary image of Bartas is as a poet-courtier who could warrant and boast the affectionate possessiveness (and translation) of James, '*Thy* Bartas'. James appears as an example, a patron, and a critic – and perhaps a poet of established excellence through the reference to Du Bartas whose work James had famously translated; if anything, it is James rather than his subjects whose poetry is silenced.

As the poem continues, this suspicion becomes explicit:

> Mine with the rest, though mine be poore and plain,
> Well fitted my rude roundelaies to sing,
> Yet if thee list to raise their lowly straine,

May somewhat say well worthy of a King.[95]

Hall employs a trope of false modesty when advertising his 'roundelaies' to James: they are 'poore and plain', 'rude', and 'lowly'. Like Elizabeth before him, James is the figure with the power to 'say' his judgement and thus 'to raise' what he reads both in terms of reputation or sanction, and in terms of improving it through his criticism. The evidence of the text, however, seems structured to discredit these adjectives, employing irony and alliteration throughout to draw attention this. Hall notes (albeit with apparent modesty) that his work is 'well fitted' for his chosen topic and form. The rhyme and meter have a smooth and reassuring stanza of uninterrupted iambic pentameters. Such ambiguous tension comes to a head in the final line of the passage, which offers three readings. First, a positive verdict spoken by James 'may' 'raise' the verse to become 'well worthy of a King'; as with H. S.'s 'Princely' poetry, this can be read as meaning that they could be raised to comparable value and skill as the poetry of the King himself (that is, 'worthy' of James as a poet). Second, if 'raise' is a literal act of choosing to raise the text to his eyes, it can also be read that he will find them 'worthy' to speak of a King, and/or 'worthy' of a royal audience. Finally, the lines assert that the act of 'rais[ing]' the poetry of others, being a supporter of verse, is 'well worthy of a King' - a role he ought to assume. (James's *Treatise* might suggest that this is a complex role for which he was uniquely qualified.) All three readings flatter the King's poetic comprehension and skill, while firmly defining a new function for him that excludes composition. In all his lines about James's poetic understanding and

[95] Hall, *The Kings Prophecie*, B8r.

ability, Hall never refers to him, explicitly, as a poet in the present moment. In fact, throughout the accession verse, James is never actually shown writing.

The poets seem to argue that James must pass on his laurels, must raise and perpetuate English poetry, because in spite of his apparently incomparable talent he cannot effectively be his own laureate (just as he was unable to state his own case openly in a succession pamphlet.) In reality, his actions in Scotland suggest otherwise but, as with all aspects of the King's poetic icon, this is a matter of perception, and representation of the poets' ideal in a refashioning agenda, rather than action. He must accept their support, or renounce this key field of powerful persuasive art. Byng lays this out in *Sorrowes Joy when* he asks:

> Is any penne so rich in poetry,
> As to pourtray thy matchless majestie?
> Can mortall wight conceit thy worthines,
> Which fills the worlds capacious hollownes?
> Lo then the man which the *Lepanto* writ;
> Or he, or els on earth no man is fit.
> Request him then, that he would thee commend:
> Els nev'r thy worth may worthily be penn'd.

So far, so predictable in its self-effacing flattery perhaps. But he continues:

> And yet, for all his royall eloquence,
> Scarce may he figure forth thy excellence.[96]

James has reached the limit of what he can do – not on account of his talent, but because he cannot praise himself. Instead, through the coming together of his youthful experience of poetry with his elevation to the throne of Elizabeth, the King is now presented as making real his poetry, living the poetic image of the ideal King that he had created in his writing. In Chettle's words:

[96] T. B., 'Is any penne so rich in poetry', *Sorrowes Joy*, pp. 11-12.

> Onely her brother King, the Muses trust
> (Blood of her Grandsires blood, plac'd in her Throne)
> Can raise her glory from the bed of dust:
> To praise her worth belongs to Kings alone.
> In him shall we behold her Majestie,
> In him her vertue lives and cannot die.[1]

At first glance, the 'praise' of James for Elizabeth must be – we assume – his poetry, as 'the Muses trust' James 'Onely' to 'raise her glory' and 'praise her worth'. However, this tribute is 'beh[e]ld' not on paper but 'In him', a point that is repeated twice to ensure it is understood. As James will 'raise' Elizabeth's 'glory' in continuing her 'vertue[s]', so the poets will 'raise' his 'glory' so that this to shall (as it were) 'live and cannot die'. For Rowlands, the poets write 'in honour of our famous Kingly *Poet*' because his arrival could 'bring' the gift of 'Art'; Hall agrees that as James has 'honor'd' these Muses with his past skilful work and current action, he will now receive their his reward in the poetic praise which surrounds his accession: 'as thou hast honoured them, to honour thee'. Poet and Poet-King have a mutually beneficial but distinct roles in Jacobean England.

Petowe is particularly explicit about what these roles should be: 'all pennes' write 'Poetrie' to praise him and so protect the nation, and in return James is the 'Royall Patron'. In 'The Induction' to *England's Cæsar*, he lays out the philosophy:

> Oh, were my penne so rich in Poetrie,
> As to pourtray his royall Maiestie.
> But since she is not as I would she were,
> And since I cannot as I wish I could,
> No marvell though her weaknes doe forbeare, *5*
> To sing that Royall song which all pennes should.
> Yet what she can she will for love compile,
> Not seeking glory for a stately stile.
> Goe joyfull truce-men in your virgin weedes,
> Under a Royall Patron I have past you, *10*

> Soake up the teares of every hart that bleeds.
> And on the wings of Fame hence quickly hast you.
> And from the silver mayne of Calmy Thames,
> Sound forth the worth of our Heroicke *James*.[97] *14*

In what has become a recognisable stance, lines 1-6 initially suggest that Petowe 'cannot' 'pourtray his royall Majestie' or may 'forbeare | To sing that Royall song' on account of 'weaknes' (either fear or lack of skill). Yet, he does not 'forbeare', as it is their duty to 'Sound forth the worth of our Heroicke *James*' on account of the King's value, 'love', and the concerns of PART ONE. It becomes clear that once again the 'Royall song' is not 'Royal' in the sense that it is from James, the famous poet, but rather in that it is for James. The roles of the King and poet do not overlap, although both can achieve 'fame' through their interaction.

Throughout the accession poetry of 1603-4, the representation of King James the 'poet' is refashioned to enhance the positions of the accession poets themselves through their association with him, together and severally. In the most extreme cases, he undergoes an apotheosis into a 'Muse' and even a 'Deitie' of poetry. The poets deploy and manipulate a parallel strategy to that discussed in PART ONE, wherein Elizabeth's imagery and position falls vacant only because she has herself been elevated beyond it. The writers, who claim to have been insignificant, barren, or both, before his example can therefore become his 'poets' (for the Muse), his 'Quire' (for the god), and begin to create 'Claroes Kingdom' anew. The King becomes a poetic icon in every sense, symbol of hope for cultural and personal advancement and rejuvenation adopted and adapted to address

[97] Petowe, *Englands Caesar*, A3v-4r.

potential artistic threats and to advance cultural, and specifically poetic, causes materially and artistically.

3: 'Whose deeds with words, Whose words with deedes accord': Reading the King.

This chapter has so far explained why, and demonstrated how, the image of King James as a writer was current in England in 1603. It has discussed its use and relevance for the private hopes and ambitions of the many writers of accession poetry, who saw in the representation of James as a poet an *anchor* for their own advancement. This *response shaping* is far less complicated and contentious than has been hitherto critically suggested, and much more optimistic; the sense of threats which has been perceived within the poems are entirely absent. Yet the third point – the moral, political, and religious promise represented by the arrival of James – is a national concern requiring *response changing* more in keeping with that discussed in Part One. The King was a malleable icon to be read and interpreted, not only in the poetry commemorating his accession, but in life.

On 4 April 1603, the day before the new King of England left Edinburgh for London, he accepted a petition from prominent and respected Puritan ministers led by Stephen Egerton and Arthur Hildersham.[98] The document expressed a 'longing for the redress of divers abuses of the Church'; specifically, for the further

[98] Brett Usher, 'Egerton, Stephen (c.1555–1622)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8593, and Bryan D. Spinks, 'Hildersham , Arthur (1563–1632)', www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13256, *ODNB* (online edn. 2008). Also involved were Samuel Hieron, a clergymen who gathered signatures in the West Country, and Henry Jacob, who helped to write it. Stephen Wright, 'Jacob, Henry (1562/3–1624)', *ODNB* (online edn., 2008) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14566 [all accessed 7 January 2015].

'reformation' of 'rites and ceremonies' which originated in Roman Catholicism.[99] This *Millenary Petition*, as it would come to be known, had wide support and demonstrable influence. It was said to be endorsed by 'more than a thousand of your majesty's subjects and ministers' (the Latin 'millenarius' means 'of a thousand') from at least twenty-five counties. It stimulated James to call the Hampton Court Conference in January 1604, when leading churchmen and politicians met with the King to discuss the future of the Church of England. Just over a week later, 'before [James] came to Yorke' on 15 April, Doctor Thomas Hill also 'delivered [to the King] a petitione, and talked with him'.[100] Hill was 'a notable archpriest', a senior Roman Catholic clergyman given authority over priests by the Pope in the absence of a Catholic hierarchy. As with the *Millenary Petition*, Hill had both support and effect. His 'petitione' was one of many pleas for tolerance that James received on his journey from subjects whom historian Michael Questier identifies as 'prominent Catholics'.[101] In July, the new King suspended the monthly fine of £20 introduced in 1581 for recusancy and (as Lord Sheffield, the Lord President in York, complained) 'showed them […] many grases and favores' besides.[102]

---

[99] Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Great Britain* (London: John Williams, 1655), v.305; Parry, *The Seventeenth Century*, p. 181; Travers, *James I*, p. 23.

[100] Francis Foster to Dr. John Cecil, both Roman Catholic priests (1 May 1603; Lambeth Palace Library MS 2006 ff. 177r-78r; *State Papers Online*).

[101] William Atkinson to Lord Cecil ([undated] 1603), HMC *Salisbury* 15/349 (*State Papers Online*). 'archpriest, n.', *OED Online* (online edn. 2014) www.oed.com/view/Entry/10440 [accessed 7 January 2015].

[102] Questier, 'Sermons, Separatists, and the Succession', *Journal of British Studies*, 314. On the suspension of the £20 fine, see Michael L. Carrafiello, *Robert Parsons and English Catholicism, 1580-1610* (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University *(cont.)*

The initial urge to petition the King, combined with the scope of the ensuing 'argument' (as one participant called it[103]) between Puritans, Catholics and mainstream Protestants, indicates that James's intentions were not clear to his new subjects.[104] The authors were not merely seizing an apparent opportunity for negotiation at the beginning of a new regime but perceived a real opportunity, or danger: the many passionate articles are comprehensive and comprehensible, written by educated men, to persuade the reader to the total eradication of alternative arguments. Three examples demonstrate the pattern. Leading figures of the University of Oxford ('indorsed' by the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge) 'answere' the Puritans: the modest *Millenary Petition* is reproduced and refuted point by point. For instance, their tract is condemned as 'repleate, with

Press, 1998), p. 165 n.58; F. X. Walker, 'The Implementation of the Elizabethan statutes against Recusants 1581-1603' (PhD thesis, University of London, 1961). Lord Sheffield to James I, 1 November 1603 (CP 118/36, Hatfield House HMCS 15/278, and CP 118/36, *State Papers Online*).

[103] Gabriel Powel[l], *The Catholikes supplication unto the Kings majestie […] and The Protestants Counterpoyse* (London: Felix Kyngston for Edmund Weaver, 1603), p. 5.

[104] Lord Sheffield continued, in the same November letter to James, that 'many […] men have ben imployed […] to gett oute a petission for toleration of religgion', signed by 'all the hands of not only requsantes' but also any 'favoreres of there religgion'. Tobias Matthew, Bishop of Durham, likewise warned Cecil of 'a greate longe schedule of parchement' which he knew was being circulated 'to subscribe […] names to a supplicacion to be presented unto his Majestie on behalf of the Catholickes (fallsly so called)' (Letter of 24 November 1604, TNA SP 14/4/92 f.204r). See also Questier, 'Sermons, Separatists, and the Succession', *Journal of British Studies*, p. 314, for further accounts of petitions. John Colleton, *A supplication to the Kings most excellent Maiestie* (London: [Valentine Simmes for the English secret press], 1604). Powell, *A consideration of the papists reasons of state and religion, for toleration of poperie in England, intimated in their supplication unto the Kings Majestie* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes for Simon Waterson, 1604).

unthankefulnes towards God' and 'contempt of their Brethren […] in the Lordes harvest'.[105]

One Christopher Muriell uses the same thorough and effective strategy to 'answer' one of 'the Catholiques Supplication[s]', disparaging (for example) a bid for sympathy – that they are 'overwhelmed with persecutions for our consciences' – with the marginal note:

> If they be persecuted, themselves are the cause thereof, for they are never well but when their heads are hatching of rebellion.[106]

The polemical 'counterpoyse' of Gabriel Powell (an Oxford-educated Welsh clergyman 'at the centre', theologically, 'of the ecclesiastical establishment'[107]) is even more closely argued – necessarily so, as it attacks both Catholic and Puritan:

> the Papists […] are not ashamed unto the kings highnes, most impudently and most falsely to traduce our Church for Puritanisme and Atheisme.[108]

Powell engages with the same Catholic petition as Muriell, but uses a different argumentative technique. Juxtaposing the text with that of his own 'supplicatorie counterpoyse of the Protestants', he defends the tenets of the mainstream Church

---

[105] *Answere of the vicechancelour, the doctors, both the proctors, and other the heads of houses in the Universitie of Oxford […] To the humble pettion of the ministers of the Church of England, desiring reformation of certaine ceremonies and abuses of the church* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, Printer to the University, 1603), p. 3.

[106] Christopher Muriell, *An Answer unto the Catholiques Supplication, presented unto the Kings Majestie, for the tolleration of popish religion in England* (London: R[ichard] R[ead] for Francis Burton, 1603), D1r. Muriell's *Answer* is often misidentified as a response to Gabriel Powell, misreading Powell's short title as the Supplication itself, rather than another anti-Catholic response.

[107] Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: the Roman and protestant churches in English protestant thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 56. See Margo Todd, 'Powell, Gabriel (bap. 1576, d. 1611)', *ODNB*, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22646 [accessed 7 January 2015].

[108] Powell, *Supplication*, p. 5.

of England in a concise facing-page edition which clearly demonstrates their disagreement with both the Catholics and Puritans. Polemical 'notes and animadversions in the margine' address political points beyond the theological scope of the 'counterpoyse' itself, such as 'What loyall hearts Papists beare the Kings Majestie, appeareth by their sundrie conspiracies against his sacred person […] especially by that in the yeere 1591 recorded in publike print' and, more forcefully, 'Impudent fellowes! A manifest untruth, as all the world knoweth.'[109] Each text claims that James is of their mind. In doing so the authors employ the rhetorical strategy of appealing to authority, but they also demonstrate the uncertainty, threat, and opportunity that precipitated the close intellectual engagement of the debate in the first place. That is, each argument can claim the King's support because his opinions were uncertain; but they must make their argument because his opinions are uncertain; and they publish their argument because popular support might exert pressure to shape his opinions in their favour – because his opinions are uncertain. Their projected certainty in fact betrays concern, while recognizing opportunity.

Speculation about the new King's theological and political attitudes in private correspondence shows that the perception of uncertainty is not a critical imposition. In July, Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli, the Venetian Secretary in England, assured the Doge and Senate that a former Scottish emissary to Venice, a Catholic nobleman:

[109] Powell, *Supplication*, t. p. and pp. 6, 8.

> who is very intimate with the King, and still more with the Queen as being a Catholic, told me in the strictest confidence that he himself had an interview with the Pope at Ferrara, and had promised in the King's name that if he succeeded to the throne of England he would permit liberty of conscience, and would restore to their country and their possessions all who had been persecuted for being Catholics.

Since the accession (Scaramelli confirmed) 'The King himself, though continuing a Protestant' had allowed the Queen 'to place in office as many Catholic nobles as possible'; but the diplomat also warned that, according to his informant, James 'would not go a step further':

> first because he would never, in the interests of peace, permit two religions in his kingdoms, and second because he would never admit allegiance to the Pope in the free kingdoms to which he had succeeded.[110]

Scaramelli's appraisal of James's conduct is complicated and contradictory: on the one hand, James will never 'admit allegiance to the Pope' or 'permit two religions in his kingdoms'; on the other, he has promised to 'permit liberty of conscience' and 'restore' estates, and has appointed Catholics to positions of power. The papers of the Bishop of Durham, Tobias Matthew, corroborate the private Catholic optimism and attendant Protestant concern. Matthew recorded on 31 August that 196 of 526 recusants had 'since the decease of Quene Elizabeth […] been seduced or after their conformitie revolted to papistrie', and in November warned Cecil of a 'greate longe schedule of parchement' which he knew was being circulated:

---

[110] Horatio F. Brown (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Vol. 10: 1603-1607* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1900), p. 63 (10 and 23 July 1603). Available at *British History Online*, www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol10/pp58-72 [accessed 3 January 2015]. The emissary was Robert Crichton (M. J. Bowman, 'Crichton, Robert, eighth Lord Crichton of Sanquhar [c.1568–1612]', *ODNB* www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6700 [accessed 7 January 2015].)

> to subscribe [...] names to [another] supplicacion to be presented unto his Majestie on behalf of the Catholickes.[111]

These private accounts offer a very different viewpoint from the fire and brimstone of Hall, Nixon, *et al*, and one much more like the doubt of the many petitions. Issues of religion were only one, albeit particularly contentious, area of concern and debate; similar contemporary disagreements exist about James's approach to many aspects of domestic and foreign policy.

The evidence tallies with the 'atmosphere of unease' discerned by Jenny Wormald in the English reception of James's recent Scottish writing on government, *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* (1598) and *Basilikon Doron* (1599); his English subjects, she concludes 'did not understand the King.'[112] Yet several critics have argued that (as Maurice Lee Jr writes) 'the new King was not an unknown quantity'.[113] For example, Daniel W. Doerksen and James Travers both assert that 'the theological views of James, unlike those of Elizabeth [in 1558] were clearly known' due to his 'impeccably Protestant' education under George Buchanan and Peter Young, while Judith Richards argues that 'James's hostility to the papal Antichrist was assumed' and that, in a direct reference to Scaramelli's letters, 'there was little public echo of the ambiguous rumours extant in the circles

---

[111] Tobias Matthew, Bishop of Durham: 'Vewe taken within the bishopricke of Duresme and countie of Northumberlande' (31 August 1603) TNA SP 14/3/42, f. 80r; letter to Robert, Lord Cecil (24 November 1604) TN ASP 14/4/92, f.204r (*State Papers Online*). Questier, 'Sermons, Separatists, and the Succession', *Journal of British Studies*, p. 312; on Catholic conformity, see Questier, 'Religious Conformity', *Historical Journal*, p. 16.

[112] Wormald, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*, *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, p. 48.

[113] Lee, *James I and Henry VI*, p. 17.

where the Venetian ambassador moved'.[114] The deceptive sense of certainty must come from misreading subjective or persuasive texts – such as the various treatises responding confidently to the petitions, or the enthusiastic Protestant verse of poets like Nixon or Robert Pricket – as statements of fact, by viewing them in isolation and with the benefit of critical distance and hindsight.

It is true that James had apparently displayed what Wormald has called 'a clear picture of a very effective ruler' during his thirty-six-year reign in Scotland (or, at least, since the start of his full personal rule, without official or unofficial regency, in July 1583), albeit in a kingdom whose structure differed remarkably from England.[115] In particular, his published writings could offer (as James himself had warned Prince Henry in *Basilikon Doron*) 'true pictures of [his] mind'. *True Lawe* and *Basilikon Doron* explicitly pronounced his style of monarchy, while his Biblical commentaries of the late 1580s, as well as *His Majesties Lepanto, or, Heroicall Song* (1591) and *Dæmonologie* (1597), offered insight into his religious beliefs. Peter W. M. Blayney has suggested that the London republication of *Basilikon Doron* in London, within a fortnight of Elizabeth's death, was at the instigation of Sir Robert Cecil; if this were the case it could be inferred that he too

---

[114] Daniel W. Doerksen, *Conforming to the Word* (Lewisbury: Bucknell University Press, 1997), p. 15; see also p. 19. Travers, *The Masque of Monarchy*, pp. 5, 9. On James's Protestant education, see Croft, *King James*, pp. 13, 18.

[115] Wormald, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*', *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, p. 44. (After the regencies of the Earls of Moray, Lennox, Mar, and Morton, and finally the Ruthven/Gowrie Regime of 1582-3 – when James was abducted and held by the Presbyterian faction of the Earl of Gowrie, in the hope of limiting pro-Catholic influence in Scottish government.)

hoped that what Wormald has called 'its low-key and admirable common sense and wit' might be reassuring.[116]

Indeed, all these texts were republished within weeks of James's accession in their first London editions, in exceptional numbers.[117] *Basilikon Doron* appeared in three authorized editions by John Norton, as well as at least one pirate edition printed by Edward Allde for Edward White 'and others of the company of stationers'. At the same time, two Edinburgh editions were also printed for the English market: a revision from the printer of the 1599 edition, Robert Waldegrave (the King's printer), and one attributed to another royal printer, 'H. Charteris' (although, in fact, by his son and heir Robert, as Henry had died in 1599[118]). And finally, a versification renamed *A Princes Looking Glass*, by William Willymat, was

---

[116] Wormald, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*', *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, p. 51: 'Norton himself, publisher of all eight editions, was a friend of Cecil; and, as Dr. Blayney suggests, Cecil – no doubt anxious to please his new master – may have been involved in bringing the initial Waldegrave copy to London before Elizabeth's death and its registration with the Stationers' Company immediately afterwards' (p. 48).

[117] In 1603, *Basilikon Doron* was printed and published in London editions by Richard Field for John Norton, Felix Kyngston in a second Norton edition, and Edward Allde for Edward White, while an Edinburgh edition was reissued by Robert Waldegrave, and another 'Edinburgh' edition (printed abroad) was produced by H. Chateris. In 1604 it was published again by in Latin, and by Simon Stafford for Thomas Salisbury in a Welsh translation by Robert Holland (which included Harry's Pedigree). Likewise, *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* appeared in three 1603 Thomas Creede editions: Creede alone; Creede for Robert Waldegrave; and Creede and J. Roberts. *Daemonologie* and *A Fruitefull Meditation* each appeared in two 1603 editions: Arnold Hatfield for Waldegrave, and R. Bradock for William Cotton and William Aspley; and the latter by R. Read for John Harrison, and John Windet and Valentine Simmes for Felix Norton. *His Majesties Lepanto* appeared in two London editions in English in 1603 by Simon Stafford and Henry Hooke, and in Latin in 1604 by Richard Field for John Norton.

[118] Joseph Marshall, 'Charteris, Henry (d. 1599)', *ODNB* (online edn. 2006) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5176 [accessed 8 January 2015].

printed by John Legat (printer to Cambridge University) and sold in London. Blayney has estimated that between 13,000 and 16,000 copies of *Basilikon Doron* were therefore on sale in London in the spring of 1603. This unprecedented supply must have been satisfying a perceived demand.

Additionally, Norton and Allde (at least) had their editions produced at great speed. Norton, with six fellow members of the Stationers' Company, entered *Basilikon Doron* into the Stationers' Register on 28 March, within four days of James's accession. By 13 April, his editions – along with those of Allde – were already on sale; on that date, Allde was fined by the Stationers' Company for producing 3,000 pirate copies and 'undercutting the price of the official editions'.[119] (Norton had produced his editions fast by employing perhaps half of London's printers, although their title pages credit only either Felix Kyngston or Richard Field. The use of mixed sheets of paper, and ornaments identifiable as belonging to a particular printing house, reveal others employed in the task; perhaps, Blayney suggests, half the twenty-one printers active in London.[120]) This demand was not fleeting, or speculative, either; in 1604, Norton produced a final edition in Latin, and Thomas Salisbury published a Welsh translation by Robert Holland (which included George Owen Harry's *Pedigree*). *Basilikon Doron* was not unique, although it was the most extreme case: *True Lawe* and *Lepanto* both appeared in three editions, *Dæmonology* in two, and each of the Biblical

[119] Wormald, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Lawe of Free Monarchies*', *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, p. 51.

[120] Peter W. M. Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks', *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 393-417.

commentaries in one.[121] These extraordinary figures indicate that they were desirable objects, whether as souvenirs or as keys to James's intentions.

However, these supposedly 'true pictures of [James's] mind' in fact often seem to demonstrate his willingness to say almost anything to achieve his aims, exercising what Peter C. Herman has termed his 'duplicitous diplomacy'.[122] A striking example, again regarding Catholicism, is found in his epic poem, 'The Lepanto'. 'The Lepanto' celebrates the victory of 'Christian Navie' of the Holy League over the 'Turband Turkes' of the Ottoman Empire in 1571.[123] But the Holy League was an alliance of Catholic maritime states, and their year of glory was (in England) the year of the Ridolfi Plot (a Catholic conspiracy to assassinate Elizabeth and replace her with James's mother, Mary Queen of Scots). Furthermore, the poem's primary hero, 'Don-John of Austria', was the illegitimate though acknowledged half-brother of Elizabeth's great enemy, Philip II of Spain.

In the 1591 Edinburgh and 1603 London editions of the poem, James included a 'Preface to the Reader' defending his choice of subject, and explaining

---

[121] *The True Law of Free Monarchies*: three Thomas Creede editions: Creede alone; Creede for Robert Waldegrave; and Creede and J. Roberts; *Daemonology*: Arnold Hatfield for Waldegrave, and R. Bradock for William Cotton and William Aspley; *Meditatiouns* by R. Read for John Harrison, and John Windet and Valentine Simmes for Felix Norton; *Lepanto* in English by Simon Stafford and Henry Hooke (1603) and in a Latin translation by Richard Field for John Norton (1604). The English edition seems to have been excerpted from *Poeticall Exercises*, something the publishers were able to do because Field held its title, which he had registered with the Stationers' Company on 7 August 1589 (the reason, perhaps, why Norton chose to work with him on the 1604 edition of the poem), while Hooke and Stafford had entered the poem independently on 12 April 1603, a mere nineteen days after the accession proclamation.

[122] Herman, '"Best of Poets, Best of Kings"', *Royal Subjects*, p. 77.

[123] James VI and I, *Lepanto*, B4r.

that – in spite of its heroes – the poem's message was a Protestant one. His invocation (he argues) is made 'to the true God onely, and not to all the Hee and Shee Saints', and his epilogue (the '*Chorus Angelorum*') 'speak[s] somewhat of our religion'. Reviewing this great 'victory', the 'holy Angels in the heaven' explain that it is a demonstration of God's 'mercy' 'to all' Christians, 'And not alanerly [exclusively] to them | Professing it aright.'[124] In this context, they ask the poet to consider:

> sith that so [God] uses them
> That doubt for to be sav'd,
> How much more them that in their hearts
> His promise have engrav'd?
> And since he doth such favour shew
> To them that fondly pray
> To other Mediatours, than
> Can helpe them any way:
> O how then will he favour them,
> Who prayers doe direct
> Unto the Lambe, whom onely he
> Ordaynd for that effect?[125]

These are just two of several examples within the '*Chorus*' which explicitly state that the Protestant elect (those 'that in their hearts | His promise have engrav'd' and pray 'Unto the Lambe') are preferred over Catholic adherents (who 'pray | To other Mediatours' and 'doubt for to be saved'). The use of common meter (lines alternating between iambic tetrameter and trimester, rhyming x-a-x-a) helps their argument seem uncomplicated and sincere, letting the reader reach regular small conclusions (in resolved rhymes, and occasional end stops) while also carrying them smoothly forward (using rhyme and enjambment). The

[124] 'allenarly, adv. and adj.', www.oed.com/view/Entry/5247, A.

[125] James VI and I, *Lepanto*, E3r.

inevitability and forward motion of common meter could even be seen as a metaphorical representation of Providence, 'preordoning | What ever doth befall', by a poet who would 'take heid to frame [his] wordis and sentencis according to the mater' (as the chapter on meter in his 'treatise of the airt of Scottis Poësie' advised).[126]

By composing a Protestant poem on the victory at Lepanto, James claims for his religion a potentially problematic instance of Providence at work on behalf of Catholicism (albeit in the face of a greater peril and threat to all Christendom). Rickard believes that his Preface 'reflects a tension between aesthetic considerations and political efficacy'; that is, that James had chosen the most attractive and (in generic terms) heroic recent Christian material available, but recognized that a Protestant audience would – in his own words – 'mislike' his 'praise of a forraine Papist bastard'.[127] However another plausible explanation is that, while the 'Preface' alongside the '*Chorus Angelorum*' ensures a Protestant interpretation for a Protestant audience, this is done in discrete parts of the poem which could be disregarded, even removed, to permit the main body to demonstrate to a Catholic audience unfettered admiration for the forces of the Holy League – including 'eight thousand Spaniards brave' – who are praised for their 'bold magnanimo[us] hearts' and their great 'conscience'.[128]

---

[126] James VI, *Poeticall Exercises*, L4v.

[127] Jane Rickard, 'From Scotland to England: The Poetic Strategies of James VI and I', *Renaissance Forum: An Electronic Journal of Early-Modern Literary and Historical Studies*, Vol. 7 (Winter 2004), p. 10.

[128] James VI and I, *Lepanto*, B3v-4r.

James had some reason to be sympathetic to Catholicism: he had been baptised into the Roman Church (a religion for which, arguably, his mother had died), and his wife Queen Anne was a practising Catholic.[129] He was also aware of the political and diplomatic benefits of maintaining a strong Catholic faction. In Scotland he had used the power – and demands – of Catholic lords to balance those of the troublesome Kirk. In the most extreme and notorious example, he repeatedly forgave the treasonous George Gordon, Earl of Huntly. A powerful and trusted councillor, Huntly was found to have been corresponding secretly with Catholic monarchs: first, in 1584, with the exiled Queen Mary; then, in 1586, with Philip II. Nothing was done. In January 1589, English spies intercepted more correspondence with Philip, in which the Earl promised 'unmitigated support […] for any invasion of Britain'; this time the discovery prompted Huntly to raise a regional rebellion, although he quickly surrendered to the King at the 'Brig O'Dee' (Bridge of Dee) near Aberdeen.

From 1590-94 Huntly only grew in royal favour, even though during this time he had, in the words of the popular ballad, 'slain the Earl of Murray' (the King's Protestant cousin, James Stewart, Earl of Moray) and was implicated in yet another Jesuit plot, the Affair of the Spanish Blanks. Only late in 1594 was James finally forced to act:

---

[129] James maintained his equivocation regarding Catholicism privately as well, confronted Anne in May 1603 about the danger of her religious inclination and taking Henry from her custody. He wrote to her: 'I can say no more but protest, upon the peril of my salvation and damnation, that neither the Earl of Mar nor any flesh living ever informed me that ye was upon any papist or Spanish course…' (Akrigg, *Letters*, p. 214).

> Political agitation from the Kirk and the [Moray] Stewarts [as well as, her letters suggest, the Queen of England] caused James to commission an army under Archibald Campbell, seventh earl of Argyll to pursue Huntly in October 1594. [Argyll was defeated.] When James later raised his own army and marched north against Huntly, the Earl refused to face James on the field and in March 1595 he voluntarily went into exile abroad.[130]

Although Ruth Grant's research concludes that Huntly's actions were, at root, caused by his feud with Moray and other leading Protestant noblemen (explaining James's willingness to forgive him), J. R. M Sizer argues that it cannot be denied that they were also an 'attempt to avoid compromising [his] religious beliefs'. At the time, Huntly's feuds were certainly seen as a manifestation of the Counter-Reformation.[131] After the Earl's fall, James himself – recognising its importance – 'began actively to solicit Catholic support' in Britain and abroad, resulting in 'Rumours that James was ready to convert to Catholicism and to invade England' which 'disturbed [the] English's perceptions of him'.[132] James may have been unsettled by Huntly's actions; furthermore recent studies by Susan Doran, Pauline Croft, and Rei Kanemura have argued that the 1594 publication of Robert Persons' *A Conference about the Next Succession* 'fundamentally transformed James's relation with England and Catholic Europe', just as it had unsettled the writers of

---

[130] Ruth Grant, 'George Gordon, sixth Earl of Huntly and the Politics of the Counter-Reformation in Scotland, 1581-1595' (PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2010), abstract.

[131] J. R. M. Sizer, 'Gordon, George, First Marquis of Huntly (1561/2–1636)', *ODNB* www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11036 [accessed 11 January 2015].

[132] Kanemura, The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, p. 321; Croft, *King James*, Ch. 1 and 2; Susan Doran, 'Loving and Affectionate Cousins? The Relationship Between Elizabeth I and James VI of Scotland 1586-1603', *Tudor England and Its Neighbours*, ed. Susan Doran and Glenn Richardson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp. 223-4.

Elizabethan England (as PART ONE has shown). Lee's research explains quite how far this went:

> James's own devious and unofficial negotiations with Clement [VIII] led the Pope to believe that James's conversion, while unlikely, was not outside the realm of possibility.[133]

He had to play a very careful diplomatic game.

James's writings could not therefore be relied upon as 'true pictures of [his] mind', but rather as complex and fluid texts serving this purpose. Alongside his actions as King of Scotland, they indicated royal ambivalence to anyone trying to interpret them as a whole and in a single, English context that has been largely critically ignored. James had been writing and acting to the occasion, as need arose, over two decades. For example, Kanemura has convincingly argued that *True Lawe* was 'a time-specific counterblast to Persons, and James's own contribution to the succession debate', rather than an deferred ideological riposte to Buchanan as has often been assumed.[134] This would explain its reliance on what J. P. Sommerville has called 'continental theories of monarchy', which support the undeniable right of the next blood heir to his or her crown, apparent for example in statements such as that 'Kinges were the authors & makers of the lawes, and not the lawes of the Kings', and arguments like:

> As to this contract alleged made at the coronation of a King: although I deny any such contract to be made then […] yet I confess that a king at his coronation, or at the entry to his kingdom,

---

[133] Lee, *James I & Henri IV*, p. 8.

[134] Kanemura, 'The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, p. 320.

> willingly promiseth to his people to discharge honourably and truly the office given him by God over them.[135]

In *True Lawe*, the coronation (Peter Lake explains) 'recognised something that had already happened rather than constituting some sort of conditional transfer of power from the commonwealth to the prince'. Such an understanding would circumvent Persons' 'clause irritant' (as James revealingly termed it), that subjects might resist a monarch who broke with that 'contract'. James's subtitle is equally telling: *The Reciprock and Mutuall Dutie betwixt a free King and his natural Subjects* is about reminding 'Subjects' of their 'natural' state, and of the 'free[dom]' of their 'King'. As Wormald writes, it has 'nothing whatsoever to do with a contract which may be broken by the inferior party if the superior does not fulfil his part'.[136]

4: 'THE PEDESTALL WHEREON THY GREATNESSE STANDS, | IS BUILT OF ALL OUR HEARTS, AND ALL OUR HANDS': POLITICAL REJUVENATION

Unlikely though it may seem from a modern standpoint, therefore, the ample evidence of the 'Supplication' debates, private records and correspondence, and the English reception of the King's published writing all demonstrate that, in 1603, James I is perceived as 'an unknown quantity'. This means that he represents to his new subjects both abundant hope and terrible threat. Accordingly, many of the texts which defend his right to the English throne in complex and innovative ways also defend their own rights and advocate their own agendas under him. This is a

---

[135] James VI and I, *Selected Writings*, p. 272; J. P. Sommerville, 'James I and the Divine Right of Kings: English Politics and Continental Theory', *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, pp. 55-70.

[136] Wormald, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*: The Scottish Context and the English Translation', *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, p. 45.

second aspect of the poetic transformation of James from a figure representing insecurity and concern into one of strength and promise – except here the cause of anxiety is James himself (rather than what he represents). Using arguments primarily based on the persuasive appeal of 'logos' (reasoning), they attempt to *manufacture the consent* and *shape the perception* of their new King himself by presenting an image of their desired monarch, to encourage and persuade the ordinary reader that this is how a King must behave (and thus exert public pressure upon him) and also to persuade James that this is how he ought to behave – because he is dependent upon them for his power.

Predictably, the most frequent and straightforward stratagem is seen in concepts and imagery of inheritance and continuity. This includes the transposing of Tudor and specifically Elizabethan imagery (especially those independently indicating renewal: the Moon and Phœnix) to James and the Stuart dynasty and (related to this) the provision of optimistic 'figura' or 'types' to prefigure his monarchy, discussed in PART ONE, but also explicit requests for the state to remain the same. This trope of 1603-4 has been identified by Perry and Catharine Loomis, but they do not recognize that these pleas for continuity are often accompanied by another device, which subtly adds weight to their pleas by implying that James did not receive the Crown of England solely by right. He was (in the words of the anonymous poet I. F.) 'Englands choyce'; in the words of Samuel Rowlands, 'King of our desire'.[137] The anonymous 1604 collection *Northerne Poems*, which (according

[137] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, B3r; Rowlands, *Ave Cæsar*, B1r.

to its opening poem) openly responds to the accession poetry of 1603, makes their meaning explicit. In this short poem, the reader is asked:

> Wouldst thou a chosen king should raign,
> Or one the next of bloud?
> O England both these wishes now
> Doe serve unto thy good.
> For whome couldst thou desire to chuse,
> Then in whose sacred brest,
> All virtues and religious faith
> As in a closet rest?
> Or who by righter line descends
> From our most auncient Kinges,
> Then our King *James*, who double right
> From double title bringes?[138]

'England', the poet concludes, is unusually fortunate: the 'chosen king' is also 'the next of bloud'. Likewise, in Henry Petowe's *Englands Cæsar*, James is 'elected King of blisse', punning on the concepts of government by the Protestant elect, and an elected monarchy.

While this may initially seem radical, many studies have shown that republican ideas in fact circulated widely in the Renaissance, through (in particular) the works of Aristotle, Plato, Cicero, and Machiavelli.[139] English writers also addressed the topic. For example, in 1576 John Barston's *A Safegarde of Societie*, a commonwealth led by entirely elected governors is proposed as the 'ideal type of commonwealth'; more specifically, in 1598 and 1599 two translations appeared which praised 'the merits of Venice and Poland respectively'. Markku Peltonen makes a persuasive case that these were at least partly in response to the

[138] Anon., *Northerne Poems*, p. 4.

[139] Gaby Mahlberg, *Henry Neville and English republican culture in the seventeenth century: Dreaming of another game* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), p. 4.

Succession Question.[140] Indeed, as Patrick Collinson has shown, the Privy Council already had plans for 'the dangerous hiatus which [her] death would leave behind, so long as the succession to the crown was not limited or determined'. They:

> envisaged themselves conducting business in an acephalous commonwealth in which the great offices of state and the institutions of consultation and government, Council and Parliament, would continue in being, as if there were no hiatus, no vacancy. For such a hiatus was, in the last resort, intolerable. "The government of the realm shall continue in all respectes', wrote Burghley, in drafting the terms for an interregnum which was unconstitutional and unprecedented in recent experience, albeit, given the far from smooth operation of the laws of succession in England, not wholly unprecedented.[141]

Centrally, however, Jonathan Scott explains, 'the intellectual core of English republicanism' was not opposition to monarchy but 'a moral philosophy of self-government'.[142] (This grew from, as Collinson famously argued, 'a monarchical republic' in which 'citizens were concealed within subjects' on account of the self-governing structures of local government.[143]) Consequent to this, English Humanists conceived of themselves, in imitation of the Classical and Italian republics, as 'reformers of the commonwealth', and therefore as (ideally) part of a 'mixed constitution'. Peltonen explains:

---

[140] Markuu Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 102 and passim.

[141] Patrick Collinson, *De Republica Anglorum: Or, History with the Politics Put Back* (Inaugural Lecture as Regius Professor of Modern History, 9 November 1989; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 24.

[142] Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p.78.

[143] Collinson, *De Republica Anglorum*, p. 12, 25.

> One of the chief benefits of the mixed constitution and a virtuous nobility […] was the particular way in which these qualities could help the commonwealth to avoid corruption. […] This could be eschewed, as both Contarini and Goslicius held, first by choosing many magistrates and second by choosing those who indeed possessed virtue. […] Goslicius assured his readers that "among other things which do preserve the commonweale & happines thereof, there is nothing better then to elect such men for magistrates, as be induced with greatest wisedome, judgement & virtue."[144]

However, all Renaissance republican writing was very clear that, 'when it came to the crunch, the realm took precedence over the ruler' – tyranny would be opposed, and a new, suitable, ruler elected in their place.[145]

Anthony Nixon (in *Elizaes Memoriall*) and Robert Pricket (in *A Souldiers Wish*) make this explicit. Nixon writes:

> But marke and see the goodnesse of the Lord
> When we nought but confusion might expect,
> Did guide our Nobles hearts with one accord, *3*
> The worthiest Prince in Europe to elect,
> King James the first, next heire unto the Crowne,
> To rule this Land in honour and renowne. *6*

These lines are a masterful balancing act. The role 'of the Lord' in bringing James to the throne is paramount, leading the section in line 1, to make it clear that this piece is loyal and pious: James coming to the English throne, 'When we nought but confusion might expect', is a mark of 'the goodnesse of the Lord'. But in lines 3-5, the focus vacillates between James's claims equally based on right, and based on choice. James did not gain the throne through his own actions; 'our Nobles' 'elect[ed]' him – although, lest this goes too far, they were 'guide[d]' by God to do so. These two strands are seen in the ambiguity of word choice in line 4, and word

[144] Peltonen, *Classical Humanism*, pp. 9, 110-11.

[145] Collinson, *De Republica Anglorum*, p. 24.

order in line 5: James is 'elect[ed]', in that he is chosen by the 'Nobles', who account him 'The worthiest Prince' to be 'next heire unto the Crowne', suggesting their deliberation (if the line is read in the sense of 'next heire unto the Crowne' being dependent on 'elect'); and he is, in his own right, 'The worthiest Prince in Europe', suggesting praise of the 'Nobles' in seeing aright what has, punningly, been 'elect[ed] by divine providence (if the line is read with 'next heire' being descriptive). This is the only line that is fractured in the middle. There is a drive through this sentence, in spite of its many clauses, that suggests both the power of the decision process and the inevitability of its outcome, but which also forces the reader to consider the whole, with its many meanings. The rhyme scheme supports this. It may be that the ambiguous punctuation lends itself to this, forcing the reader to think about the meaning; on the other hand, these may have been imposed to make the reading less obviously pointed. Comparably, but perhaps with even more daring, Pricket writes:

> Most prudent, wise, and just in every thing,
> Approved was Prince James then Scotlands king. *2*
> And for thy heart with God did stand upright,
> He now hath raisd thee to a greater might.[146] *4*

Pricket leaves it unclear as to whether James was 'approved' was by God, the English, or both. He also focuses on what James did to achieve the approval, in a way that is not done by other poets. Lines 3-4 show that James has gained the English throne because of his religion and probity – it is his 'heart', not his conscience, say, or mind, that 'with God did stand upright', and he should be

[146] Petowe, *Englands Cæsar*, C4r; Nixon, *Elizaes Memoriall*, C2v; Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish*, B2r.

thankful for being consequently 'raisd […] to a greater might'. England is a promotion; he got it 'for' particular actions, and must remember this in his government. What God has given, he could, this would suggest, take away. This level of close reasoning with the King himself is supported by the poet's use of the familiar second person, 'thy'/'thee' – at once, affectionate, and potentially patronising. However, all these poets, including Nixon, are somewhat cautious in that they include the role of God, and to varying degrees James's right, to satisfy the King and also to keep his claim strong in the context of the external threats discussed in PART ONE.

Some go further; rather than simply offering the King a brief warning or reminder, they simultaneously attempt to guide and to prescribe him using forms of the Renaissance Protestant Humanist strategy of instruction by praise, *laudando praecipere*.[147] It has become widely accepted that this potentially critical didactic praise was (as Helen Hackett explains):

> an important strain in Protestant panegyric [...] setting up an ideal to which the monarch should aspire, a template of future perfection for her to fulfil.[148]

In 1603-4, the aim here is also to ensure, by doing this, that the King knows that he is nothing without his people's support, and indicate the government they would

[147] As Francis Bacon explained, 'Some praises come of good wishes and respects, which is a form due, in civility, to kings and great persons, *laudando praecipere*, when by telling men what they are, they represent to them, what they should be.' ('LIII. Of Praise', *The Oxford Francis Bacon Vol. 15: The Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall*, ed. Michael Kiernan [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985], p. 160).

[148] Hackett, *Virgin Mother*, p. 45.

like to receive. Don E. Wayne, in his study of Jonsonian drama, has explained that, in early seventeenth-century drama:

> Writers and their audiences may still be constrained by institutionalized relationships, but they are also beginning to play a relatively more active and independent role in the historical processes through which social institutions are both sustained and transformed. Or, at least, they are beginning to imagine themselves as having a more independent and important role.[149]

Symbiotic relationship with the people is presented as vital to the political strength of the nation. They actually believe that they can change things. This is sometimes even figured in the grammatical structure. Fletcher writes of 'the King rejoycing in his subjects, the subjects glorying in their King', the chiasmus conveying their equality, as (the poem elaborates):

> Most worthy Prince in Europe bred,
> Is now our soveraigne Lord and King:
> Who by Gods wisedome will be led,
> To worke our weale in every thing.
> Religious, wise, of valiant minde,
> Who to such subjectes will be kinde.[150]

James is King, but he is 'led' 'by God' for the good of the people (he must 'worke our weale', while he 'to such subjects will be kinde'), imitating the quid-pro-quo structure of the ceremonies of the accession. This is the other side of literary coronation, with 'its emphasis on sharing, exchange, and reciprocity'[151] (in the promise of the oath, the duties of the acclamation, the gifts of the people to the King and the King to his officers) and enshrining them in popular documentary

---

[149] Done Wayne, 'Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson: An Alternative View', *Renaissance Drama* 13 (1982), pp. 128-9.

[150] Fletcher, *Epistle*, A4r, B2v.

[151] Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*, p. 215.

form.[152] I. F. gives a clear acknowledgement of this quid-pro-quo, or even symbiosis, close to the end of the poem:

> For why? Upon thy safty doth depend,
> The publicke losse, thy losse, thy health our friend.[153]

That is, in spite of any tensions, their concerns are identical, and this is why everything will be resolved to their satisfaction and comfort – more than any advice or fears or imagery. The texts testify to the artists' notion of a covenant of mutual duty between King and subjects. The people, united, become the prince's mainstay, as a counterpart to the role of James as the keystone of the nation.

This can be clearly and effectively applied to other genres and forms of literature. Peter McCullough, for example, has followed this technique in what he calls the 'court "welcome" sermons' of March-August 1603.[154] We may, of course, expect it here due to the privileged position of the preacher, but still the extent is quite extraordinary, particularly given what PART ONE has revealed about the perceived political insecurities of the time and of the accession. They do not all merely celebrate the accession. Bishop Matthew, for example, (who had recorded the increase in noticeable Catholicism in his Durham bishopric in the aftermath of the accession, and warned Cecil about the 'greate longe schedule of parchement […] to be presented unto his Majestie on behalf of the Catholickes') addressed James at Newcastle on 10 April, which seems to have been the second Sunday after Easter. McCullough explains:

---

[152] See, for example, Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*, p. 5.
[153] I. F., *King James His Welcome*, C3rv.
[154] McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, pp. 101-116.

> We know nothing of Matthew's sermon itself, but the text he chose, 2 Corinthians 15:1, 2 is suggestive: 'The Lord is with you, while ye be with him: and if ye seke him, he wil be founde of you, but if ye forsake him, he wil forsake you.'[155]

Matthew had been one of the staunchest critics of the Scottish succession, but the moderate Giles Tomson, a royal chaplain (who had just received the 'plum deanery' of Windsor from the Queen in February, and who was a friend of the accession poet John Davies) preached to the King on Psalm 2:10, 11, 'Be wise nowe O ye Kings, be learned O ye judges; serve the Lord with feare, and rejoice unto him with reverence.' In this sermon, McCullough explains, 'Thomson stressed kings' subjection to God.'[156]

Alongside Matthews and Tomson, McCullough has found that at least Richard Eedes (Dean of Worcester and royal chaplain), Thomas Bilson, Anthony Rudd, and Thomas Blague all demonstrated in their initial sermons before the King that they:

> wanted to ensure that court preachers could safely offer James and his court prescription as well as praise.[157]

In its simplest poetic form, modest prescription according to the poets' hopes can be seen in their references to 'prophecies', whether in their own poems or external documentary evidence, all of which tie a particular kind of behaviour, hopefully, to the new reign and King. For example, *The Kings Prophecie: or Weeping Joy*, offers a summary exemplum, as an idealised 'prophecie' of the King's rule, in which 'Not number shall, but weight his lawes commend; | Which wisely made, shall justly be

---

[155] McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, p. 103.

[156] McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, p. 103.

[157] McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, pp. 102-3, 105.

maintain'd', while 'His Court shall be a church of Saints: quite free | From filth, excesse and servile flattery.'[158] These poets are attempting to 'shape perceptions' of the new reign in line with their own social, religious, and political desires.

Very occasionally, this is very direct. In John Hanson's *Time is a Turne-coate* – which had elsewhere praised James as '*Englands* [second] *Phœnix*' and encouraged him to pursue an aggressive Protestant campaign beyond '*Britaines* Ile', as '*Hercul's*' against 'dread *Romes* Hydra' (see Part One) – the poet goes on to celebrate how '*Albion*' will fare under his rule. '*Blest* […] *Albions isle*' will:

> abundantly increase
> In Wealth, Tranquilitie, and joyfull Peace:
> For that's true Peace, which *Ius* to Kingdomes brings,
> *Kings subject to their Lawes, not Lawes to Kings*.

On a first reading, the poem seems to display unambiguous panegyric optimism. However, line 4 in fact inverts the statement from *True Lawe*, that 'Kinges were the authors & makers of the lawes, and not the lawes of the Kings'.[159] Furthermore, the contention is placed in a position of particular emphasis, at the end of the verse paragraph which has enthused at length about the 'Kingdomes' future 'abundan[ce]'. Its positioning is dramatic and persuasive. The foregoing catalogue of 'abundan[ce]', which had been made to seem so desirable, now seems dependent on James's acquiescence with the final clause (encouraging ordinary readers to expect this from their King). But the ensuing, final, paragraph shows what the King will receive in return for his acquiescence: his subjects will 'injoy

[158] Hall, *The Kings Prophecie*, B3v, B7r.

[159] James VI and I, *True Lawe* (1603), C3r.

JAMES royall Majestie', the '*Heav'ns*' will make him '*prosper*' at their loving request, and so:

> That neighbour-kings admiring at his state,
> His Princely steps may strive to imitate;
> And that by Soveraigne blisse his Raigne may be
> A rare Memoriall to Eternitie.[160]

If James so chooses, he can be the envy of the world.

Samuel Daniel's *A Panegyricke Congratulatorie* is one of the most skilful and unusually strident examples of *laudando praecipere*. Over six leaves, Daniel proclaims James heir to the Tudor myth of 'thy great Grandfather'. Daniel acknowledges fear; but also suggests that the King's writing – and particularly *Basilikon Doron* – is reassuring, as it shows who James will be, bringing the King onside in his own *laudando praecipere*. At the end of the poem, he tells James 'Upon what grounds depend thy Majestie':

> Thy fortune hath indebted thee to none,
> But all thy people universally,
> And not to them, but for their love alone, *3*
> Which they account is placed worthily:
> Nor wilt thou now frustrate their hopes, whereon
> They rest, nor they faile in their loyaltie; *6*
> Since no Prince comes deceived in his trust,
> But he that first deceives, and prooves unjust.

This is a brilliant piece of equivocation, stating the debt the King owes to his subjects alongside the duty his subjects owe to the King, in such a way that the political covenant it suggests could not offend. Symbiosis of King and subjects is confirmed in the 'nor'/'nor' parallels and in the enjambment of 'whereon | They rest' (l. 5-6). The stanza vacillates between threat and flattery to mark the path

[160] Hanson, *Time is a Turne-coat*, pp. 68-71.

James must follow as monarch. James's 'fortune' is at once providential monarchic destiny, an interpretation of *Basilikon Doron* and *True Lawe*, and mere good luck. James is 'indebted [...] to none, | But all' (l. 1-2), since his people have allowed him to capitalize on that luck when his claim is (in fact) uncertain; yet James owes this debt only so long as the people do not 'faile in their loyaltie' (l. 6). The use of the financial terms 'account' and 'worth' signifies James's debt to the nation; debts can be called in, if the lenders do not 'account' it to have been 'placed worthily' (l. 4). Daniel ends the stanza with a final piece of advice, directly reminding the King that he will only be 'deceived in his trust' if he 'first deceives, and prooves unjust' (l. 7-8). It is left up to James as to whether he will choose to abide by this covenant, and thus allow the continued security which the verse works so hard to establish. Daniel's concluding couplet epitomises his point:

> The pedestall whereon thy Greatnesse stands,
> Is built of all our hearts, and all our hands.[161]

This is patently not the King of *True Lawe* Daniel had erstwhile praised, but at the same time the image of James as a writer – though not necessarily the image of James *in* his writing – is being used as a token to control what the King will do. As the anonymous poet of *Northern Poems* writes the short epigram:

> *Elizabetha eadem semper, Rex semper & idem,*
> *Invicto peragat pectore semper idem.*
> Elizabeth our noble Queene was wont to write
> Alwayes the same, the same in deed and word,
> Our King may alwayes use the same by right,
> Whose deeds with words, whose words with deedes accord.[162]

[161] Daniel, *Panegyricke*, B1v, A6v, B5v, B6v, B7r.

[162] Anon., *Northerne Poems*, B2v.

Monarchic and dynastic continuity is expressed in the epigram's echoing of Elizabeth's motto, 'Semper Eadem', 'Alwayes the Same' (as the poem subtly translates). This is a translation in every sense of the word (as in the transferral of the imagery in PART ONE) and James's writing is of value because it explores and backs up his actions as a monarch testing and proving own mind is 'divinely sanctified'. Like Elizabeth, James is 'the same in deed and word'/'Whose deeds with words, whose words with deeds accord' (rhetorical trope of *chiasmus*). Not only does this render him trustworthy in his own right, but in his continuity with Elizabeth: together, they are 'alwayes the same' (line 4 refers to both). This 'accords' with the multiple 'proofs' and supports and checks on James's kingship, but here it is his own words that secure him.

5: CONCLUSION – AND RENEWED POETOMACHIA, 1603-4.

To conclude, in the precarious moment of the accession, the printed poetry of 1603-4 once again seeks to transform an insecure and undetermined representation of James into a symbol of promise and hope – personal, artistic, religious, or political, at the same time overcoming attendant concerns provoked by his publicly available writing. In responding to the King's own established iconography and intentions, which have the potential to enrich or to obstruct national and personal causes, the poetry develops strategies to negotiate with, and appropriate, the King's self-fashioning to create a positive figure of artistic and cultural renaissance, royal bounty, moral advancement and religious reform. This private, subjective agenda with wide public implications forms the dual aspect of the national self-fashioning that was the subject of PART ONE – this time, working at once for self and state.

There is, however, a coda. Undermining the imagined poetic community and its national and personal productivity, in a bathetic inversion of the idealised coterie, a general poetic rivalry breaks out. This again assumes the language of civic intention, but it occurs purely to satisfy the private ambitions threatened by the new King's role in a competition for the commercial market and the sheer volume of accession verse that was otherwise its great strength. Herbert, for example, claims to be defending the honour of accession verse (and therefore by association its civic causes) in an advisory role which combines the resolution of both Helgerson's amateur and laureate roles. In his verse epistle 'To the Reader' he claims that he felt forced to write because it:

> amaz'd my minde, and griev'd mine eye
> To see the Buzards with the Eagles flye.

'*Eagles*' (in falconry) are the birds of kings, while '*Buzards*' are inferior. 'The *Eagles*' therefore symbolise the skilled authors whose majestic poetry would honour James, while 'the *Buzards*' represent the hack versifiers whose feeble texts imitate the themes of better authors. This proceeds from the figurative meaning of buzzard (a worthless, stupid, or ignorant person), although it is likely that the near homophone 'bastard' also influenced this metaphor, implying the illegitimacy of the verse.[163] Herbert goes on to explain why he was 'griev'd' and 'amaz'd':

> To see a troupe of Souldiers never tride,
> Besiege a fort by nature fenc[e]d on high,
> I was asham'd to see the heires of pride,
> Debase in unexperienc'd Poetry,
> The immortall vertues of great Majestie.
> I these are they that do the Muses staine,

[163] 'buzzard' (n.1), *OED Online* www.oed.com:80/Entry/25500 [accessed 01 May 2011].

One wanton pen makes all be judged vaine.

He has recognised a danger that the noble aims and subject of accession verse will seem as ridiculous (or rather as 'debase[d]') as the 'unexperienc'd Poetry' of its weakest adherents, 'the *Buzards*'. The aims of PART ONE are under threat, hence the image of the siege in lines 1-2. Herbert repositions this bad 'Poetry' as hostile to the ideal of strengthening the King's claim. It threatens to 'staine' all the poetry, as well as the monarchy itself, and thwart any repair of the damage caused as: 'One wanton pen makes all be judged vaine'. Herbert's use of 'vaine' and 'pride' draw attention to the ambitious private motivations of hacks, and he concludes by contrasting himself with the 'wanton pen[s]':

> I which securely on these errours gaz'd,
> And safely stood upon the silent shore,
> When other Ships by envies rockes were craz'd,
> Love me constrain'd, as pride did them before,
> To trust the rockes and leave the silent shore:
> The love of friends, not prayse did me perswade,
> Against my will, against the streames to wade. [164]

Herbert begins in the audience, 'upon the silent shore', a phrase repeated to emphasize its importance. Throughout, he separates himself rhetorically and grammatically from the other writers. In 'laureate' guise, he decides to write, 'Against my will', out of necessity; he alone is 'constrain'd' and then 'perswade[d]' by 'Love' for the king, while others write out of 'pride'. His use of the caesura combined with *zeugma* in line 4 and *anaphora* in line 7 emphasize the difference in their motivations and ambitions. When he is eventually compelled to 'leave the silent shore' he continues 'against the streames to wade', a slow and deliberate

[164] Herbert, *Cadwallader*, A4v.

movement, in contrast with the 'craz'd' 'other Ships' (also suggesting that his own poetry is unusually intelligible for accession verse).

Similar though more concise examples can be found in much of the poetry. Hall places his own 'vulgar verse':

> among those throngs of Poesies
> Which now each trivial Muse dares harshly sing.[165]

The modest epithet 'vulgar' might alone simply denote ordinary, but 'throngs', 'trivial', and 'dares harshly' carry a pejorative tone. Lane complains that the 'silence' of the 'sleepie *Muse*' has meant that 'every Cuckoe learnes to tune a note'. Greene laments:

> how ev'ry day
> New swarmes of vertue-killing Drones appeare,
> Which vilely […] untune the gen'rall eare
> With harsh discording sounds.[166]

Elsewhere, while Petowe apologises that 'my Muse […] Creepes forth […] Amongst high sp'rited Paragons of wit', he continues with somewhat less modesty:

> Each moderne Poet that can make a verse
> Writes of Eliza, even at their Muses birth.

Within a page, Petowe has grammatically divorced himself from the novice poets, who appear as 'each' and 'they'. The general theme is that, until a greater writer speaks (namely, the poet in question), the accession has encouraged all ambitious men – 'every Cuckoe', 'each trivial muse', 'New swarmes of […] Drones' – 'learne to tune a note' amid 'throngs of Poesies' deserving only scorn. Much of this satire seems to be provoked by sincere frustration, but there is also without doubt a

[165] Hall, *The Kings Prophecie*, A8r, B8r.
[166] Greene, *A Poets Vision*, C2r; Lane, *Elegie*, A2r-3r.

tendency to seek pre-eminence through duplicitous criticism of other writers and thus advance private ambitions.[167]

The textual engagement between Chettle and I. F. in 1603 provides a compelling illustration of this extraordinary inversion. In *Englands Mourning Garment*, discusses the poetic response to the accession and – like several others – he claims in his introductory epistle that 'the negligence of many better able, hath made me bold to write'. Like Herbert, he demands that 'you Goblins, and you under Elves' who write 'rude rimes and meters reasonlesse' should 'cease', but Chettle goes further than previous examples, chastising some poets for their content as well as their style. For instance, Drayton must 'Make some amends' and acknowledge his error for not introducing his praise for the King by first memorialising Elizabeth (in keeping with the outline of *Englands Welcome*). This subverts the elegiac movement from sorrow for the old monarch to hopeful joy for the new, and (more simply) seems ungrateful:

> Think twas a fault to have thy Verses seene
> Praising the King, ere they had mourn'd the Queen.

The 'fault' is figured in the arrangement of the verse, since 'the Queen' is relegated to a consecutive clause in the second line of the couplet, while the enjambment and primary position of the words emphasise 'Praising the King'. (Chettle does not allow himself the same mistake; the terminal position of 'the Queen' means that she lingers in his reader's memory.)

[167] Fletcher, 'An Epitaph', *A Briefe Epistle*, B1r; Newton, *Atropoïon Delion*, B2r; Petowe, *Elizabetha quasi vivens*, A3r; Fenton, *King James his Welcome*, C4rv.

Chettle also criticises poets who have not published on the accession at all, on the grounds of his stated belief that accession verse holds an important civic function. He reproaches silent poets 'better able' to write commanding that they 'awake for shame', and identifying them through clear allusions to their work. The chastising of Shakespeare, for example, ends with reference to the popular 1594 poem *The Rape of Lucrece*:

> Shepheard remember our Elizabeth,
> And sing her Rape, done by that Tarquin, Death.[168]

This strategy serves two functions, both of which make Chettle an engaging and attractive read: impressively demonstrating the breadth of his own reading, and flattering his readers by allowing them the satisfaction of unpicking his references.

In apparent contrast with his appraisals of this crowd of incompetent or silent writers, Chettle singles out Petowe for commendation in response to his (commercially successful) contribution, *England's Caesar*:

> And thou that scarce hath fligd thy infant Muse,
> (I use thine owne word) and commend thee best,
> In thy proclaiming James: the rest misuse
> The name of Poetry, with lines unblest;
> Holding the Muses to be masculine:
> I quote no such absurdity in thine.
> Thee doe I thank for will, thy worke let passe:
> But wish some of the former had first writ
> That from their poems like reflecting glasse
> Steeled with the purity of art and wit,
> Eliza might have livde in every eye
> Alwaies beheld till Time and Poems die.[169]

[168] Chettle, *England's Mourning Garment*, A2r, D2r.
[169] Chettle, *Englands Mourning Garment*, D2rv.

By telling Petowe that he 'commend[s] thee best' Chettle seems to demonstrate that, despite his focus on more famous poets, he is no enemy to the contributions of an 'infant Muse' in 'proclaiming James'. Yet, this measured praise is disingenuous. Petowe's poetry had been published in 1598 and 1599, so this supposed failure to recognise him as a published poet is an insult in itself.[170] Chettle simultaneously indicates Petowe's incompetence by attributing 'fligd', a nonce corruption of 'fledged', to him as 'thy owne word' (ignoring, in doing so, the more likely explanation of printing error). Moreover, more widely, in apparently commending a novice poet, Chettle has shown willing to offer praise where merit dictates and so his derision of 'the rest' by comparison on account of their ignorant 'absurdity' becomes even more striking. (For instance, he gives the example of *The Lamentation of Melpomene* 'Holding the Muses to be masculine', yet he claims (addressing Petowe) 'I quote no such absurdity in thine'.) He condescendingly 'thank[s]' Petowe 'for will' (that is, for his intention if not his execution), and promises to 'let pass' (ignore or forgive) the 'unblest' work itself, suggesting at the last that in spite of all his praises Petowe too 'misuse[s] | The name of Poetry'.

Thus Chettle not only undermines and denigrates the work of Petowe, but implies that 'the rest' do not even rival this flawed poem of an inexperienced and unknown writer. Chettle concludes his commentary by confiding that he does 'wish some of the former had first writ' (referring to those he had criticised for their silence, like Shakespeare, Jonson, and Dekker), as only they are 'Steeled with the purity of art and wit'. These techniques allow him to pose as a leader among

[170] B. J. Sokol, 'Petowe, Henry (1575/6–1636?)', *ODNB,* www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22044 [accessed 23 September 2012].

the poets, assuming the vacant active role of James, as his didactic and critical role implies a greater command of the form and subject than those he addresses. By alluding to silent successful poets, Chettle uses their literary rank to raise himself through association. In both spheres, he has the opportunity either to criticise unopposed if the poets remain silent, or (if publications follow) to claim that his criticism spurred the poet to publish or to revise, as in the case of Drayton.

Chettle got his comeuppance. In the final leaf of the poem *King James His Welcome to London*, I. F. writes:

> Poets with their quil's,
> To welcome thee, have showne their chiefest skils.
> An on heroyicke art man,[171] more to grace thee,
> Drawing thy discent, with former Kings doth place thee. **A**
> Another with Encomius doth praise thee,
> And with a Princes meriting trompe doth raise thee, **B**
> Another in a soldiers wish doth greete thee. **C**
> Another sends his welcomming looke to meete thee. **D**
> Another weeping, yet in teares rejoyced, **E**
> Others in Elegyes laugh when thee are noysed, **F**
> Another bids thee welcome in Englands name, **G**
> In thy arrival another tells the same. **H**
> Another with great joy doth gladly sing,
> His ave Cæsar. or God save the King, **I**
> Another in Melpomenes weeping teares,
> Even at thy name abandons former feares **J**
> Another cries out against Atropos,
> For sweete Elizæs death, and Delias losse. **K** (SEE NOTE 172)

[171] Perhaps 'And one heroyicke art man' (taking 'art man' as a kenning coined to avoid repetition of 'poet'); although possibly a compositor's misreading of 'author', mistaking secretary hand for transitional script. 'And in heroyike art, man' is unlikely, as it would be surprising were the poet to address the King ('thee') as simply 'man'.

[172] I. F., *King James His Welcome to London*, C4rv. The texts to which the poet refers seem to be:
A: Drayton, *A Gratulatorie Poem*.
B: Anon., *Englands Wedding Garment* (which adheres closely to the Classical structure of *encomium*).
(cont.)

This extensive critical bibliography of the accession verse published in the first three months of the new reign is both critically approbatory and duplicitous. The references run from the clear to the obscure: '*ave Cæsar.* or God save the King' is the title verbatim of Rowlands' contribution, while lines 3-4 allude more cryptically to *A Gratulatorie Poem*, Drayton's poetic genealogy, author of 'heroyicke' verse such as *England's Heroical Epistles* (1597) and *The Barons' Wars* (1603). I. F. clearly allows for other accession verse of which he is not specifically aware: line 10 alludes to the title of the Cambridge memorial collection *Sorrowes Joy*, but 'Others' and their '*Elegyes*' are general enough to cover similar examples.

In recording the efforts of other poets and focusing (through the frequently anaphoric repetition of 'Another') the King's attention on the English poetic cornucopia, I. F. seems to commend his fellow writers. Yet simultaneously he competes with those whom he names. That very repetition of 'another' implies the great number of texts produced, concomitantly decreasing their individual value in the context of a flooded market in keeping with the 'throngs' of the other verse. Moreover, his parodies employ contradictions designed to undermine their subjects. Conflicting texts are placed adjacent to one another, so that each appears to exist in isolation, oblivious to any general movement – for instance the

C: Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish*.
D: Daniel, *Panegyrike* (as Daniel's 'welcomming looke' did actually 'meete' the King when he performed the poem before James on 23 April 1603).
E: Thomas Rogers, *Anglorum Lacrimae* (London: Thomas Pavier, 1603).
F: specifically: *Sorrowes Joy*, but also more widely applicable.
G: Anon., *England's Welcome to James*.
H: Nixon, *Elizaes Memoriall. King James His Arrival. And Romes Downfall.*
I: Rowlands, *Ave Caesar*.
J: T. W., *Lamentation of Melpomene*.
K: Newton, *Atropoïon Delion*.

unmitigated 'joy' of *Ave Cæsar* (in lines 13-14) against the 'weeping teares' of *Melpomene* (ll. 15-16) and 'cries' of *Atropoïon Delion* (ll. 17-18). This projected muddle even applies with more potency to individual works. I. F. writes for instance of the anonymous poet of *Anglorum Lacrimæ* 'weeping, yet in teares rejoyced'. His reductive summary self-consciously belittles the elegiac transformation to which that poem aspires; his use of a volta-like caesura early in the line makes *Anglorum Lacrimae* seem merely fickle and confused.

But I. F. reserves his most notable display of competitive bile to confront Chettle's ambitious self-fashioning:

> Yet joying in thee, another all to torne,
> Greets thee'n a garment thats by shepheards worne.
> A proper worke of learned Poetry?
> Of Oratory: Proase? and Heraldry?
> A rare conceited piece of work no doubt:
> Whose sharpe conceite younger conceit doth flout.
> Well he is learned, and were I but able,
> He should eate bread from out Augustus stable.
> But many worthier Poets more beside,
> With health and happinesse may thee betide.
> And limping I come last: among the rest,
> Wishing like welcoms to thee with the best.

Initially, Chettle seems to be clothed flatteringly as a follower of Spenser (in 'a garment thats by shepheards worne'). Tellingly, though, he has 'torne' it. This irony sets up the argument of the passage. At a first reading, lines 3-8 seem to agree on the superiority of Chettle's 'proper worke of learned Poetry': not only 'proper' and 'learned', its 'conceite' is more 'sharpe' than the inexperienced naivety of 'younger conceit' ('inexperienced poetry' of which Herbert despaired). Furthermore, Chettle has produced a verse and prose miscellany where others manage just a single poem or a collection of poems. This may demonstrate a wide

mastery of various forms, and leaves the admiring reader at a loss as to how to classify the work (being perhaps 'Oratory: Proase? and Heraldry?'). It was a commonplace of accession verse to represent James as a type of Augustus, but the allusion to the historical emperor also places Chettle in the company of Horace, Virgil, and Ovid.[173] Chettle, I. F. suggests, must deserve the coveted royal patronage.

Alternatively and amusingly, the 'torne' garment suggests another reading which can be applied with equal success. Chettle 'Greets' James in 'a garment thats by shepherds worne', tactlessly or even seditiously addressing a Spenserian poem to the King when (in Andrew Hadfield's words) 'Spenser aroused James's wrath'.[174] If Chettle is incompetent rather than seditious, the reader must then suspect that him of unintentional disorder rather than intentional elegiac negotiation when (in the first line) he reports 'joying in thee' while simultaneously 'all to torne', a confused impression underscored by a caesura that suggests severance not balance. The use of broken syntax and *polysyndeton* in the list of genres further satirises Chettle's inconsistent and unfocused application, while the effect of massed questions suggests that, far from having written 'A proper worke' of any of

[173] In *The Kings Prophecie*, for example, Hall rejoices in the new age of literal and metaphorical plenty, writing that in James '*Augustus* lives adorned with *Crassus* store' (G4v-H1r), and James repeatedly becomes 'Englands Caesar' (most famously in Petowe's poem of that title).

[174] See Andrew Hadfield, 'Spenser and the Stuart Succession', *Literature & History* 13:1 (2004), pp. 9-24: 'As is well known, Spenser aroused James I's wrath through his portrait of the trial of Duessa in *The Faerie Queene*, v. ix, a transparent allegory of the trial and execution of Mary Queen of Scots on 8 February 1587. The English ambassador in Scotland, Robert Bowes, wrote to Lord Burghley on 1 November 1596 that James refused to allow the second edition of *The Faerie Queene* to be sold in Scotland and "further he will complain to Her Majesty of the author as you will understand at more length by himself." On 12 November, Bowes wrote again [...that] James "still desire[d] that Edward [sic] Spenser for his fault be duly tried and punished"' (p. 9).

those genres, he is a jack of all trades and master of none. The *antanaclasis* in lines 5-6 (the use of a word more than once in more than one sense) strengthens this implication: I. F. insinuates that Chettle's 'conceit' should be understood in the sense of having an overweening opinion of oneself and spiteful attitude towards others (in conjunction with this, 'sharpe' and 'flout' also have potentially derogatory connotations), while the 'younger conceits' are by contrast those ingeniously devised.[175] In this light, 'well he is learned' gains a disparagingly sarcastic tone and '*Augustus* stable' becomes literal and offensive (especially since the most famous Classical stable were those of Augeas).

Like Chettle, I. F. then turns his criticism to his own advantage. In the passage's final lines, he expresses a hope that 'many worthier Poets more' may still write to welcome James and scorns all those he has already mentioned, in a direct parallel to Chettle's 'wish' that 'some of the former had first writ'. When ranking all these poets he places himself among 'the best', although he places himself 'last' and 'limping' among them. It is possible that this is a faint dab of modesty, but it is just as likely to be a statement of time not value; after all, he writes 'like welcomes', suggesting pieces of 'like' value and may even be comparing himself to an innovative elegiac poet. The Greek lyric poet Tyrtaeus introduced the Classical elegiac couplet. He was called the lame or hobbling poet (so the myth goes) because his own physical lameness was thought to be figured in his couplets' movement, alternating lines of pentameter and hexameter. Through derision he

[175] 'conceit (n.)', meanings (3a) and (6), *OED Online*, www.oed.com:80/Entry/38074 [accessed 01 May 2011].

places himself foremost, and into fellowship with the brilliant poet, critic, and monarch who shares in this criticism as nominal audience of the poem.

To explain the engagement of Chettle and I. F., internal evidence suggests that the texts were both written in the summer of 1603, and I. F.'s particular targeting of Chettle suggests that Chettle had published first. (Moreover, *Englands Mourning Garment* contains a summary of 'The order and proceeding at the Funerall' of Elizabeth, dating it after 28 April 1603, yet at the same time the interest in 'welcoming our King' who 'comes in Pompe' (F4rv) suggests that it precedes the curtailment on 6 July of the coronation ceremonies. I. F.'s text, in entering into dialogue with this and several others, must post-date their publication.) While Chettle's book proved highly popular, running to three editions by December, I. F. was an unknown author. He sought to use Chettle's popularity to promote his own poem, and therefore Chettle's social, commercial and literary status to advance I. F.'s own (as his criticism is didactic and thus suggests poetic superiority). Petowe, meanwhile, was targeted by Chettle because he had produced two popular examples of accession verse in 1603, *Elizabetha quasi vivens* and *England's Cæsar*. Their ferocious competition, more reminiscent of *The Dunciad* conflagration than the Renaissance, was widespread: I. F. and Chettle are merely particularly striking examples of the many poets who invert the ostensibly civic and social enterprise of poetic community orbiting the figure of the 'Kingly-*Poet*' in attempts to place themselves in a position of importance and influence to the detriment of other poets and their work. The textual rivalry is an intriguing and unrecognised consequence of the flood of writers, the active market, and the perceived potential influence of poetic responses to the accession in 1603-4.

Ironically, it is the poets own rivalry in this persuasive campaign that threatens, in the end, to undermine their personal ambitions.

CONCLUSION

From March 1603 to the early summer of 1604, an unprecedented surge of printed poetry celebrated James I of England, and this thesis has shown that much of this writing attempted to overcome popular concerns that were perceived as inherent in the accession of this King. In this precarious moment, the poems transform an insecure and undetermined figure into a symbol that represents – and enables – promise and hope (be it political, religious, cultural, or personal). It addresses fears of invasion, unrest, rivals, the legality of James's own claim (PART ONE), and of the King's own established iconography and intentions, which have the potential to obstruct national and personal causes (PART TWO). The thesis has shown that the poets of 1603-4 transform the relatively unknown James VI of Scotland from a figure of potential threat into an English Jacobean Icon which aims to construct both popular and international consent to Scottish Stuart rule, and popular and royal consent to a poet's vision of a Jacobean England, by *shaping the perceptions* of its readers.

This has not been critically recognized in part because the complexity and innovation in many of these disregarded poems becomes obvious only when the poems are looked at, for the first time, through the lens of propaganda and communications theory in the context of established Early Modern literary criticism. Then, the attitudes and intricate strategies of poetic persuasion that constitute their attempts to enact *beneficial propaganda* and *manufacture of consent* (on behalf of the King, their country, and themselves), are thrown into stark relief. By reading them only as elegy or panegyric or anxious bids for advancement, or only within the context of much wider arguments, their primary politically innovative and persuasive aspects go unrecognized. These texts are primarily about altering, or securing,

perception of royal readers (such as James, Queen Anne, and Prince Henry Frederick) and non-royal readers through the necessary language and terminology appropriate to the issues at hand.

The Jacobean accession poetry represents a key moment of scarcely recognized change in the development of English panegyric poetry, its presentation of, and address to, those in power. However, its wider influence seems to be apparent in other forms of writing, and a few examples will demonstrate how rewarding it can be to review texts with this frame of reference. In a May 1604 sermon Henrie Hooke would declare that 'Jerusalem hath not forgotten the late alteration of her prince, the expectation whereof caused her heart oft times to be cold within her brest', using imagery strongly reminiscent of the verse:

> For when the rare Phoenix of the world, the queene of birds, which had for many yeeres gathered together, and safely covered Jerusalems children under her wings, was now through age to be turned into dust and ashes, though she appeared unto men to die, yet she died not, but was revived in one of her owne bloud […] who stood up a man as it were out of the ashes of a woman.[1]

Hooke's sermon takes as its topic not the accession but Protestant security and reformation: the bringing about of 'the peace of Jerusalem' through 'carefull industrie', where 'Jerusalem' is understood as 'the church of God'.[2] The paragraph illustrates the power of Providence, as an example of 'what things the Lord hath done for [Jerusalem] alredie'. The imagery is effective independently, but in the context of the accession verse it also alludes to the ideas of renewal, dynastic security, progress, and safety that are substantiated around the metaphor in the poetry. In doing so, it intensifies

[1] Henrie Hooke, *A Sermon Preached Before the King at Whitehall, the eight of May 1603 […] Jerusalems peace* (London: Adam Islip for Simon Waterson, 1604), C1v, C2v-3r.
[2] Hooke, *Sermon*, A2r-3v.

Hooke's statements that James will 'better that which is good' and 'mend that which is amisse' in the Kingdom, and strengthens his argument as a whole without need for a prosaic digression. Other sermons similarly reward knowledge of the provisions of accession poetry.

Arguably, from the wealth of evidence discussed in PARTS 1 and 2, and corresponding examples such as Hooke's sermon, the accession verses made a significant impression on the Jacobean public. They may also have made an impression on their King. It has been noted that James did not reply in kind to his accession poets as he had done during the 1580s and 1590s in Scotland; PART 2 has suggested that this royal poetic silence (albeit, with a level of patronage and express interest) may have been the desired aim of many of the authors. Yet in his first speech to Parliament on 19 March 1604 (which ran to four printed editions in 1604), the King employs many of the tropes of accession verse himself in the context of the new national security. He explores the security provided by his physical presence; David Bergeron draws attention to the fact that he uses the phrase 'my Person' fourteen times in the first one hundred lines. He discusses that provided by his descent and heirs, specifically using imagery of 'princely Roses', and also by open displays of:

> your most wonderfull conjunction and harmonie of your hearts in declaring and embracing Mee as your undoubted and lawfull King and Governour.

He contrasts the 'Outward peace' with 'the lamentable and miserable events by the civill and bloodie dissension betwixt these two houses [...] of *Lancaster* and *York*'; he

promises spiritual and political renewal, naming himself 'Apollo'.[3] Bergeron has argued persuasively that the 'major ideas and themes of the speech' were garnered from the royal entry pageant of Ben Jonson and Thomas Dekker.[4] However, these pageants were themselves heavily influenced by the accession poetry which had preceded them. It seems more accurate to expand Bergeron's argument to suggest that the King was responding to the accession literature as a whole.

Even when allusions to the body of poetry are not explicit, knowledge of the context of Jacobean accession verse is profitable to the analysis of literature that is – or proves to be – thematically connected. For example, it is a critical commonplace to recognize several 'disguised duke plays' dateable to 1603-4. In these plays, which include John Marston's *The Malcontent*, William Shakespeare's *Measure For Measure*, John Marston's *Parasitaster, or The Fawn*, and, tantalizingly, Thomas Middleton's *The Phoenix*,

> a duke supposedly goes on a private excursion, but re-emerges in disguise, unrecognizable to his own family and members of his court. He then explores and exposes immoral behaviour, finally throwing off his disguise to judge the evildoers and reassume the throne.[5]

The theme of the 'disguised duke' has been extensively discussed and there is (to summarize the wider argument) significant critical disagreement over whether these plays offer a 'very overt political commentary on the nation's new Scottish monarch'

[3] David M. Bergeron, 'King James's Civic Pageant and Parliamentary Speech in March 1604', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, Vol. 34 No. 2 (Summer 2002), p. 220; James VI and I, *The Kings Majesties speech, as it was delivered by him in the upper house of the Parliament* (London: Robert Barker, 1604), A4v, A2v, B3v, C3r-4r.

[4] Bergeron, 'King James's Civic Pageant and Parliamentary Speech', *Albion*, p. 213.

[5] Mary Bly, '"The Lure of a Taffeta Cloak": Middleton's Sartorial Seduction in *Your Five Gallants*', *The Oxford Handbook of Thomas Middleton*, ed. Gary Taylor and Trish Thomas Henley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 597.

or are 'concern[ed] with the exercise of power' more generally.[6] Brian Gibbons even suggests that that duke may be

> a dramatic metaphor for the imaginative art of the satiric poet, encouraging vice and folly in order to exhibit their true nature and contrive their exposure and correction.[7]

However, given the context of the accession verse, it can be argued without undermining any of these readings that the plays dramatize the same features of the succession with which the poetry seems to engage. The duke enters his unsettled land. He represents an unknown (or unknowable) ruler to his Court; to him, his subjects reveal their true selves; from this unique position he is able to perceive and so reform the faults of his realm and its inhabitants. The undeterminable ruler has the ability to transform the state from concern and precariousness to promise and security. As in Hooke's sermon, and the King's speech, national renewal and progress are not just of interest to accession poets for reasons of personal ambition.

The playwrights of the disguised duke plays are all notable absentees from the list of those whose contemporaneous responses to the accession can be identified. So too is 'brave Shakespeare', as we have seen the accession poets complain.[8] As a

---

[6] Michael J. Redmond, *Shakespeare, Politics, and Italy: Intertextuality on the Jacobean Stage* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), p. 143 (and passim); Kevin A. Quarmby, *The Disguised Ruler in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), p. 25 (and passim); Peter Hyland, *Disguise on the Early Modern English Stage* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), p. 104; Ivo Kamps, 'Ruling Fantasies and the Fantasies of Rule: *The Phoenix* and *Measure for* Measure', *Studies in Philology* 92 (1995), pp. 248-73; Thomas A. Pendleton, 'Shakespeare's Disguised Duke Play: Middleton, Marston, and the Sources of *Measure for Measure*', '*Fanned and Winnowed Opinions': Shakespearean Essays Presented to Harold Jenkins*, ed. John W. Mahon and Thomas A. Pendleton (New York: Methuen, 1987), pp. 79-98.

[7] Brian Gibbons, *Jacobean City Comedy*, 2nd Edition (London: Methuen, 1980), p. 69.

[8] Henry Chettle, *Englands Mourning Garment* (London: [E. Short?] for Thomas Millington, 1603), A2r, D2r; Anon., *A mournefull Dittie, entitled Elizabeths losse, together with a welcome for King James* (London: T[homas] P[avier], [1603]).

final thought, however, 'Sonnet 107' is arguably his 's[o]ng' (which Chettle had requested) of the late Queen's 'Rape, done by that Tarquin, Death', and of the accession of James I. The sonnet has been variously dated to several years, but (as Katherine Duncan-Jones writes) 'the only convincing one is also the most obvious' – 1604.[9]

> Not mine own fears, nor the prophetic soul
> Of the wide world dreaming on things to come,
> Can yet the lease of my true love control,
> Supposed as forfeit to a confined doom. *4*
> The mortal moon hath her eclipse endured,
> And the sad augurs mock their own presage;
> Incertainties now crown themselves assured,
> And peace proclaims olives of endless age. *8*
> Now with the drops of this most balmy time,
> My love looks fresh, and Death to me subscribes,
> Since, spite of him, I'll live in this poor rhyme,
> While he insults o'er dull and speechless tribes: *12*
> And thou in this shalt find thy monument,
> When tyrants' crests and tombs of brass are spent.[10]

The first two quatrains employ terminology of the accession verse to establish a state of things in 'this most balmy time' (l. 9) which is remarkably familiar. They speak of 'fears' and 'prophe[cy]' (l. 1), 'dreaming on things to come' (l. 2) and the 'supposed' threat of 'a confined doom' (l. 4), which have now been overtaken by 'peace' (in lines 6-7). These experiences are both 'Of the wide world' and 'mine own' (ll. 1-2). The single sentence flowing through the quatrain, and the enjambment between the first two lines, conveys not only the sense of prediction but also the pace of events and heightened emotions, as in Hall's *The King's Prophecie*.

But this response to the accession is more candid than the printed poems.

[9] Katherine Duncan-Jones, 'Introduction', *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones, Rev. Ed. (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2010), pp. 20-21.

[10] Shakespeare, 'Sonnet 107', *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, p. 325.

The implication of the use of 'tyrants' in the final line attracts most attention – and rightly so, especially given the debates surrounding Persons' tracts and *The Trew Law*. Yet equally surprising in the context of the accession poetry are the frank probable descriptions of Elizabeth as 'The *mortal* moon' who has been 'eclipsed' (in her death and in her replacement), while the Stuarts are 'Incertainties', who do indeed 'now crown themselves assured' – but '*crown themselves*'. The poem pulls away the mask of diplomacy and confidence that sought to enact persuasion, and states things as they are: the Queen has died, succeeded by heirs whose right and suitability can be questioned. Now, 'peace proclaims olives of endless age' (l. 8), but given the ridicule inflicted on the 'prophetic soul' and 'sad augurs' (ll. 1, 6) this new hope seems equally absurd.

This thesis can, however, still end on a positive note. Even in 'Sonnet 107', the poet begins by stating passionately that

> Not mine own fears, nor the prophetic soul
> Of the wide world dreaming on things to come,
> Can yet the lease of my true love control.

Perhaps this could be read as a statement of loyalty, albeit realistic loyalty, to James Stuart as England's new King. Like that of other accession poets, 'my true love' can be 'lease[d]' as the poet sees fit; it cannot be externally 'control[led]' by threats, although he admits it might have been made 'forfeit' on account of them. The poem is clear-sighted about the realities of the coming reign, but also about the poet's role within it and the service he can provide to one who seeks permanence, security, good reputation, and loyalty, when the final lines are re-read from this perspective:

> Now with the drops of this most balmy time,
> My love looks fresh, and Death to me subscribes,
> Since, spite of him, I'll live in this poor rhyme,
> While he insults o'er dull and speechless tribes

> And thou in this shalt find thy monument,
> When tyrants' crests and tombs of brass are spent.

The power of the poet has triumphed in the creation of a representation that secures the promise of King James and the Stuart dynasty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

A

Cardinal William Allen, *Admonition to the Nobility and People of England* (Antwerp: A. Coninnex, 1588).

G. P. V. Akrigg (ed.), *Letters of King James VI & I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

William Alexander, *Aurora* (London: Richard Field for Edward Blount, 1604).

----, *A Paraenesis to the Prince* (London: Richard Field for Edward Blount, 1604).

Anon. *A Lamentable Dittie composed upon the Death of Robert Lord Devereux Earle of Essex* (London: Margaret Alde, 1603).

Anon., *A lamentation of the death of the moost victorious Prynce Henry the eyght* (London: John Turck, 1547).

Anon., *All Wrapped in Wretchedness* (London: W[ynkyn] de Worde, 1509).

Anon., *A mournefull Dittie, entitled Elizabeths losse, together with a welcome for King James* (London: T[homas] P[avier], [1603]).

Anon., *Englands Wedding Garment. Or a preparation to King James his royall coronation* (London: [Richard Read for] Thomas Pavier, 1603).

Anon., *Englands Welcome to James by the Grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland* (London: [Edward Alde] for E[dward] W[hite] and C[lement] K[night], 1603).

Anon. *King James Proclaimed* (London: Robert Waldegrave, 1603).

Anon., *The Complaynt of Scotland* [Paris: n.p, ca. 1550].

Anon., *The noble tryumphant coronacyon of queen Anne* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1533).

Anon. *Northerne Poems congratulating the Kings majesties most happy and peaceable entrance to the crowne of England.* (London: John Windet for Edmund Weaver, 1604).

Anon., *The petigree of our Royall King James* (London: E[dward] W[hite], 1603).

Anon. *The Poores Lamentation* (London: Thomas Pavier, 1603).

Anon., *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Majestie, from the time of his departure from Edenbrough; till his receiving at London.* (London: Thomas Creede for Thomas Millington, 1603).

Edward Arber and Charles C. Rivington (ed.), *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, 5 vols. (London: [privately printed,] 1875-94).

Lodovico Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, trans. John Harington (London: Richard Field, 1591).

Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, trans. J. H. Freese, Loeb Classical Library 193 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926).

John Awdelay, *The Wonders of England 1599* (London: John Awdeley [sic], 1599).

B

Francis Bacon, *A Declaration of the Practises & Treasons attempted and committed by Robert late Earle of Essex and his complices* (London: Robert Barker, 1601).

----, *The Oxford Francis Bacon Vol. 15: The Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall*, ed. Michael Kiernan (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

Richard Beeard, *A Godly Psalme of Marye Queen, which brought us comfort* (London: Wylliam Griffith, 1553) (includes Thomas Bownell, *A Godly Psalme in Meetre*).

Thomas Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, 2 vols (London: A. Millar, 1754).
Thomas Brice, *A briefe register in meter, containing the names and patient suffrings of the martyrs [and] members of Iesus Christ, afflicted, tormented, and cruelly burned here in England, in ye time of Q. Marie, together with the yeere, moneth, day, and place of their martyrdomes.* (London: Simon Stafford for E. Venge, 1599).
Horatio F. Brown (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Vol. 10: 1603-1607* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1900).
----, *Calendar of State Papers [...] of Venice and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy. Volume 11, 1607-10* (London: HMSO, 1904).

C

William Camden, *Annales, or, The History of the most renowned and victorious Princesse Elizabeth, late Queen of England*, 3rd Edition (London: B. Fisher, 1635).
----, *Annales rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum regnate Elizabetha* (London: [George Purslowe, Humphrey Lownes, Miles Flesher] for Benjamin Fisher, 1625).
Dudley Carleton, *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 1603-1624*, ed. Maurice Lee Jr. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1972).
Robert Cary, *Memoirs of Robert Cary, Earl of Monmouth*, ed. G. H. Powell (London: Alexander Moring, 1905).
Robert Cecil, *Letters from Sir Robert Cecil to Sir George Carew*, ed. John Maclean (London: Camden Society, 1844).
John Chamberlain, *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. N. E. McClure, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939).
Henry Chettle, *Englands Mourning Garment* (London: [E. Short?] for Thomas Millington, 1603) and (London: Valentine Simmes for Thomas Millington, 1603).
Thomas Churchyard, *Sorrowfull Verses made on the death of our most Soveraign Lady* ([London: S. N., 1603]).
Anne Clifford, *The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford*, ed. D. J. H. Clifford (Stroud: The History Press, 2009).
Charles Matthew Clode, (ed.) *Memorials of the Guild of Merchant Taylors* (London: Harrison, 1875).
John Colleton, *The Supplication of Certaine Masse-Priests falsely called Catholickes. Director to the Kings most excellent Majestie, now this time of Parliament, but scattered in corners, to moove mal-contents to mutinie.* (London: [George Eld] for William Aspley, 1604).
John Colville, *Original Letters of Mr. John Coleville, 1582-1603* (Edinburgh: John Hughes, 1858).
----, *A Supplication to the King's Most Excellent Majestie, wherein, severall reasons of state and religion are briefly touched: not unworthy to be read, and pondered by the lords, knights, and burgeses of the present parliament and other of all estates. Prostrated at his Highnes feete by true affected subjects.* (London: [Valentine Simmes for English secret press], 1604).
Alexander Craig, *The Poeticall Essayes of Alexander Craige Scotobritane* (London: William White, 1604).
Sir Thomas Craig, *Ad Sereniss. et potentiss. principem Iacobum Sextum e sua Scotia decendentem paræneticon.* ([Edinburgh]: Robert Waldegrave, 1603).
James Cranstoun (ed.), *Satirical Poems of the Time of the Reformation* (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1891).

D

Samuel Daniel, *A Panegyricke Congratulatory Delivered to the Kings Most Excellent Majestie* (London: Edward Blount, 1603).
John Davies, *The Poems of Sir John Davies*, ed. Robert Krueger (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).
Thomas Dekker, *1603. The Wonderful Yeare* (London: Thomas Creede, 1604).
----, *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953-1961)
----, *The Magnificent Entertainment Given to King James, Queene Anne his Wife, and Henry Frederick the Prince, 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* (London: T[homas] C[reede, Humphrey Lownes, Edward allde and others], Thomas Man, 1604).
----, *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, ed. Grosart, Alexander (New York, Russell & Russell, 1963).
----, *The Whole Magnificent Entertainment Given to King James, Queene Anne his Wife, and Henry Frederick the Prince, 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* (London: E[dward] Allde for Thomas Man, 1604).
R. Doleman [Robert Persons/Parsons], *A Conference about the Next Succession of the Crown of England* (Antwerp: printer unknown, 1594).
Michael Drayton, *The Owle* (London: E[dward] A[llde] for E. White and N. Ling, 1604).
----, *A Paean Triumpall* (London: John Flasket, 1604).
----, *To the Majestie of King James: A Gratulatory Poem* (London: James Roberts for T[homas] M[illington] and H[umphrey] L[ownes], 1603).
Gilbert Dugdale, *The Time Triumphant, declaring in briefe, the ariual of our soueraigne liedge Lord, King Iames into England, his coronation at Westminster: together with his late royal progresse, from the Towre of London throúgh the Cittie, to his Highnes manor of White Hall* (London: R. B[lower], 1604).

E

Richard Eedes, *Six Learned and Godly Sermons* (London: E. Bishop, 1604).
Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. Leah S. Marcus, Janel M. Mueller, Mary Beth Rose (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002).
----, *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth I*, ed. G. B. Harrison (London: Cassell, 1968).
----, *A special Grace appointed to have been said after a banket at Yorke […] November 1558* [n.p., n.d], Aiii(v).
Erasmus, *The Epistles of Erasmus,* trans. Francis Morgan Nichols, 3 vols. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963).

F

I. F. [John Fenton], *King James His Welcome to London. With Elizaes Tombe and Epitaph* (London: [Richard Read for] Thomas Pavier, 1603).
Robert Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle shewing His Majesties most lawfull, honourable and just title to all his kingdomes. With an epitaph or briefe lamentation for the late Majestie Royall* (London: [Richard Read for] John Harrison, 1603).
Joseph Foster (ed.), *Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1891), 'Faber-Flood', digitized at www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=117058 [accessed 10 April 2014].
John Foxe, *Actes and monuments of these latter and perillous dayes, touching matters of the Church* (London: John Day cum privilegio Regi[a]e Maiestatis, 1563 and 1583).
Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Great Britain* (London: John Williams, 1655).

G

Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The Historia regum Britannie of Geoffrey of Monmouth. 1, Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 568*, ed. Neil Wright (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1984).

Godfrey Goodman, *The Court of King James the First*, ed. J. S. Brewer, 2 vols. (London: Samuel Bentley, 1839).

John Gordon, *England and Scotlands Happinesse* (London: V[alentine] Simmes for William Aspley, 1604).

----, *Panégyrique de congratulation pour la concorde des royaumes de la Grande Bretagne* (La Rochelle: J. Le Fevre, 1603).

Thomas Greene, *A Poets Vision and a Princes Glorie* (London: [Richard Braddock for] William Leake, 1603).

W. W. Greg, *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration* 4 vols. (London: Bibliographic Society, 1939-59).

----, *A Companion to Arber* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).

H

Joseph Hall, *The Kings Prophecie. Or, Weeping Joy* (London: T[homas] C[reede] for Symon Waterson, 1603).

John Hanson, *Time Is a Turne-Coate. Or Englands three-fold Metamorphosis* (London: [Richard Field] for J[ohn] H[andson], 1604).

John Harington, *The Letters and Epigrams of Sir John Harington*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930).

----, *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown (AD 1602)*, ed. Clements R. Markham (London: J. B. Nichols, 1880).

Stephen Harrison and William Kip, *The Arch's of Triumph erected in honor of the high and mighty prince, James* (London: John Windet, 1604).

George Owen Harry (for M. Robert Holland), *The Genealogy of the High and Mighty Monarch, James, by the grace of God, King of great Brittayne, &c.* (London: Simon Stafford for Thomas Salisbury, 1604).

Gabriel Harvey, *Pierce's supererogation*, in *The Works of Gabriel Harvey*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart, 3 vols. (London: privately printed, 1884).

Stephen Hawes, *A Joyfull medytacyon to all Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall soverayne lorde Kynge Henry the eyght* (London: W[ynkyn] de Worde, 1509).

John Hayward, *Answer to the First Part of a Certaine conference concerning Succession, published not long since under the name of R. Dolman* (London: [Richard Read, Richard Bradock, Peter Short, Thomas East, Richard Field, and John Harrison for] Simon Waterson, and Cuthbert Burbie, 1603).

George Herbert, *The English Poems of George Herbert*, ed. Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

William Herbert, (also Harbert)*The Prophesie of Cadwallader* (London: Thomas Creede for Roger Jackson, 1604).

Raphael Holinshed et al., Abraham Fleming, Francis Thynne, and John Stow, *The First and Second Volumes of Chronicles, comprising the description and historie of England, the description and historie of Ireland, the description and historie of Scotland: first collected and published by Raphaell Holinshed, William Harrison, and others: now newlie augmented and continued* ([London]: John Harison, George Bishop, Rafe Newberie, Henrie Denham, Thomas Woodcocke, [1587]).

Hugh Holland, *Pancharis* (London: Clement Knight, 1603).

Henrie Hooke, *A Sermon Preched Before the King at Whitehall, the eight of May 1603 […] Jerusalems peace* (London: Adam Islip for Simon Waterson, 1604).

Thomas Hudson and Guillaume de Salluste, seigneur Du Bartas, *The Historie of Judith* (Edinburgh: Thomas Vautroullier, 1584).

J

W. A. Jackson (ed.), *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company: 1602 to 1640* (London: Stationers Company, 1957).

James VI and I, *Ane fruitfull meditatioun contening ane plane and facill expositioun of […] the Revelatioun* (Edinburgh: Henry Charteris, 1588 and 1589).

----, *Basilikon Doron* (London: Richard Field for John Norton, 1603, Felix Kyngston for John Norton, 1603, E[dward] Allde for Edward W[hite], 1603, Simon Stafford for Thomas Salisbury, 1604; Cambridge: John Legat, 1603) and (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1599).

----, *Daemonologie* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave , 1597).

----, *Essayes of a Prentise, in the divine art of poesie* (Edinburgh: Thomas Vautrollier, 1584 and 1585).

----, *His Majesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Hours* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1591).

----, *James I*: *The True Law of Free Monarchies and Basilikon Doron*, ed. Daniel Fischlin, and Mark Fortier (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1996)

----, *King James VI and I: Selected Writings*, ed. Neil Rhodes, Jennifer Richards, and Joseph Marshall (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

----, *The Kings Majesties speech, as it was delivered by him in the upper house of the Parliament, to the Lords spirituall and temporall, and to the knights, citizens and burgesses there assembled, on Munday the 19. day of March 1603* (London: Robert Barker, 1604).

----, *His Majesties Lepanto, or, Heroicall Song* (London: Simon Stafford and Henry Hooke, 1603)

----, *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. James Craigie, 2 vols. (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons, 1955-1958).

----, *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* (London: [Thomas Creede for] Robert Waldegrave, 1603) and (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1598).

Ben Jonson, *B. Jon: his part of King James his royall and magnificent entertainement through his honorable cittie of London, Thurseday the 15. of March. 1603.* (London: V[alentine] S[immes and George Eld] for Edward Blount, 1604).

----, *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford, Percy Simpson and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012).

----, *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson: Online*, ed. Martin Butler et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2015), http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson.

----, *The Works of Benjamin Jonson* (London: Will Stansby, 1616).

[John Johnston], *A Trewe Description of the nobill race of the Stewards: succeding Lineallie to the Croun of Scotland unto this day: And now this yeir 1603. unto the Croun of England* (Amsterdam: [by C. Claeszoon for] Andro Hart, Edinburgh, 1603).

Richard Johnson, *Anglorum Lacrimæ* (London: Thomas Pavier, 1603).

L

J[ohn] L[ane], *An elegie upon the death of the high and renowned Princesse* (London: [W. White] for John Deane, 1603).

J. W. Legg (ed.), *The Coronation Order of King James I* (London: Church of England, 1902).

William Leighton, *Vertue Triumphant, or a lively description of the foure vertues cardinall* (London: Melchisedech Bradwood for Matthew Lownes, 1603).

William Lisle, *Nothing For a New Yeares Gift* (London: William Lugger, 1603).
Thomas Lodge (trans.), *The Workes of Lucius Annaeus Seneca, Both Morrall and Naturall* (London: William Stansby, 1614).

M

R. M. (Minister), *Three Treatises Religiously handled, And named according to the Severall subject of each Treatise: The Mourning Weede, The Morning Joy, The Kings Rejoycing* (London: John Windet, 1603).
T. M., *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Majestie, from the time of his departure from Edinburgh, till his receiving at London with all or the most speciall Occurrences* (London: Thomas Creede, for Thomas Millington, 1603).
John Manningham, *The Diary of John Manningham of the Middle Temple*, ed. Robert Parker Sorlien (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1976).
Richard Martin, *A Speech Delivered, To the Kings Most Excellent Majestie in the Name of the Sheriffes of London and Middlesex* (London: Thomas Thorpe, 1603).
Matthew McDiarmid (ed.), *The Kingis Quair of James Stewart* (London: Heinemann, 1973).
Francis Meres, *Palladis Tamia. Wits Treasury* (London: 1598).
Thomas Middleton, *The Phoenix* (London: E[dward] A[llde] for A[rthur] J[ohnson], 1607).
Linne R. Mooney and Mary-Jo Arn (eds.), *The Kingis Quair and Other Prison Poems* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2005).
William Muggins, *Londons Mourning Garment* (London: Ralph Blower, 1603).
Richard Mulcaster, *The Translation of certain Latine verses written uppon her Majesties death, called A Comforting Complaint* (London: Edward Aggas, 1603).
[----], *The passage of our most drad Soueraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to westminster the daye before her coronacion* (London: Richard Totill, 1559).
Anthony Munday, *A Watch-Woord to Englande* (London: [John Charlewood] for Thomas Hacket, 1584).
Christopher Muriell, *An Answer unto the Catholiques Supplication, presented unto the Kings Majestie, for the tolleration of popish religion in England* (London: R[ichard] R[ead] for Francis Burton, 1603).

N

Nelson, Alan H. (ed.) *Records of Early English Drama: Cambridge* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989).
Thomas Newton, *Atropoïon Delion: Or, The Death of Delia* (London: [William White for] W[illiam] Johnes, 1603).
John Gough Nichols, *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary* (London: J. B. Nichols for the Camden Society, 1850).
John Nichols (ed.), *The Progresses, Public Processions, &c. of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols. (London: John Nichols, 1823).
----, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 4 vols. (London: J. B. Nichols, 1828).
Anthony Nixon, *Elizaes Memoriall. King James his arriual. And Romes Downefall.* (London: T[homas] C[reede] for John Baylie, 1603).

P

Henry Peachum, *The Garden of Eloquence* (London: H. Jackson, 1577).
Henry Petowe, *Elizabetha quasi vivens. Eliza's funerall. A fewe Aprill drops, showred on the hearse of dead Eliza.* (London: Edward Allde for M. Lawe, 1603).
----, *Englands Cæsar* (London: John Windet, 1603).

Irenicus Philodikaios (pseud.), *A Treatise declaring, and confirming the just title and righte of James the sixt* ([Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1599]).
Pliny the Younger, *Letters: Volume I: Books 1-7*, trans. Betty Radice, Loeb Classical Library 55 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969).
----, *Letters: Volume II: Books 8-10, Panegyricus*, trans. Betty Radice, Loeb Classical Library 59 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969).
Gabriel Powel[l], *The Catholikes supplication unto the Kings majestie [...] and The Protestants Counterpoyse* (London: Felix Kyngston for Edmund Weaver, 1603).
----, *A consideration of the papists reasons of state and religion, for toleration of poperie in England, intimated in their supplication unto the Kings Majestie* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes for Simon Waterson, 1604).
Walter Powell, *The Diary of Walter Powell of Llantilio Crossenny in the County of Monmouth, Gentleman, 1603-1654*, ed. Joseph Alfred Bradney (Bristol: John Wright, 1907).
Powys Land Club, *Montgomeryshire Gent. Wills 1620. Printed in Collections Historical & Archeological Relating to Montgomeryshire and its Borders, issued by the Powys Land Club for the use of its members Vol. XXVI* (London: Charles J. Clark for Powys Land Club, 1892).
Robert Pricket, *A Souldiers Wish unto his Soveraigne Lord King James* (London: John Harrison, 1603).
George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589).

R

Richard Rainolde, *A Booke called the Foundacion of Rhetorike* (London: Jhon Kingston [sic], 1563).
Jean Robertson and D. J. Gordon (eds.), *A Calendar of Dramatic Records in the Books of the Livery Companies of London, 1485-1640* (Malone Society Collections, 3; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954).
Thomas Rogers, *Anglorum Lacrimae* (London: Thomas Pavier, 1603).
Samuel Rowlands, *Ave Cæsar. God save the King* (London: [by William White] for W[illiam] F[erbrand] and G[eorge] L[oftus], 1603).

S

H. S., *Queene El'zabeths Losse and King James His Welcome* (London: T[homas] C[reede] for John Smythicke, 1603).
John Savile, *King James his entertainment at Theobalds: With his welcome to London together with a salutorie Poeme* (London, Thomas Snodham, 1603).
William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, ed. J. W. Lever, 2nd Ed. (London: Arden Shakespeare, 1967).
----, *The Riverside Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans, J. J. M. Tobin, et al., 2nd edition (Boston New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997).
----, *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones, Rev. Ed. (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2010).
Edward Sharpham, *The Fleire* (London: [Edward Allde] for F. B[urton], 1606).
Philip Sidney, 'The Defence of Poesy', *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Brian Vickers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
----, *Sir Philip Sidney: The Major Works*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
G. C. Moore Smith (ed.), *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia* (Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1913).
Thomas Speght, *The Workes of our antient and learned English poet, Geffrey Chaucer* (London: Adam Islip for Thomas Wight, 1598).

Leonard Stopes, *An Ave Maria in commendation of our most vertuous Queen* (London: Richard Lant, 1553).

T

Thomas Thomas, *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae* (Cambridge: Thomas Thomas, 1587).

V

Var., *Academiæ Cantabrigiensis lachrymæ tumulo noblissimi equitis, D. Philippi Sidneii sacratæ per Alexandrum Nevillum* (London: John Windet, 1587).

Var., *Bel-Vedére or The Garden of Muses* (London: Felix Kingston for Hugh Astley, 1600).

Var., *Englands Parnassus* (London: Nicholas Ling, Cuthbert Burby, and Thomas Hayes, 1600).

Var., *Sorrowes Joy. Or, A lamentation for our late deceased soveraigne Elizabeth, with a triumph for the prosperous succession of our gratious King, James, &c.* ([London]: John Legat, Printer to the University of Cambridge, 1603).

Virgil, *The Thirteene Bookes of Aeneidos*, trans. Thomas Phaër (Bks. 1-10) and Thomas Twyne (Bks. 10-12) (London: Thomas Creede, 1600).

Var., *Sorrowes Joy* ([London]: John Legat, printer of Cambridge University, 1603).

Var., *Threno-thriambeuticon. Academiae Cantabrigiensis* (Cambridge: John Legat (printer of Cambridge University), 1603).

John Venn and J. A. Venn (eds.), *Alumni Cantabrigienses […] Part 1: From the Earliest Times to 1751, Vol. 1 Abbas-Cutts*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922).

Richard Vennar, *An Apologie* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1614).

Polydore Vergil, *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil*, Camden Series LXXIV, ed. and trans. Denys Hay (London: Royal Historical Society,1950).

Abbé de Vertot, *Ambassades de Messieurs de Noailles en Angleterre*, 5 vols. (Leiden: Dessaint & Saillant, and Durand, 1763).

W

T. W., *The Lamentation of Melpomene of the Death of Belphaebe* (London: W[illiam] White for C[lement] Knight, 1603).

Peter Wentworth, *Treatise Containing […] The True and Lawfull Successor to these Realmes* ([Edinburgh]: [Robert Waldegrave], 1598).

John Wickham Legg (ed.), *The Coronation Order of King James I* (London: F. E. Robinson, 1902).

L. G. Wickham Legg, *English Coronation Records* (London: A. Constable & Co., 1901).

Roger Wilbraham, *Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham*, ed. Harold Spencer Scott (London: Royal Historical Society, 1902).

Thomas Wilson, *The Arte of Rhetorique* (London: Richard Grafton, 1553).

----, *Camden Miscellany XVI: The State of England Anno Dom 1600*, ed. F. J. Fisher (London: Camden Society, 1936).

Reginald Maxwell Woolley, *Cambridge Liturgical Handbooks: Coronation Rites* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915).

-

Answere of the vicechancelour, the doctors, both the proctors, and other the heads of houses in the Universitie of Oxford […] To the humble pettion of the ministers of the Church of England, desiring reformation of certaine ceremonies and abuses of the church (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, Printer to the University, 1603).

Forasmuch as it has pleased almighty God (London: Robert Barker, Printer to Queen Elizabeth, 24 March 1602/3).

INDIVIDUAL COPIES REFERENCED:

Bodleian Library J-J Drayton e.47
British Library 8122.aa 50
Folger Shakespeare Library HH164/39
Folger Shakespeare Library cs0361
Huntington Library 16976
Huntington Library 31410
Huntington Library 31751
Huntington Library 49048
Huntington Library 62756
Newberry Library 4A911

MANUSCRIPTS REFERENCED:

Bodleian Library MS Add. A. 368
Bodleian Library MS Arch. Selden B.24
Bodleian Library MS Eng. poet. e. 40
Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson C.886
Bodleian Library MS Rawl. poet. 117
Bodleian Library MS Rawl. poet. 153
Bodleian Library MS Tanner 75
British Library MS Add. 5665
British Library MS Add. 6709
British Library MS Add. 15227
British Library MS Add. 18920
British Library MS Add. 27406
British Library MS Add. 30982
British Library MS Add. 31922
British Library MS Add. 47111
British Library MS Cotton Titus C.VII.57
British Library MS Egerton 923
British Library MS Eger. 2421
British Library MS Eger. 2877
British Library Royal MS 18 A.LXXII
Corpus Christi College, Oxford MS 328
Folger Shakespeare Library MS V.a.97
Folger Shakespeare Library MS V.a.262
Folger Shakespeare Library MS V.a.162
Folger Shakespeare Library MS V.a.311
Folger Shakespeare Library MS V.a.319
Folger Shakespeare Library MS V.a.345
Huntington Library MS HM116
Inner Temple Library MS Petyt 538 Vol. 10
National Library of Scotland MS Panmure 9.450
Yale University MS b.208
Yale University MS c.152
Yale University MS c.81/1 no. 445

SECONDARY SOURCES

A

Simon Adams, *Leicester and the Court: Essays on Elizabethan Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

Sydney Anglo, 'The *British* History in Tudor Propaganda', *Bulletin of John Rylands Library* 44 (1961-2), pp. 17-48.

Ian W. Archer, *The Pursuit Of Stability: Social Relations In Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Janet Arnold, 'The "Coronation" Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I', *Burlington Magazine* 120 (1978), pp. 727-41.

John H. Astington, 'The Globe, The Court and *Measure for Measure*', *Shakespeare Survey 52: Shakespeare and the Globe*, ed. Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 133-42.

J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).

Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977).

B

János M. Bak (ed.), *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual* (Berkeley and Oxford: University of California Press, 1990):
Andrew Hughes, 'The Origins and Descent of the Fourth Recension of the English Coronation', pp. 197-216.

Richard C. McCoy, 'The Wonderful Spectacle": The Civic Progress of Elizabeth I and the Troublesome Coronation', pp. 217-27..
T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakespeare's 'Small Latine & Lesse Greeke'* (Urbana, IL.: 1944, 1956).
Leeds Barroll, 'Inventing the Stuart Masque', in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, ed. David M. Bevington and Peter Holbrook (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 121-43.
Anne Barton, 'Harking Back to Elizabeth: Ben Jonson and Caroline Nostalgia', *English Literary History* 48 (1981), pp. 706-31.
Priscilla Bawcutt, 'The Castalian Band - a modern Scottish myth', *Scottish Historical Review* (October 2001) LXXX, 2 (210), pp. 251–259.
Anna Bayman, *Thomas Dekker and the Culture of Pamphleteering in Early Modern London* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).
Charles Bazerman, 'Verse Occasioned by the Death of Queen Elizabeth I and the Accession of King James I' (Brandeis University USA: Ph.D. thesis, 1971).
George Bennett, *The History of Bandon* (Cork: Henry and Coghlan, 1862).
H. S. Bennett, *English Books and Readers Vol. 2: 1558-1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).
----, *English Books and Readers Vol. 3: 1603-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).
Thomas Berger, 'Textual Problems in English Renaissance Masques, Pageants, and Entertainments', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, 17 (1974), pp. 13-16.
David M. Bergeron, 'Elizabeth's Coronation Entry (1559]: New Manuscript Evidence', *English Literary Review* 8 (1978), pp. 3-8.
----, 'G. Dugdale and the Royal Entry of James I (1604)', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 13 (1983), pp. 111-125.
----, 'King James's Civic Pageant and Parliamentary Speech in March 1604', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, Vol. 34 No. 2 (Summer 2002), pp. 213-31.
----, 'Stuart Civic Pageants and Textual Performance', *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998), pp. 163-83.
----, *Textual Patronage in English Drama*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).
Joseph Bergin (ed.), *The Seventeenth Century: Europe 1598-1715* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
M. Berlin, 'Civic Ceremony in Early Modern London', *Urban History Yearbook* (1986), pp. 15-27.
Edward Bernays, *Propaganda* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1928).
Herbert Berry, 'Richard Vennar, *England's Joy*', *English Literary Renaissance* 31.2 (March 2001), pp. 240-265.
Philippa Berry, *Of Chastity and Power: Elizabethan Literature and the Unmarried Queen* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989).
David Bevington, 'Harrison, Jonson, and Dekker: The Magnificent Entertainment for King James (1604)', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 31 (1968), pp. 445-48.
Peter W. M. Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks', in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 393-417.
Mary Bly, '"The Lure of a Taffeta Cloak": Middleton's Sartorial Seduction in *Your Five Gallants*', in *The Oxford Handbook of Thomas Middleton*, ed. Gary Taylor and Trish Thomas Henley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 588-604.

Julia Boffey, 'Manuscript and Print: Books, Readers and Writers', in *A Companion to Medieval Poetry*, ed. Corinne Saunders (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010), pp. 538-554.
Percival Boyd (ed.), *Pedigrees with Index of London Citizens, abt. 1600-1800* (Salt Lake City: Genealogical Society of Utah, 1954), Vol. 493, No. 49501, S86.
Theodore Dwight Bozeman, 'Federal Theology and the "National Covenant": And Elizabethan Presbyterian Case Study', *Church History* 61 (1992), pp. 394-407.
Muriel Bradbrook, 'The Politics of Pageantry', *Shakespeare in his Context: The Constellated Globe, Collected Papers of Muriel Bradbrook* IV (Brighton: Barnes and Noble, 1989), pp. 95-109.
J. S. Brewer (ed.), *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII Vol. 3: Part I: 1519-21* (London: Longman, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1867).
Chris W. Brooks, *Law, Politics, and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer, and Jason Lawrence (eds.), *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006):
Pauline Croft, 'Rex Pacificus, Robert Cecil, and the 1604 Peace with Spain', pp. 140-154.
Curtis Perry, '1603 and the Discourse of Favouritism', pp. 155-176.
Martin Butler et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson: Online* (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2015), http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson.

C

Daniel Cadman, 'Th'accession of these mighty States': Daniel's *Philotas* and the union of crowns' *Renaissance Studies* 26.3, pp. 365-384.
Alan Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).
Michael L. Carrafiello, *Robert Parsons and English Catholicism, 1580-1610* (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 1998).
Noam Chomsky and Edward S. Herman, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Bodley Head, 2008).
Colin Clair, *A History of Printing in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966).
John Clapham, *Elizabeth of England: Certain Observations Concerning the Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. Evelyn Plummer Read and Conyers Read (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951).
Patrick Collinson, *De Republica Anglorum: Or, History with the Politics Put Back* (Inaugural Lecture as Regius Professor of Modern History, 9 November 1989; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
----, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).
----, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester : Manchester University Press, 2011).
Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins (eds.), *Essex: The Cultural Impact of an Elizabethan Courtier* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013):
Andrew Hiscock, '"Achilles alter": the heroic lives and afterlives of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex', pp. 101-32.
Chris Butler and Willy Maley, '"Bringing rebellion broached on his sword": Essex and Ireland', pp. 133-152.
Alexandra Gajda, 'The Earl of Essex and "politic history"', pp. 237-259.
Benito Rial Costas (ed.), *Print Culture and Peripheries in Early Modern Europe: A Contribution to the History of Printing and the Book Trade in Small European and Spanish Cities* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013):

Paul F. Gehl, 'Advertising or *Fama*? Local Markets for Schoolbooks', pp. 69-99.
Huburt Meeus, 'Printing in the Shadow of a Metropolis', pp. 147-70.
Lesley Ann Coote, 'Cadwallader and the Angelic Voice: The Rationalization of Chaos 1450-1485', *Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England*, pp. 195-234.
David Cressy, 'Binding the Nation: the Bonds of Association 1584 and 1696', in *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G. R. Elton from American Friends*, ed. G. R. Elton, DeLloyd J. Guth, John W. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 271-334.
Pauline Croft, *King James* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
---- (ed.), *Patronage, Power, and Culture: The Early Cecils, 1558-1612* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002):
James Knowles, '"To raise a house of better frame": Jonson's Cecilian Entertainments', pp.181-195.
E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton and Oxford, 2013).

D

Christopher D'Addario, 'The Texture of the Everyday in John Manningham's Diary (1602-1603)', *English Literary Renaissance,* 42. 2 (Spring 2012), pp. 203-222.
John F. Danby, *Elizabethan and Jacobean Poets: Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont & Fletcher* (London: Faber & Faber, 1965).
Jean Danielou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (London: Burnes and Oates, 1960).
Leanda De Lisle, *After Elizabeth: How James King of Scots Won the Crown of England in 1603* (London: Harper Collins, 2005).
Janet Dickinson, *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex, 1589-1601* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011).
Frederick Charles Dietz, *English Public Finance: 1558-1641*, 2nd Edition (London: Cass, 1964).
Michael Dobson and Nicola J. Watson, *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
Daniel W. Doerksen, *Conforming to the Word* (Lewisbury: Bucknell University Press, 1997).
James Doelman, 'The accession of King James I and English Religious Poetry', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 34:1 (1994), pp. 19-40.
Ian Donaldson, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
Judith Doolin Spikes, 'The Jacobean History Play and the Myth of the Elect Nation', *Renaissance Drama* 8 (1977), pp. 117-49.
Susan Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 25-42.
---- and Thomas S. Freeman (eds.), *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003):
Thomas S. Freeman, 'Providence and Prescription: The Account of Elizabeth in Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', pp.27-55.
Patrick Collinson, 'William Camden and the Anti-Myth of Elizabeth: Setting the Mould?', pp. 79-98.
Lisa Richardson, 'Elizabeth in Arcadia: Fulke Greville and John Hayward's Construction of Elizabeth, 1610-12', pp.99-119
Alexandra Walsham, '"A Very Deborah?" The Myth of Elizabeth as a Providential Monarch', pp.143-168.
Susan Doran, 'Virginity, Divinity and Power: The Portraits of Elizabeth I', pp. 171-99.

---- and Glenn Richardson, *Tudor England and Its Neighbours* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005):
Susan Doran, 'Loving and Affectionate Cousins? The Relationship Between Elizabeth I and James VI of Scotland 1586-1603', pp. 209-16.
Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney: Courtier Poet* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).

E

Francis Edwards, *Plots and Plotters in the Reign of Elizabeth I* (Dublin and Portland, OR: Four Courts, 2002).
Kenneth Elliot, *The Music of Scotland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).
Jacques Ellul, *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*, trans. Konrad Kellen and Jean Lerner (New York: Vintage Books, 1973).

F

Cyril Falls, *Elizabeth's Irish Wars* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1995).
Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature, and History 1600-1750* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000):
Mary Morrissey, 'Elect Nations and Prophetic Preaching: *types* and *examples* in the Paul's Cross Jeremiad', pp. 43-58.
Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church 1603-1642* (Basingstoke: Stanford University Press, 1993).
Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (eds.), *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writing of James VI and I* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002):
Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, '"Enregistrate Speech": Stratagems of Monarchic Writing in the Work of James VI and I', pp. 37-58.
Peter C. Herman, '"Best of Poets, Best of Kings": King James VI and I and the Scene of Monarchic Verse', pp. 61-103.
Carolyn Ives and David J. Parkinson, '"The Fountain and Very Being of Truth": James VI, Poetic Invention, and National Identity', pp. 104-123.
H. W. Fowler and R. W. Burchfield, *Fowler's Modern English Usage: Revised Third Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
Sigmund Freud, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (London and Vienna: The International Psycho-Analytical Press, 1922).
Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
E. B. Fryde, *Humanism and Renaissance Historiography* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983).
Patricia Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

G

Alexandra Gajda, *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
Bruce Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986).
---- and Brian Levack (eds.) *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604* (Edinburgh: Scottish Historical Society, 1985).
James D. Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).

Stephen Gersh and Bert Roest (eds.), *Medieval and Renaissance Humanism: Rhetoric, Representation and Reform* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003):
Karl Enenkel, 'In Search of Fame: Self-Representation in Neo-Latin Humanism', pp. 93-113.
Christel Meier-Staubach, 'Humanist Values in the Early Modern Drama', pp. 149-165.
Brian Gibbons, *Jacobean City Comedy*, 2nd Edition (London: Methuen, 1980).
Vincent Gillespie and Susan Powell (eds.), *A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain 1476-1558* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2014).
Ernest B. Gilman, *Plague Writing in Early Modern England* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2009).
Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1983).
Elizabeth Goldring, *Robert Dudley Earl of Leicester, and the World of Elizabethan Art: Painting and Patronage at the Court of Elizabeth I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014).
Godfrey Goodman, *The Court of King James the First*, ed. J. S. Brewer, 2 vols. (London: Samuel Bentley, 1839).
Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, Salvatore Settis (eds.), *The Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2010).
Ruth Grant, 'George Gordon, sixth Earl of Huntly and the Politics of the Counter-Reformation in Scotland, 1581-1595' (PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2010).
Robert Edmund Graves, 'The Isham Books', *Bibliographica* 3 (1897), pp. 418-429.
Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 2005).
----, *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).
W. W. Greg, J. P. Gilson et al. (eds.), *English Literary Autographs, 1550-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925-32).
Bryon Lee Grigsby, *Pestilence in Medieval and Early Modern English Literature* (New York and London: Routledge, 2004).
John Guy, *My Heart is My Own: The Life of Mary Queen of Scots* (London and New York: Fourth Estate, 2004).
---- (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995):
John Guy, 'The 1590s: The second reign of Elizabeth I?', pp. 1-19.
Simon Adams, 'The patronage of the crown in Elizabethan politics: the 1590s in perspective', pp. 20-45.
Patrick Collinson, 'Ecclesiastical vitriol: religious satire in the 1590s and the invention of Puritanism', pp. 150-170.
Alistair Fox, 'The complaint of poetry for the death of liberality: the decline of literary patronage in the 1590s', pp. 229-257.

H

Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996).
Andrew Hadfield, 'Spenser and the Stuart Succession', *Literature & History* 13:1 (2004), pp. 9-24.
Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway (eds.), *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007):

Katherine Duncan Jones, '"Almost always smiling": Elizabeth's Last Two Years', pp. 31-47.
Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, 2nd Edition (Harlow: Longman, 1998).
William Haller, *Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs' and the Elect Nation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963).
J. O. Halliwell, *A Hand-list of the Early English Literature Preserved in the Malone Collection in the Bodleian Library* (London: [private circulation,] 1860).
Paul E. J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
Frederick Hard, 'Two Spenserian Imitations, By "T. W."', *English Literary History* 5 (1938), pp. 113-26.
Margaret Healy, *Fictions of Disease in Early Modern England: Bodies, Plagues and Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).
Gabriel Heaton, *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments: From George Gascoigne to Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
Margot Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama Under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: the Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
----, *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).
Peter C. Herman, 'Authorship and the Royal "I": King James VI/I and the Politics of Monarchic Verse' *Renaissance Quarterly* 54.4 Part 2 (Winter 2001), pp. 1495-1530.
----, *Royal Poetrie: Monarchic Verse and the Political Imaginary of Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010)
---- and Ray G. Siemens, *Reading Monarchs Writing: The Poetry of Henry VIII, Mary Stuart, Elizabeth I, and James VI/I* (San Diego: San Diego State University, 2002):
Peter C. Herman and Ray G. Siemens, 'Henry VIII and the Poetry of Politics', pp. 11-34.
Peter C. Herman, '"mes subjectz, mon ame assubjectie": The Problematic (of) Subjectivity in Mary Stuart's Sonnets', pp. 51-78.
Leah S. Marcus, 'Queen Elizabeth I as Public and Private Poet: Notes towards a new edition', pp. 109-53.
James A. Herrick, *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: An Introduction*, 5th Edition (London and New York: Routledge, 2013).
Misako Himuro, 'The Phoenix in the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians', *Renaissance Studies* (December 1999) Vol. 12 Issue 4, pp. 523-544.
Mary Hobbs, *Early Seventeenth -Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992).
Peter Holmes, 'The Authorship and Early Reception of *A Conference About the Next Succession to the Crown of England*', *The Historical Journal*, 23.2 (1980), pp. 415-29.
James Holstun, 'Ranting at the New Historicism' *English Literary Renaissance* 19 (1989).
Lisa Hopkins, *Drama and the Succession to the Crown, 1561-1633* (Farnham: Ashgate: 2011).
----, *Writing Renaissance Queens: Texts by and about Elizabeth I and Mary Queen of Scots* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002).
Ralph Houlbrooke (ed.), *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006):
Susan Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', pp. 25-42.

Victor Houliston, *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Persons' Jesuit Polemic, 1580-1610* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).
----, 'The Hare and the Drum: Robert Persons' writings on the English Succession, 1593-6', *Renaissance Studies* 14.2 (2000), pp. 235-250.
Gregory T. Howard, *Dictionary of Rhetorical Terms* ([n. p.]: Xlibris, 2010).
David Howarth, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1997).
Wilbur S. Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700* (Princeton, 1953).
Blair Hoxby, *For Pleasure and Profit: Plague Literature from Elizabeth I to the Great Plague of 1665* (University of Oxford M.Phil., 1990).
Cyrus Hoy, *Introductions, Notes, and Commentaries to Texts in 'The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
Alice Hunt, *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
G. K. Hunter, *The Humanist as Courtier* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962).
Joel Hurstfield, *Elizabeth I and the Unity of England* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971).
Lorna Hutson, *Thomas Nashe in Context*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
Peter Hyland, *Disguise on the Early Modern English Stage* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

I

Grace Ioppolo, *Dramatists and their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton, Heywood* (New York and London: Routledge, 2006).

J

Sybil M. Jack, '"A Pattern for a King's Inauguration": the coronation of James I in England', *Parergon* 21.2 (July 2004), pp. 67-91.
W. A. Jackson (ed.), *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company: 1602 to 1640* (London: Stationers Company, 1957).
Mervyn James, *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
Harold Jenkins, *The Life and Work of Henry Chettle* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1934).
Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998).
Valerie Jones, 'The Phoenix and the Resurrection', in *The Mark of the Beast*, ed. Debra Hassig (New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 99-115.
Garth S. Jowett and Victoria J. O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion*, 6th Edition (London: Sage Publications, 2014).
Robert E. Jungman, 'Pastime with Good Company', *Notes & Queries* (October 1979), 26 (5), pp. 397-399.

K

William F. Kahl, *The Development of the London Livery Companies: an Historical Essay and Select Bibliography* (Kress Library of Business and Economics, 15; Boston: Baker Library, 1960).
Ivo Kamps, 'Ruling Fantasies and the Fantasies of Rule: *The Phoenix* and *Measure for* Measure', *Studies in Philology* 92 (1995), pp. 248-73.
Rei Kanemura, 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election? The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies* 52.2 (April 2013), pp. 67-91.
Ernst Hartwig Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: a Study in Mediæval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

Dennis Kay, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
Harry Kelsey, *Philip of Spain, King of England* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2012).
Alvin B. Kernan (ed.), *Two Renaissance Mythmakers, Christopher Marlowe and Ben Jonson* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1977).
John Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
Paulina Kewes, *Plagiarism in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
Bruce King, *Seventeenth-Century English Literature* (London: Macmillan, 1982).
John N. King, 'Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen', *Renaissance Quarterly* 18 (1990), pp. 30-74.
----, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).
Gordon Kipling, 'Triumphal Drama: Form in English Civic Pageantry', *Renaissance Drama* NS8 (1977), pp. 37-56.
James Knowles, 'The Spectacle of the Realm: Civic Consciousness, Rhetoric, and Ritual in Early Modern London', in *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts*, ed. J. R. Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993; reprinted in paperback, 2009), pp. 157-89.
Stuart M. Kurland, 'Hamlet and the Scottish Succession?' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 34.2 (Spring, 1994), pp. 279-300.
Chris R. Kyle, *Parliaments, Politics, and Elections, 1604-48* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

L

Peter Lake, 'The King (The Queen) and the Jesuit: James Stuart's *True Law of Free Monarchies* in context/s', *Transactions of the Royal Historical* Society, 6th Series, 14 (2004), pp. 243-60.
----*, Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
---- and Steven Pincus (eds.), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).
Robert Lane, '"The Sequence of Posterity": Shakespeare's King John and the Succession Controversy', *Studies in Philology* 92.4 (Autumn 1995), p. 460.
Richard A. Lanham, *The Motives of Eloquence: Literary Rhetoric in the Renaissance* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1976).
Harold Lasswell, *Democracy Through Public Opinion* (Menasha, WI: George *Banta,* 1941).
Jessica Lazar, *'Heare, and Record it': notes on aspects of the publication of Jonson's and Dekker's 1604 pageant for James I* (University of Oxford, M.St. dissertation, 2010).
Maurice Lee Jr., *Great Britain's Solomon* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990).
----, *James I & Henri IV: An Essay in English Foreign Policy, 1603-1610* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970).
Alexander Leggatt, *Ben Jonson: His Vision and Art* (London: Methuen, 1981).
Theodore B. Leinwand, 'Negotiation and New Historicism', *PMLA* 105 (1990), pp. 477-490.
Donald Lemem Clark, *John Milton at St. Paul's School: A Study of Ancient Rhetoric in Renaissance Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948).
Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Carole Levin, *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
Mortimer Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question, 1558-1568* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966).
Linda Levy Peck, *Northampton, Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1982).
Jerzy Limon, *The Masque of Stuart Culture* (London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1990).
David Lindley (ed.), *The Court Masque* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984).
Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York and London: Free Press Paperbacks, 1997).
Edmund Lodge, *Illustrations of British History*, 3 vols. (London: Mitcham, 1838).
Catherine Loomis, 'Elizabeth Southwell's Manuscript Account of the Death of Queen Elizabeth (with text)', *English Literary Renaissance* 26.3 (Autumn 1996), pp. 482-509.
----, 'Philip III and the Stuart Succession', *Revue Belge* XLIII, pp. 509-13.
Joseph Loewenstein, *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
Roger Luckhurst, 'The public sphere, popular culture and the true meaning of the zombie apocalypse', in *The Cambridge Companion to Popular Fiction*, ed. David Glover and Scott McCracken (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 68-85.
Michael Lynch, *Scotland: A New History* (London: Pimlico, 1991).

M

Alan MacColl, 'The Construction of England as a Protestant "British" Nation', *Renaissance Studies* 18.4 (2004), pp. 582-608.
James MacManaway, 'Elizabeth, Essex, and James', in *Elizabethan and Jacobean Studies, Presented to Frank Percy Wilson*, ed. Herbert Davis and Helen Gardner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), pp. 219-30.
Gaby Mahlberg, *Henry Neville and English republican culture in the seventeenth century: Dreaming of another game* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009).
Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380-1620* (Oxford: OUP, 2011).
R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of the Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987).
Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
Arthur F. Marotti, '"Love is not Love": Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order', *ELH*, Vol. 49 No. 2 (Summer 1982), p. 396-428.
----, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995).
----, 'Patronage, Poetry, and Print', *Politics, Patronage and Literature in England 1558-1658*, The Yearbook of English Studies Vol. 21, Special Number (1991), pp. 1-26.
---- and Stephen W. May, 'Two Lost Ballads of the Armada Thanksgiving Celebration', *English Literary Renaissance* 41:1 (Winter 2011), pp. 31-63.
Tristan Marshall, *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages under James VI and I* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2000).
Roger A. Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

----, 'Scotland, Elizabethan England and the Idea of Britain', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 14, pp. 279-293.
Katharine Eisaman Maus, *Ben Jonson and the Roman Frame of Mind* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).
Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, W.D. Hall (trans.) (London: Routledge, 1990).
Steven W. May, 'Queen Elizabeth's Future Foes: Editing Manuscripts with the *First Line Index of Elizabethan Verse* (a Future Friend)', in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts III: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1997-2001*, ed. W. Speed Hill (Tempe: Arizona Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2004), pp. 1–12.
Jean-Christophe Mayer, *Breaking the Silence on the Succession* (Montpellier: Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3, 2003).
---- and Jenny Wormald (eds.), *The Struggle for the Succession in Late Elizabethan England: Politics, Polemics and Cultural Representations* (Montpellier: Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, 2004):
Susan Doran, 'Three Late-Elizabethan Succession Tracts', pp. 91-117.
Peter McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
John F. McDairmid (ed.), *The Monarchical Republic of Early Modern England: Essays in Response to Patrick Collinson* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007):
Ethan H. Shagan, 'The Two Republics: Conflicting Views of Participatory Local Government in Early Tudor England', pp. 19-36.
Dale Hoak, 'Sir William Cecil, Sir Thomas Smith, and the Monarchical Republic of Tudor England', pp. 37-54.
Scott Lucas, '*A Mirror For Magistrates*, Resistance Theory, and the Elizabethan Monarchical Republic', pp. 91-108.
Markku Peltonen, 'Rhetoric and Citizenship in the Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', pp.109-128.
Claire McEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590-1612* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
Tricia A. McElroy, 'A "Quarrell sett out in metre": Towards a New Edition of Scottish Reformation Satirical Literature', *Studies in Scottish Literature* Vol. 39 Issue 1 (2013)
C. E McGee and John C. Meagher, 'Preliminary Checklist of Tudor and Stuart Entertainments, 1558-1603', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 24 (1981), pp. 51-155.
----, 'Preliminary Checklist of Tudor and Stuart Entertainments, 1603-13', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 27 (1984), pp. 47-126.
Michael McGiffert, 'God's Controversy with Jacobean England', *The American Historical Review* 88.5 (December 1983), pp. 1151-1174.
----, 'Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism', *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982), pp. 463-502.
D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, rev. ed. 1999).
----, 'Printing and Publishing 1557-1700: Constraints on the London Book Trades', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, iv. *1557-1695*, ed. John Barnard, and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 553-67.
R. B. McKerrow, 'Booksellers, Printers, and the Stationers' Trade', *Shakespeare's England* 11 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916), pp. 212-39.

Anne McLaren, 'Challenging the Monarchical Republic: James I's Articulation of Kingship', in *The Monarchic Republic of Early Modern England: Essays in Response to Patrick Collinson*, ed. John F. McDiarmid (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 165-180.
Helena Mennie Shire (*Song, Dance and Poetry at the Court of Scotland under King James VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).
Marcus Merriman, *The Rough Wooings: Mary Queen of Scots, 1542-1551* (East Linton: Tuckwell, 2000).
Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: the Roman and protestant churches in English protestant thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
Andrew Milner, *Cultural Materialism* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press; Portland, OR: U.S.A. and Canada, International Specialized Book Services, 1993).
Louis Montrose, '"Shaping Fantasies": Figurations of Gender and Power in Elizabethan Culture', in *Representing the English Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, pp. 31-64.
----, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2006).
Linne R. Mooney and Mary-Jo Arn (eds.), *The Kingis Quair and Other Prison Poems* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2005).
Morrill, John *'Uneasy Lies the Head that Wears a Crown': Dynastic Crises in Tudor and Stuart Britain, 1504-1746* (Reading: University of Reading, 2005).
Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
Janel Mueller, '"To My Very Good Brother the King of Scots": Elizabeth I's Correspondence with James VI and the Question of Succession' *PMLA* 115.5 (October 2000), pp. 1063-1071.
Craig Muldrew, 'Interpreting the Market: The Ethics of Credit and Commerce in Early Modern England', *Social History* 18 (1993), pp. 163-83.
James J. Murphy (ed.), *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1983):
Paul Oskar Kristeller, 'Rhetoric in Medieval and Renaissance Culture', pp. 1-17.
James J. Murphy, 'One Thousand Neglected Authors: The Scope and Importance of Renaissance Rhetoric', p.20-36
Arthur F. Kinney, 'Rhetoric and Fiction in Elizabethan England', pp. 385-393.
Murray, Margaret Alice *The Divine King in England* (London: Faber, 1954)

N

John E. Neale, 'Peter Wentworth', *English Historical Review* 39 (1924), pp. 36-54.
----, *Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1934).
Diana Newton, *The Making of the Jacobean Regime: James VI and I and the Government of England, 1603-1605* (Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society, The Boydell Press, 2005).
Richard Samuel Noble, *Shakespeare's Use of Song* (London: Oxford University Press, 1923).
David Norbrook, 'Panegyric of the Monarch and its Social Context under Elizabeth I and James I' (University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 1978).
----, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, Revised Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
----, Absolute Revisionism', *English* 33 (1984), pp. 251-63.
----, 'The Emperor's New Body? *Richard II*, Ernst Kantorowicz, and the Politics of Shakespeare Criticism' *Textual Practice* 10:2 (1996), pp. 329-357

O

Victoria O'Donnell and June Kable, *Persuasion: an Interactive-Dependency Approach* (New York: Random House, 1982).
Yassu Okayama, *The Ripa Index: Personifications and Their Attributes in Five Editions of the Iconologia* (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1992).
Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theatre in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1975).

P

Anita Pacheco (ed.), *Early Women Writers: 1600-1720* (Longman: London and New York, 1998).
George Parfitt, *English Poetry of the Seventeenth Century* (London and New York: Longman, 1985).
Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981).
----, *The Seventeenth Century: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1603-1700* (New York and London: Longman, 1989)
Derek Pearsall, 'The English Chaucerians', in *Chaucer and Chaucerians: Critical Studies in Middle English Literature*, ed. Derek Brewer (Mobile, AL: University Press of Alabama, 1966), pp. 201-39.
Linda Levy Peck, 'Benefits, Brokers and Beneficiaries: The Culture of Exchange in Seventeenth-Century England', in *Court, Country and Culture: Essays in Early Modern History in Honour of Perez Zagorin*, ed. B. Y. Kunze and D. D. Brautigam (Rochester NY: University of Rochester Press, 1992), pp. 109-27.
---- (ed.), *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1990).
---- (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991):
Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*: The Scottish Context and the English Translation', pp. 36-54.
J. P. Sommerville, 'James I and the Divine Right of Kings: English Politics and Continental Theory', pp. 55-70.
Markuu Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
Thomas A. Pendleton, 'Shakespeare's Disguised Duke Play: Middleton, Marston, and the Sources of *Measure for Measure*', in *Fanned and Winnowed Opinions: Shakespearean Essays Presented to Harold Jenkins*, ed. John W. Mahon and Thomas A. Pendleton (New York: Methuen, 1987), pp. 79-98.
Curtis Perry, 'British Empire on the Eve of the Armada', *Studies in Philology* 108:4 (2011), pp. 508-537.
----, *The Making of Jacobean Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
Alessandra Petrina and Laura Tosi (eds.), *Representations of Elizabeth I in Early Modern Culture*, (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011):
Carlo M. Bajetta, '"Most peereles Poëtresse": the Manuscript Circulation of Elizabeth's Poems', pp. 105-121.
Heinrich F. Platt, *Rhetoric and Renaissance Culture* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004).
Frederick Pollock and F. W. Maitland, *The History of English Law*, 2nd Edition, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968).

Q

Kevin A. Quarmby, *The Disguised Ruler in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012).

Michael Questier, 'The Politics of Religious Conformity and the Accession of James I', *Historical Journal* 41 [1998], pp. 14-30.
----, 'Sermons, Separatists, and the Succession Politics in Late Elizabethan England', *Journal of British Studies*, 52.2 (April 2013), pp. 290-316.

R

Matthias Range, *Music and Ceremonial at British Coronations: From James I to Elizabeth II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
James Raven, *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007).
Michael J. Redmond, *Shakespeare, Politics, and Italy: Intertextuality on the Jacobean Stage* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).
Eleanor Relle, 'Some New Marginalia and Poems of Gabriel Harvey', *Review of English Studies* 23 (1972), pp. 401-16.
Judith M. Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI: "National" Identity, Gender, and the Personal Monarchy of England', *English Historical Review* 117:472 (2002), pp. 513-535.
Jane Rickard, *Authorship and Authority: the Writings of James VI and I* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).
----, 'From Scotland to England: The Poetic Strategies of James VI and I', *Renaissance Forum: An Electronic Journal of Early-Modern Literary and Historical Studies*, Vol. 7 (Winter 2004).
Jean Robertson and D. J. Gordon (eds.), *A Calendar of Dramatic Records in the Books of the Livery Companies of London, 1485-1640* (Malone Society Collections, 3; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954).
Tessa Rose, *The Coronation Ceremony of the Kings and Queens of England and the Crown Jewels* (London: HMSO, 1992).
Rumrich, John P., and Gregory Chaplin *Seventeenth-Century British Poetry, 1603-1660* (New York, London: W.W. Norton, 2006).
David Rundle, '"Not so much praise as precept": Erasmus, panegyric, and the Renaissance art of teaching princes', in *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning*, ed. Yun Lee Too and Niall Livingstone (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 148-69.

S

Elizabeth Salter, *Medieval Poetry and the Figural View of Reality* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968).
Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
----, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010).
----, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009).
----, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).
---- and Stephen N. Zwicker (eds.), *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
Cathy Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Ray G. Siemens, "Revisiting the Text of the Henry VIII Manuscript (BL Add. MS 31,922): An Extended Note", *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14.3 (January 2009), pp. 31-36.
Paul Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
Helen Smailes and Duncan Thomson, *The Queen's Image: a Celebration of Mary, Queen of Scots* (Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 1987).
B. L. Smith, H. D. Lasswell, and R. D. Casey (eds.), *Propaganda, Communication, and Public Opinion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946).
R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of the Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987).
Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
----, 'Repatching the Play', in *From Script to Stage in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel (London: Palgrave, 2004), pp. 151-77.
----, 'Watching as Reading: The Audience and Written Text in the Early Modern Playhouse', in *How to Do Things with Shakespeare*, ed. Laurie Maguire (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), pp. 136-59.
---- and Simon Palfrey *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
Julie Stone Peters, *Theatre of the Book 1480-1880: Print, Text, and Performance in Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
Roy Strong, *Coronation* (London: Harper Collins, 2005).
----, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Elizabeth I* (London: Random House, 2003).
----, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting Iconography, Vol 1: Tudor* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995).
----, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography, Vol. 2: Elizabethan* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995).
----, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography, Vol. 3: Jacobean and Caroline* (Woodbridge: Harper Collins, 2005).
Jennifer Summit, *Lost Property: The Woman Writer and English Literary History, 1380-1589* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000).
Margaret Swain, *Needlework of Mary Queen of* Scots (Bedford: Ruth Bean Publishers, rev. ed. 1986).

T

J. S. P. Tatlock, *The legendary history of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniæ and its early vernacular versions* (New York: Gordian Press, 1974).
Edward Tenace, 'A Strategy of Reaction: The Armadas of 1596 and 1597 and the Spanish Struggle for European Hegemony', *English Historical Review* (2003) Vol. 118 Issue 478, pp. 855–882.
Leonard Tennenhouse, 'Representing Power: *Measure for Measure* in its Time', in *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Norman: Pilgrim Books, 1982), pp. 139-56.
Kevin Terry, *Terrys of Cork 1600-2000* (Midleton: Litho Press, 2005).
George Malcolm Thomson, *The Crime of Mary Stuart* (London: Hutchinson, 1967).
F. W. Tickner, *The Patriotic Spirit in English Literature* (Oxford University D.Phil., 1977).
Kathleen Tillotson, 'The Source of *An Excellent New Ballad*', *Review of English Studies* 14:54 [1938], pp. 173-75.
E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (London: Chatto, 1943).
Rebecca Carol Noel Totaro, *Suffering in Paradise: the Bubonic Plague in English Literature from More to Milton* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2005).

James Travers, *James I: The Masque of Monarchy* (Kew: National Archives, 2003).
Evelyn B. Tribble, *Margins and Marginality* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993).
Wilfred Trotter, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War, 1916-1919* (London: Keynes, 1985).
Francis H. Tuckey, *The County and City, or Cork Remembrancer* (Cork: Osborne Savage and Son, 1837).
Stefania Tutino, 'The Political Thought of Robert Persons's *Conference* in Continental Context', *Historical Journal* 52 (2009), pp. 43-62.

U

David Underdown, *Revel, Riot & Rebellion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).
George Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, 4th edition (London: Cass, 1966).

V

Roelof van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972).

W

F. X. Walker, 'The Implementation of the Elizabethan statutes against Recusants 1581-1603' (PhD thesis, University of London, 1961).
Julia M. Walker, *The Elizabeth Icon, 1603-2003* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
Wendy Wall, 'Isabella Whitney and the Female Legacy', *English Literary History* 58 (1991), pp. 35-62.
Joseph P. Ward, *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity and Change in Early Modern London* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997).
John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart Literature: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
Done Wayne, 'Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson: An Alternative View', *Renaissance Drama* 13 (1982), pp. 103-129.
David A. Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
David Welch, *Propaganda: Power and Persuasion* (London: British Library, 2013).
Mary Whitby, *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1998).
Bertrand T. Whitehead, *Brags and Boasts: Propaganda in the Year of the Armada* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1994).
John Wickham Legg (ed.), *The Coronation Order of King James I* (London: F. E. Robinson, 1902).
L. G. Wickham Legg, *English Coronation Records* (London: A. Constable & Co., 1901).
Roger Wilbraham, *Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham*, ed. Harold Spencer Scott (London: Royal Historical Society, 1902).
B. Wilkinson, *The Coronation in History* (London: George Philip, 1953).
Franklin B. Williams, 'Richard Johnson's Borrowed Tears', *Studies in Philology* (University of North Carolina Press) 34:2 (April 1937), pp. 186-190.
Edwin E. Willoughby, *A Printer of Shakespeare* (London: Philip Allan, 1934).
D. H. Wilson, *King James VI and I* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967).
Elkin Calhoun Wilson, *England's Eliza* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939).
F. P. Wilson, *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963).
Jean Wilson, *Entertainments for Elizabeth I* (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980).

Edward Wilson-Lee, 'Birch, William', in *The Encyclopedia of English Renaissance Literature Vol. 1: A-F*, ed. Garrett A. Sullivan and Alan Stewart (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012).
Karen A. Winstead, *Chaste Passions: Medieval English Virgin Martyr Legends* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000).
----, *Virgin Martyrs: legends of sainthood in late medieval England* (Ithaca: Cornell University press, 1996).
Peter Womack, *Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986).
Matthew Woodcock, 'Edmund Spenser and Commemorations of the Death of Elizabeth I', *Notes and Queries* (March 2009), pp. 42-46.
Jonathan Woolfson (ed.), *Reassessing Tudor Humanism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
K. J. Woollcombe and G. W. H. Lampe, *Essays on Typology*, Studies in Biblical Theology 22 (London: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1957).
Reginald Maxwell Woolley, *Cambridge Liturgical Handbooks: Coronation Rites* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915).
Walter W. Woodfill, *Musicians in English Society from Elizabeth I to Charles I* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953).
D. R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1990).
----, 'Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen's Famous Memory', *Canadian Journal of History* 20 (1985), pp. 167-91.
Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas*, ed. Anna Snaith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I: Two Kings or One?', *History*, Vol. 68 Issue 223, pp. 187-209.
----, *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (London: George Philip, 1988)
H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
Gillian Wright, 'What Daniel really did with the *Pharsalia*, *The Civil Wars*, Lucan and King James' *The Review of English Studies* New Series, 55.219 (April 2004), pp. 210-232.
E. A. Wrigley, and Roger Schofield, *The Population History of England, 1541-1871* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

Y

Akihiro Yamada, *Secrets of the Printed Page in the Age of Shakespeare: Bibliographical Studies in the Plays of Beaumont, Chapman, Dekker, Fletcher, Ford, Marston, Shakespeare, Shirley, and in the Text of King James I's The true lawe of free monarchies: with an edition of Arcadia restored, Egerton MS 1994, folios 212-23 in the British Library* (New York: AMS Press, 2010)
Frances Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975).
Michael B. Young, *King James VI and I and the History of Homosexuality* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

Z

David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
Nathalie Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
Representations (Berkeley: University of California Press, Spring 2009) Vol. 106, pp.

63-118:
Stephen Greenblatt, 'Fifty Years of *The King's Two Bodies*', pp. 63-66;
Victoria Kahn, 'Political theology and fiction in *The King's Two Bodies*', pp. 77-101;
Jussen Bernhard, '*The King's Two Bodies* Today', pp. 102-117.

DATABASES

[*BBTI*] *British Book Trade Index* (Bodleian Library, 2015), http://bbti.bodleian.ox.ac.uk

British Literary Manuscripts Online, Medieval and Renaissance (Gale Cengage Learning 2015), http://gdc.gale.com/products/british-literary-manuscripts-online-medieval-and-renaissance.

British Newspapers, Part III: 1780-1950 (Gale Cengage Learning, 2015), gale.cengage.co.uk/british-newspapers-part-iii.aspx.

[*EEBO*] *Early English Books Online* (ProQuest LLC, 2003-2015), http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home.

[*ESTC*] *English Short Title Catalogue* (British Library, 2003), http://estc.bl.uk.

[*ODNB*] *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn. 2009), www.oxforddnb.com.

[*OED*] *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (Oxford University Press, 2010; online edn. 2015), www.oed.com.

Silva Rhetoricae (Brigham Young University, 2007), ed. Gideon O. Burton, http://rhetoric.byu.edu.

[*State Papers Online*] *State Papers Online: The Government of Britain, 1509-1714: Part III: The Stuarts: James I to Anne, 1603-1714* (Gale Cengage Learning, 2015), http://gale.cengage.co.uk/state-papers-online-15091714.aspx.