Masculinity, Ambassadorial Handbooks, and Early Modern English Diplomacy*

Tracey A. Sowerby

Abstract: *Despite the increasing scholarly interest in gender and diplomacy, the ways in which masculinity impacted upon early modern ambassadors remains virtually unexplored. This article responds to this lacuna by examining early modern diplomacy through the lens of early modern notions of manhood. It first sets out key themes essential to the construction of early modern notions of masculinity before conducting a detailed discussion of how three works on ambassadors by Alberico Gentili, Jean Hotman, and Francis Thynne discussed specific manly attributes that were particular to the circumstances of embassy and constructed a notion of diplomatic manhood. The final section briefly analyses how several of these areas played out in practice, paying particular attention to an ambassador's learning, physical activities, and household management. This article argues that we should take concerns about masculinity seriously as a factor influencing both ambassadorial behaviour and responses to ambassadors' actions. The very nature of diplomatic service seemingly precluded one preeminent field in which men asserted their manhood—the martial arena—and other key components of masculinity could be difficult to maintain adequately during embassy for practical reasons. This led ambassadors to adopt compensatory strategies of various kinds in order to maintain their manly reputations at home and at their host court.*

Keywords: Masculinity, Diplomatic Culture, Alberico Gentili, Jean Hotman, Tudor Diplomacy

Introduction

In the opinion of the civil lawyer Alberico Gentili, Sir Philip Sidney was the perfect ambassador. Only Sidney could claim to possess the 'excellent pattern' of character and abilities that were needed to make the 'consummate ambassador', or so Gentili wrote in *De Legationibus libri tres* (1585), a long discussion of embassies and ambassadors which he dedicated to Sidney.[1] At a distance, however, Sidney appears a weaker candidate than other Elizabethans, such as Sir Henry Cobham or Sir Francis Walsingham, who had each been entrusted with several special missions and a resident embassy by the time that Gentili was writing. In contrast, Sidney had only led one short special embassy to emperor Rudolph II in 1577, which had seen him visit various German princes *en route* and attend the christening of William of Orange's son on his return, and headed an aborted special embassy of condolence to France in 1584.[2] Gentili's laudatory dedication to Sidney was no doubt rooted in their close intellectual relationship and the conversations they had shared about ambassadors which apparently served as an inspiration for his work.[3] Gentili's choice of perfect ambassador is particularly interesting, however, due to Sidney's place in Elizabethan political culture. Sidney is best known today as an influential literary figure and an epitome of Elizabethan Protestant martial culture.[4] In 1579 the title page of Edmund Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* proclaimed the young aristocrat a 'noble and vertvous Gentleman most worthy of all titles both of learning and cheualrie'.[5] The outpourings of grief following Sidney's death in the wake of the battle of Zutphen in 1586 emphasised that he had died as a result of injuries sustained on the battlefield.[6] Sidney, then, could be seen as emblematic of a particular form of martial masculinity that is more often associated with war than diplomacy.[7]

While burgeoning, scholarly interest in gender and early modern diplomacy—to which this special issue testifies—has hitherto been much less developed than the literature on other issues relating to diplomatic culture and practices such as diplomatic ceremonial, ambassadorial networks, or gift-giving.[8] One long-standing strand of research has sought to expose the role of non-regnant royal women in diplomatic processes.[9] A more recent focus has

been the contribution of a wider array of court women, including the wives of ambassadors.[10] While the role of women in early modern diplomatic practices remains an important avenue for research, how notions of femininity and masculinity played out in diplomatic contexts also deserves to be firmly on the research agenda. Very little ink has been devoted to the relationship between early modern diplomacy and masculinity, and this despite the overwhelming majority of diplomatic work in this period being undertaken by men.[11] In contrast, masculinity in early modern England has been the subject of a large number of studies over the last few decades,[12] diversifying considerably to incorporate focussed studies of specific areas such as age, emotion, music, and appearance.[13]

This article tackles concepts of masculinity in diplomacy in theory and practice. In doing so, it examines several 'how to' books written about ambassadors. From the middle of the sixteenth century a growing number of 'how to' works were published on diverse areas of life, from high politics to fishing, that offered access to specialist, even arcane, knowledge.[14] A significant number addressed the roles and behaviour to which gentlemen should aspire. Few of these works that advised men on appropriate manly behaviour contained concerted discussions of overseas service or ambassadors, who appear to have been conceived of as a distinct group worthy of their own 'how to' literature. Humfrey Braham's *Institucion of a gentleman* (1555), which claimed that gentlemen were most suitable to undertake embassies and included a chapter on 'How ambassages be most mete for Gentlemen', suggests that analysing treatises on the role of ambassador in light of dominant notions of elite masculinity could prove enlightening.[15]

The men who undertook embassies in the sixteenth century were predominantly drawn from the social elites. In the first half of the century in particular, however, merchants and mid-ranking clerics were called upon to serve the English monarch alongside bishops, courtiers, humanists, and noblemen.[16] Noblemen most commonly undertook shorter special embassies associated with a specific negotiation or the conferral of an honour; it was not until the later seventeenth century that aristocratic ambassadors came to dominate the diplomatic ranks at the courts of Europe.[17] The majority of sixteenth-century English resident embassies were undertaken by men who had received knighthoods and were from gentle families.[18] Much could be written on the social rank of Tudor ambassadors, but that is not the focus of this article.[19] Rather, given that the vast majority of Tudor ambassadors were members of the social elite, this article asks how concepts associated with elite masculinity were discussed in the prescriptive literature and how they manifested in diplomatic practice.

Examining how the attitudes to manhood outlined in three surviving treatises on ambassadors compares to the predominant modes of masculinity expressed in other fora, including the more general prescriptive literature for gentlemen (which articulated the parameters within which normative elite masculinity was measured), reveals the peculiarities and commonplaces of diplomatic manhood. Not all of the areas that were important for the construction of early modern manhood were discussed at length (or even at all) in diplomatic handbooks. The final section of this article therefore briefly explores how some aspects of early modern masculinity played out in practice.

Early Modern Masculinities

Although masculinity as a term was unknown in the sixteenth century, ideas about masculinity were expressed through cognates such as manliness and manhood.[20] Masculinity and male honour were intimately intertwined, especially with respect to expectations of patriarchal authority; indeed early modern men and women regularly used discourses of honour to discuss normative gender roles.[21] Ideas about masculinity in early modern England largely fall into two intertwined categories: notions of how men should behave and act on the one hand, and the character virtues they should possess and which should govern their behaviour on the other.

Normative notions of masculinity focussed on the patriarchal oversight of a well-ordered household including obedient servants, children, and wife.[22] A man's honour was dependent upon his sexual reputation, especially his ability to keep his wife faithful and to father children.[23] For men of higher social status, other modes of behaviour also constructed their masculinity. Included amongst these was the maintenance of an economically independent household, while the related ability to offer good hospitality became an important marker of a gentleman's magnanimity and generosity.[24]

Manhood was further expressed through physicality. Sports such as jousting, archery, and hunting remained important means for staking claims to masculine prowess.[25] Braham, for example, praised tennis and archery as suitable pursuits for gentlemen, while Sir Thomas Elyot, a sometime counsellor of Henry VIII, writing two decades earlier, believed running, wrestling, swimming, martial sports, and above all riding and shooting with the long bow were the most beneficial and appropriate physical pastimes for honourable men; both authors approved of hunting and hawking in moderation.[26] Towards the end of the sixteenth century, elite men increasingly defended their honour and asserted their masculinity through duels.[27] But above and beyond this, the military arena remained a key site where men could hope to prove their masculine credentials and gain honour and glory.[28] Braham, for instance, praised the honour of valiantly bearing arms, claiming that there was 'nothing more praiseworthy and honourable than being a perfect soldier'.[29] Elizabeth I was notoriously reluctant to commit to continental war and even during the reign of the comparatively belligerent Henry VIII there were long years of peace, leaving men who wished to prove their manhood through military means with only occasional means to do so. Chivalric culture, with its emphasis on valour, honour, jousts, and other militaristic sports provided an outlet for masculine expression during times of both war and peace.[30]

Across the early modern period, public service was becoming increasingly important to the conceptualization of male honour.[31] An early example of a work that stressed the importance of service to the commonwealth was Thomas Elyot's *Boke named the Governour*. His discussion of how to educate future statesmen to be honourable was sufficiently popular that it was published eight times between 1531 and 1580. The most famous ancient work on honour and public service, Cicero's *De officiis*, was even more widely read, receiving at least nine separate editions in English translation alone between 1534 and 1596, as well as fourteen Latin imprints in England between 1574 and 1598.[32] Elizabeth's principal secretary, Sir William Cecil, reputedly carried a copy of *De officiis* with him at all times, and the humanist Nicholas Grimald, one of the work's earlier translators, considered it the 'myrrour of wisdom, y^{e} fortres of iustice, the master of manlinesse, the schoole of temperance, the iewell of comelinesse'.[33] Later books for gentlemen took up the theme of honorable service to the commonweal. As part of a broader argument that true gentlemen should work to uphold the commonwealth, Braham discussed the desirability of them taking up honourable positions in government at length, focussing on those professions that upheld law and order, and military and diplomatic service.[34] He assessed the relative merits of martial and governmental pursuits, judging that 'to doe valientlye in the warres it deserueth greate praise and recompence, yet to minister iustice in the state of peace it is an office worthy of higher commendacion'.[35] By this point, learning and literary manliness were not incompatible with other manly traits such as martial skill; a combination that found expression among the gentry and aristocracy at various points across the sixteenth century.[36]

As the emphasis on public service suggests, the conduct books and 'how to' manuals that circulated were primarily aimed at those with the income and status to attain the signifiers of normative manhood. Not all men were able to attain these markers of masculinity: some men who married could not afford an independent household, while some men who were independently wealthy never married. Social status is therefore inextricably intertwined with

notions of manhood, with some different modes being associated with different social groups.[37] So, while 'gentleman' was a social rank, the authors of these works were largely unconcerned with policing the boundaries between social ranks, but with appropriate male conduct among the better off, and many framed their discussions in terms that allowed 'gentlemanly' conduct to be applicable both to those of somewhat lower social status than the gentry and those who could claim to be of noble rank. Braham, for instance, distinguished between three types of gentleman. The 'gentle gentle' was born among the social elites but also possessed gentlemanly character and virtue; the 'gentle ungentle' might have inherited social status, but failed to behave as a true gentleman should; while the 'ungentle gentle', 'of which sort of gentleman we have many now in England', was low born but his behaviour and character were truly gentle.[38] Other authors distinguished between social status and innate characteristics as ways to stake claims to be a gentleman that were not necessarily mutually exclusive. William Turner, for example, defined a gentleman as 'an excellent persone ether in qualities of body or mynde, or one that is co*m*med of noble paree*n*tes & forefathers' who had a place in public life.[39] Many authors adopted the humanistic notion that virtue could be instilled by an appropriate education and that nobility and gentlemanliness did not consist exclusively in blood, but to a greater or lesser extent in a man's character.[40] In other words, while the tracts articulated notions of manhood that primarily applied to the better off in society, they did not consider gentility solely a rigid social category opposed to nobility or commonalty, but as encompassing a set of actions, attributes, and virtues, some of which applied to relations between the sexes while others applied within various homosocial contexts.

Numerous virtues were associated with masculinity, as 'the giftes of uertue are thinges whiche bringe euery man to honoure'.[41] Contemporary writers focussed on the four cardinal virtues of justice, fortitude, prudence, and temperance, which many saw to be intertwined.[42] Justice required men to behave equitably, giving everyone their due.[43] Fortitude, which the heraldic writer John Bossewell described as 'the most propre vertue belonging to a man', was the strength of mind to exercise moral or physical courage.[44] It was the mean between being overly rash and overly timid.[45] Some authors subdivided fortitude into four parts: confidence, magnanimity, patience, and perseverance, with one claiming that 'of all these perfect manlinesse doth consist'.[46] Prudence was the ability to discern the correct path to follow, to determine what was good, honest, and profitable.[47] Moreover, it was seen as a virtue which conditioned a man to develop other virtues: Bossewell described it as 'the porche of the noble palace of mans reason, whereby all other vertues shall entre, and haue theire beynge'.[48] Temperance, too, was considered a virtue which enhanced a man's ability to exercise the other cardinal virtues. Men who possessed temperance practiced self-restraint, enabling them to pursue a moderate course in all areas of their lives; those who did not risked neglecting essential needs or overindulging in bad behaviour and never being satisfied.[49] Only if a man possessed temperance could he be 'wise, happy, or any thing worth', it was claimed.[50]

All four cardinal virtues represented a mean between two extremes. The notion of moderation between extremes was found throughout discourses of early modern masculinity. So much so that Todd Reeser has argued that moderation was the defining feature of early modern masculinity. Moderation was manifested through self-control in a variety of arenas: it was through avoiding lack and resisting excess that men staked claims to manhood.[51] Indeed, this was one reason why manhood was closely associated with middle age, as a phase in the life cycle when men had outgrown youthful excess (particularly intemperance and pride) but not yet succumbed to the pettiness, covetousness, jealousy, and weakness frequently attributed to elderly men.[52]

Beyond the four cardinal virtues and the moderation they should generate in the men who cultivated them were other, associated characteristics that conferred manhood. In a world where most transactions were based on credit, honesty was seen as important to manhood.[53]

The prescriptive literature proclaimed that whoever wanted to be considered 'manly men and stoute harted' needed 'to bee good and playne men, louers of truth, and nothing at all deceiptefull'.[54] Another quality linked to manhood was liberality—'the honour of a Gentleman'—which was the mean between avarice and prodigality.[55] Men were expected to discern whom to reward, how much to spend according to their station, and so on. They were also commended for displaying magnanimity, which was usually defined, following Aristotle, as possessing greatness in mind and heart, treading the mean between haughtiness and lack of courage in one's convictions, or 'an amplenesse of a noble, and an vnconquerable stomacke, and a might and stoutnesse to commit valiaunt actes'.[56] Some writers stressed other commendable traits such as patience, constancy, sobriety, and compassion.[57]

The characteristics associated with masculinity more broadly also applied to early modern monarchs, on whom it was especially incumbent to display manly attributes and to enshrine ideals of manliness.[58] Political theory linked the well-ordered household to a well-ordered society, with failure on the part of the lead householder—the king—to uphold his own patriarchal authority threatening to undermine society as a whole.[59] As Glenn Richardson has discussed, performative physical prowess was important to the exercise of sixteenth-century adult male kingship. This played out not only in obvious arenas such as the battlefield, hunting chase, and tiltyard, but also on the dancefloor.[60] Those sixteenth-century English monarchs who were not adult males adopted compensatory strategies such as claiming the masculine virtues of prudence and temperance and reinforcing the patriarchal order through tournaments and other events.[61]

The Perfect Ambassador and Early Modern Manhood

The perceived manliness of their ambassadors was acutely important to monarchs. Within early modern European diplomatic theory an ambassador possessed representative character, he was 'invested with the personality of his sovereign'.[62] In other words, ambassadors were the physical stand-in of their princes whose speech and actions were *as if* performed by their ruler, while any injury or insult inflicted upon an ambassador was *as if* it had been perpetrated against the prince himself. Any failure of an ambassador to maintain acceptable levels of manliness therefore challenged his principal's own manhood. When the monarch was female the theory of the king's two bodies meant that the office of kingship remained male even if the personal body of the incumbent was not.[63] Moreover, claims to exceptional status were made for both Tudor queens. Those making such arguments included Alberico Gentili who claimed that other 'kings have the spirit of a woman, but this queen [Elizabeth I] that of a man'.[64] Consequently, the ambassador's duty to represent his monarch implicitly required him to meet expectations of manliness, regardless of the gender of his principal. From the ambassador's perspective this meant that he was not only expected to live up to the standards of hegemonic patriarchy as fully as other male heads of households, but that any failure to do so damaged not only his, but also his principal's reputation. How, then, did contemporary reflections on the role of ambassador deal with the key factors that impacted notions of early modern manhood?

Four tracts dealing with ambassadors and their behaviour were written during the reign of Elizabeth I by English men or by individuals who were associated with English diplomacy in some way. One, by Sir Henry Unton, who undertook two embassies in France in the 1590s, is not known to have survived.[65] The earliest known tract was composed in 1578 by the antiquarian Francis Thynne, who had no personal experience of diplomacy; it was not published until 1651.[66] The authors of the remaining two—Alberico Gentili and Jean Hotman—were both civil lawyers whose advice the Elizabethan government sought on diplomatic immunity; Hotman had additionally tutored the sons of Sir Amyas Paulet during Paulet's resident embassy in France.[67] Their texts were published in 1585 and 1603, respectively.[68] Although these three authors sometimes address the issue of an ambassador's

manhood indirectly, they all discuss male honour, virtues, and behaviour in terms similar to those used in the prescriptive literature for gentlemen. The emphasis they place on various manly attributes, however, was particular to the circumstances of embassy and constructed a notion of diplomatic manhood.

Thynne's tract deals least extensively with manly characteristics. His succinct discussion points to a wide-ranging set of attributes that invites a brief separate treatment before we consider the themes dealt with at greater length in the other books. Written as a thematically-organised collection of historical exempla used to illustrate more general points, *The perfect ambassadour* contained no concerted discussion of an ambassador's household management or other key elements that were core components in constructing masculinity at the time.[69] Instead, Thynne listed the attributes that he believed an ambassador should possess. His ambassador would be

> learned, well born, free, no bond-man, of good credit in respect of his honesty, of good estimation in respect of his calling, that he be no lyar, vaunter, dissembler, or Traytor; But that he be wise, valiant, circumspect, furnished with divers Languages, eloquent, of quick capacitie, of ready deliverance, liberall, comly of person, tall of stature, and briefly that he be adorned with all vertues required, or commendable, in a good man, and unfurnished of any vice to blemish his credit, or that may win him the Surname of a wicked man.[70]

While his list included many attributes associated with prescriptive ideals of manhood, Thynne did not expound upon most of these in any depth, concentrating his attention on practical skills associated with the conduct of diplomacy such as eloquence. It is clear, nonetheless, that Thynne's list of ambassadorial virtues aligned with ideals of elite manhood. Equally clear was Thynne's emphasis on the honour of public service.[71] Indeed, we could see the fact that four separate authors chose to dedicate treatises in whole or in large part to the role of ambassador as evidence that the increased emphasis on public service as a component of male honour resonated strongly.

Gentili and Hotman's discussions emphasised fortitude, prudence, and temperance from the four cardinal virtues associated with manliness. Gentili, who discussed the virtues at greatest length, devoting multiple chapters to them, set the bar high, requiring 'conspicuous bravery, notable temperance, and unique prudence'.[72] Indeed, he recommended that anyone who could not remain calm when threatened with violence should recognise this as a disqualification and refuse to undertake an embassy.[73] Courage, a constituent part of fortitude, was deemed a necessary virtue for ambassadors due to the dangers that could befall them during their embassies, dangers which Gentili and Hotman illustrated with examples from the ancient world, while Thynne dedicated a long chapter to the ways in which ambassadors had been attacked or killed on embassy.[74] Although many Tudor ambassadors complained of illnesses which they linked to their travels, only a very small proportion died during their embassies. While some breaches of diplomatic immunity, such as violations of ambassadors' personal property, were not uncommon, across Europe it was extremely rare for diplomats to be killed or attacked during their missions—when the French diplomats Antonio Rincón and Cesare Fregoso died at the hands of imperial troops it caused an international scandal.[75] The emphasis on the perils of embassy in the ambassadorial treatises therefore seems exaggerated, and begs the question of whether our authors were motivated to emphasise the danger and the fortitude required in order to make diplomatic service more appealing to men who might otherwise prefer to prove their manhood on the battlefield, or to flatter their dedicatees, all of whom had diplomatic experience.[76]

Prudence and temperance were discussed in terms linking them specifically to the demands of heading an embassy, leaving readers in no doubt that diplomatic service was one arena in which men might prove their possession of these cardinal virtues that were deemed so essential to notions of masculinity. Hotman's ambassador required prudence in order to ensure he would be well briefed before starting negotiations. He would also be adequately prepared in other areas such as departing promptly, taking over his predecessor's intelligence network, and discerning good from bad information, while a wise ambassador could be trusted to make autonomous decisions if expediency required it.[77] Gentili recommended that ambassadors strive to excel in 'shrewd analysis of the truth', take time to think things through properly, and make 'heroic efforts' to conduct all business prudently.[78] His somewhat abstract discussion of the methods of the prudent ambassador focussed on two issues: the ability to discern from whom to accept advice and the skill to know when and how to put a plan in motion.[79] His conviction that prudence was key to an ambassador's success, whatever his mission, was broadly shared across Europe.[80] Gentili viewed both prudence and temperance as virtues that modified and enhanced the others.[81] Inspired by Plato, he defined temperance as 'the quality which restrains us from avarice, gluttony, sensuality, and other allurements, and in short bridles and masters the concupiscent element in its manifold and varying forms'. By pursing temperance sufficiently, the ambassador would not act in a manner that degraded the dignity of the office.[82] Hotman's discussion of temperance while framed in more practical terms, followed a similar track: he advocated an ambassador exercise temperance in his personal affairs, his speech, his leisure activities, and his acceptance (or, if the ambassador followed Hotman's advice, more commonly refusal) of gifts.[83] Even the ambassador's bearing should be moderated to avoid haughtiness.[84] Hotman's combination of practical and theoretical considerations is clear in his discussion of a particular vice that epitomised unmanly excess—drunkenness. Here again, he emphasised that ambassadors should practice moderation, not least as 'wine and secrecie, are incompatible thinges'. Nevertheless, he acknowledged that the cultures of some northern European courts made abstention impossible.[85] In singling out inebriation for condemnation, Hotman was expressing contemporary concerns that the lack of control it brought about occasioned a loss of manhood and was therefore a threat to the social order.[86]

The masculine character of moderation also influenced discussions of the suitable age for an ambassador. In particular, the belief that in youth and old age men possessed an abundance or dearth of key character traits and thereby lacked the moderation needed for manhood exercised our writers. For Hotman, a man in middle age was best: young men were 'too humorous, light, and indiscreete' while old men were likely 'melancholie and diseased'.[87] Braham was more specific, recommending that his ambassador be between twenty-four and sixty years of age, arguing that younger men were too prodigal with money, while elderly men were covetous of riches. As both vices were unbecoming of ambassadors and ill-fitting with their duties of hospitality, Braham believed that only those who knew the value of money but had not yet succumbed to greed should be sent as ambassadors.[88] Meanwhile, for Gentili, young men were more prone to flaws of character such as being 'unsophisticated, gullible, easily hoodwinked' and inexperienced in life. Men of middle age or older, in contrast, were more likely to have developed the key quality required in an ambassador: prudence.[89] He did, however, concede that some truly exceptional younger men might be endowed with suitable character to serve on special embassies and did not recommend following the Chalcidians who had only appointed men aged fifty or over as diplomats.[90] Practical considerations also inspired some of the recommendations. Both Gentili and Hotman excluded youths from eligibility for diplomatic service on the grounds that age endowed men with valuable experience for the role. Hotman emphasised that men in middle age (or older) were more likely to have 'long experience of the affaires of the worlde', while Gentili prioritised foreign travel and 'long training in public business'.[91]

Gentili, Hotman, and Thynne had little to say on the physical attributes of an ambassador.[92] Hotman and Thynne only gave passing attention to the appearance of an ambassador. Thynne expected an ambassador to be 'comly of person, tall of stature', while Hotman warned against sending anyone with physical disabilities as they were likely to 'not be so acceptable' to the receiving prince.[93] Both related a popular jest Cato made about a Roman embassy to Bithynia—which comprised three ambassadors: one with a scarred head, one with diseased feet, and one who was not very smart—that it lacked head and feet.[94] Contemporaries were often not kind to those with physical disabilities—for instance Sir Robert Cecil, secretary of state and sometime ambassador, was ridiculed for his hunched back, which his detractors linked to moral and political failings.[95] Meanwhile, Gentili both followed ancient authors in praising beauty and professed that he would not 'say what measure of good looks I demand in a man and in an ambassador', just that he should be 'of good personal appearance'. He did, however, agree with Thynne on the question of height, noting that it helped if ambassadors had, like Jerome Bowes, whom Elizabeth had sent to Muscovy, 'a tall and distinguished figure' that gave 'an immediate impression of both vigor and courtesy'.[96] Braham perceptively believed that opinion on the matter of an ambassador's appearance would differ: some would consider 'comliness of body' requisite as it 'showeth forth the conning handiwork of god', but he emphasised that this was of secondary importance to developed social, political, and oratorical skills.[97] Only Gentili broached the particular topic of facial hair, warning that a long beard was no guarantee of other, more important character virtues required of an ambassador.[98]

The essential manly ability to maintain a well-run household was deemed crucial to an ambassador**.** Braham directly linked an ambassador's 'good housekeeping' to the honour of the prince sending him.[99] For Hotman, the inability to run a financially sound well-ordered household was a disqualification for overseas service. As he pertinently asked: 'how shall he performe a charge of importance, that knoweth not howe to guide his house and order his expence?'[100] He further stressed that a wise man would only undertake an embassy if he had personal resources upon which to draw, or if he had secured a sufficient allowance.[101] Our writers broke down household management into financial management, on the one hand, and ensuring that the members of the household, the ambassador's *famiglia*, behaved in a suitable manner, on the other. In order to ensure the smooth running of the embassy's financial affairs, in particular the ambassador living within his allowance, Hotman recommended that ambassadors be particularly careful when they picked the steward who would assist them.[102] He also emphasised that it was essential to an ambassador's reputation to honour his debts and maintain his credit.[103] Ambassadors were exhorted to tread a moderate path between niggardliness and prodigality when it came to financial affairs, for it was important to both their reputation and that of their principal to demonstrate an appropriate level of liberality.[104] While doing so, the ambassador was expected to maintain a suite, dispense hospitality, and a degree of display through 'horses, coaches, apparrell, and traine' that was commensurate with the honour of his principal.[105]An ambassador who had been overly bountiful with his guests might damage his own reputation and his successor was likely to run into problems as a consequence of this behaviour.[106]

Household discipline depended upon the ambassador's judicious choice of whom would be in his suite. Hotman warned of the need to reject men who were indiscrete or uncivil and to be especially careful when filling key positions of responsibility within the embassy, while Gentili rather optimistically advocated that the ambassador appoint a group of men who were all sufficiently wise and educated that any one of them might take on the role of ambassador if necessary.[107] Hotman discussed the topic at greater length than Gentili, outlining that the disposition of the ambassador played a key role in household discipline and that it was essential he lead by example: 'if himselfe be not temperate and stayed, hee presently openeth

(by his example) a doore vnto the disorders of his familie'.[108] He further recommended that an ambassador's wife should accompany him on embassy if possible to share the burden of managing the embassy household. As the ambassador would be very busy, her assistance would help prevent disorder in the household. A wife was not necessary, however, if he could trust a member of his retinue to help maintain discipline.[109]

Our writers also emphasised an aspect of manliness that was becoming increasingly prominent in the more general prescriptive literature: learning. Gentili and Hotman both underlined the importance of an ambassador being intelligent and well-educated, advocating that he be well-versed in history (especially political history), moral and political philosophy, have a practical education in politics and administration, and ideally also some background in civil law.[110] In keeping with the demands of diplomatic service, both authors emphasised the importance of eloquence and, either implicitly or explicitly, the education that inculcated such skills in a man.[111] The two authors diverged somewhat on the issue of language skills, with Gentili suggesting that ambassadors should be fluent in at least three languages—one of which must be the language of the court to which he was sent—while Hotman prioritised the host court's tongue and Latin.[112]

Readers familiar with early modern conduct books for gentlemen will be aware that several core themes addressed in such books are missing or largely absent from the discussion above. This is for the simple reason that the writers of books on ambassadors did not see fit to address the topic or did so only very briefly. Let us take one quick example. Sexual moderation, particularly the injunction that chastity should be practiced without marriage and continence within it, was a strong theme in the prescriptive literature for gentlemen, yet it was scarcely mentioned in our three tracts on ambassadors. Sexual incontinence was implicitly condemned in Thynne's work, which briefly lampooned a Florentine ambassador for trying (and failing) to sleep with Joanna queen of Naples for his foolishness.[113] Of the three authors, Hotman produced the longest discourse on the topic, including several lines on it in a broader discussion of need for ambassadors to moderate their pleasures. Warning that illicit affairs would bring 'scandale and reproch', he emphasised that attempting to ruin the honour of women 'of good name' could bring additional dangers from their enraged husbands and fathers.[114] Some continental authors were less coy, explicitly counselling against the use of prostitutes.[115]

Other topics that featured prominently in the conduct literature for gentlemen, such as the relationship between husbands and wives, were similarly lacking in the ambassadorial works. There could be two possible explanations for this, which are not mutually exclusive. The authors may have assumed that ambassadors should follow the advice of other prescriptive literature on this topic or they may not have thought sufficiently about the prospect of an ambassador having a wife with him during his embassy. In the first half of the sixteenth century it was rare for English ambassadors to be accompanied by their wives, not least as a significant proportion were clergymen who were expected to be celibate.[116] During Elizabeth's reign the appointment of clerics to diplomatic postings ceased and, from the middle of the sixteenth century, it became more common for resident ambassadors to be joined by their wives for at least some of their tenure; indeed, this was the case for many of Elizabeth's residents in France, one of only three residencies still maintained by the queen at the time of her death. But elsewhere, and during special embassies which were typically of much shorter duration than residencies, the presence of an ambassadress in an English embassy was the exception not the norm under the Tudors.[117] So while it would not have been unreasonable to consider the topic by the time that Gentili, Hotman, and Thynne were writing, it was also not so common a practice that it would have been considered essential to include it.

Manhood in Practice

Diplomacy was one arena in which circumstances might fall short of some aspects of the prescriptive ideal. Fortunately for ambassadors, early modern masculinity was flexible and adaptable, leaving space for men who could not fully conform to the prescriptive literature's ideals of manhood to claim manliness in other ways or, more pertinently for ambassadors, to emphasise those aspects of normative manhood they could attain during their embassies.[118] The challenges were multiple and varied from ambassador to ambassador. Space precludes a full exploration of the topic, so what follows will briefly explore three areas in practice: learning, physical prowess, and household management.

The emphasis on an ambassador's scholarly credentials that we find in the works by Gentili, Hotman, and Thynne, and which clearly resonated with the link between education and manliness, is also found in the self-presentation of many Tudor ambassadors. Edmund Harvel, Henry VIII's resident agent and then ambassador in Venice throughout the 1530s and 1540s, deliberately cultivated a reputation for patronizing English and Italian scholars.[119] Daniel Rogers, who undertook a range of special missions to northern Europe in the 1570s and 1580s wrote copious poetry, including many verses devoted to the politicians and scholars he encountered during his travels, and many others devoted to his fellow Elizabethan diplomats.[120] Shared scholarly interests and regularly shared poetry and political treatises created close links between the ambassadors in Elizabeth's network of residents in the early years of her reign.[121] A portrait of one of these scholar-diplomats, Sir Thomas Chaloner, whose poetry was circulated at the University of Alcalá during his residency at Philip II's court, clearly presents him as choosing learning over material gain, a message reinforced by a Latin inscription most likely of his own devising.[122] The decision to emphasise this aspect of an ambassador's reputation was also taken by family members, as the extraordinary memorial portrait Dorothy Unton commissioned for her husband—a two-time diplomat and sometime soldier—after his death illustrates. The large panel narrates key aspects of Sir Henry Unton's life, including one of his missions to France and his time at Oxford, which were accompanied by an illustration of his service on the battlefield.[123]

Our three ambassadorial treatises were all but silent on the physical activities associated with the performance of elite masculinity. This is probably for the simple reason that the ostensibly peaceful nature of embassy mitigated against martial display, and heading an embassy did not offer many opportunities for ambassadors to display their manliness through physical prowess. Thus, one important means by which kings and their male subjects exhibited their manhood to their peers was largely denied ambassadors. On the rare occasions when sixteenth-century English ambassadors took up arms (or attempted to) on their own initiative, the notion of representative character made their actions highly problematic for their monarch, even when they did so to protect their, or their principal's honour. The activities of Henry Unton during his first mission to France between August 1591 and June 1592 exemplify how violent expressions of manhood could be incompatible with honourably upholding the monarch's reputation, despite the ambassador's best intentions. Attending upon the military court of Henry IV as he campaigned to bring the country under his control, Unton regularly donned armour and fought alongside the king. Equally problematically, he repeatedly challenged the Duke of Guise to a duel as Guise had disparaged Queen Elizabeth's honour. The representative character that Unton possessed as ambassador meant that any wound he sustained in battle was as if Elizabeth had been struck herself. Moreover, contemporary works on honour detailed that some injuries enhanced and some degraded a man's honour. Thus, there was an additional danger that Elizabeth's reputation would be harmed if Unton sustained a dishonourable injury from another ruler's subject. Issuing a challenge to defend Elizabeth's honour from the Duke of Guise's slurs endangered it in practice for these same reasons. In both scenarios there were complicated questions about the extent to which diplomatic immunity would apply.[124] It is ironic then, that Unton's behaviour emerged from the chivalric military

culture in which he operated and which was enhanced, rather than undermined, by the monarch being a woman.

There were, however, exceptions to the rule that the duties of embassy rarely involved displays of masculine force. Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, jousted with aplomb at the tournament held to celebrate Mary Tudor's coronation as queen of France during his special embassy in November 1514. His fellow ambassador Thomas Grey, Marquis of Dorset, also participated in the competition, reporting that he 'ende[d] w[ith]out any maner hurte mi lord of Suff is a litill hurte in his hande'. This embassy was far from the norm in one key respect. The two noblemen had been chosen because the Dauphin (the future Francis I) had issued a challenge and they were renowned jousters. Their triumphs in the field repaid the king's confidence in their abilities: Dorset reported that Louis XII claimed that 'my lorde a Sufehoke and I dyde s[h]ame aule Franse'. This goes some way to explain why there seems to have been few concerns about how Dorset and Suffolk's performance might reflect upon Henry's own masculinity. The ambassadors were eager to protect both their own honour and their king's, however. This saw them refuse to participate on days when there were no aristocratic opponents for them.[125]

As the above examples suggest, ambassadors or their families might choose to emphasise specific or multiple characteristics of their honour and manhood. The case of Brandon and Dorset's jousting embassy moreover reveals that the processes of diplomacy also presented opportunities for ambassadors to shape their reputations, not merely in the actions they performed, but also in the texts they produced as part of embassy business. This was particularly important for resident ambassadors whose long absence from English courtly life could potentially lead to decreased influence and reputation. Many English ambassadors therefore utilized the textual tools they had at their disposal for self-promotion and reputation management. For instance, the structure and contents of the letter book of Henry Unton's first embassy sought to exonerate him from the varied and numerous criticisms of his conduct.[126] In a diplomatic system where all parties recognised the need to record the speeches, discussion, actions, and reactions of participants in diplomatic interactions carefully, ambassadors' letters were a malleable vehicle for self-presentation.[127] Affirmations of manhood (or anxieties about it) could easily be woven into ambassadors missives as they reported on the activities of their host court and some courtly activities proved more fertile grounds for doing so than others.

Precisely because kings saw encounters with ambassadors as occasions on which they could assert their manliness and compete for international status, ambassadors were invited to join them hunting and hawking on a fairly regular basis.[128] Francis I, whose relationship with Henry VIII was famously competitive, regularly asked English ambassadors to join him in various forms of hunting.[129] Even at courts presided over by women, ambassadors were invited to hunt and hawk with their hosts and thereby demonstrate their physical prowess, as John Hackett and Thomas Randolph found respectively at the courts of the Regent of the Netherlands in the early 1530s and Mary, Queen of Scots, in the early 1560s.[130] Furthermore, courtly sociability could entail invitations to hunt with various courtiers and potentates.[131] Aristocratic blood sports were therefore the main acceptable physical outlet for ambassadors to prove their own masculinity to their host court. Sir William Fitzwilliam, who served as English resident to the French court from January 1521 to February 1522, is an instructive case of how claims to manhood were staked on the one hand and how the ambassador's ability in this forum and the reputation of his principal could be intertwined on the other. During one hunting expedition he had been interrogated about 'how to knowe an harte' so thoroughly that 'it fortuned soe that they well p[er]ceyved that he that taught me was a maistre', only for Fitzwilliam to reveal to the group that he had learned everything he knew from Henry VIII himself.[132] As this suggests, ambassadors could affirm their manliness by reporting to potentates back in England not just that they had engaged in such pursuits, but also how they

had performed while doing so. In a letter Fitzwilliam sent to Cardinal Wolsey, the ambassador expressed his belief that his hunting and hawking skills gave him greater access to the French king and the Admiral respectively, he was both relaying information that might be useful in the future about the sort of ambassador the French king liked and ensuring that Wolsey heard of his own prowess.[133] This was not the only strategy ambassadors employed in order to self-fashion in ways that suggested that they possessed a mastery of hunting. Through their conversations with rulers about hunting and hawking (and their reports of those discussions) they could display expert knowledge of techniques and quarry to audiences at their host court and the monarch and his or her advisers in England.[134] Equally, they could try to impress the recipients of their reports by detailing any new or different methods that they encountered at foreign courts.[135]

If the mark of a man was his ability to maintain a solvent, well-ordered patriarchal household, then numerous English ambassadors would have had reason enough to be anxious about their masculinity.[136] Throughout the sixteenth century, resident ambassadors, in particular, repeatedly lamented their dire financial circumstances. Although the majority of residents across the century were of gentle status and relatively wealthy, they often did not have extensive personal reserves upon which to draw to mitigate the problem.[137] Particularly in the first six decades of the century, complaints about the late payment of diets, and the consequent embarrassment and dishonour of pecuniary distress were common. Four years into his resident embassy with the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I, Sir Robert Wingfield lamented that it had been so long since he had received his diets from the king that he had exhausted his own credit 'to my great unhartis ease and noothinge to the kynges honnor'.[138] Almost forty years later, Sir John Mason claimed during a residency in France that 'I ame so destitute as never was their [in] any courte a more miserable Ambassadour'.[139] Another resident, Richard Sampson, found himself in a similarly untenable position in Spain in 1523, explaining to the king's chief minister Cardinal Wolsey that his diets of twenty shillings *per diem* and 'all that I have yet off myn own lyving wyll not suffice me here except that I shuld doo as yet they speke off thamb spynell serch my dynar and suppar daly now in oon place and now in som othir'.[140]

Such expressions of distress were not uncommon, but were they justified? By invoking the alleged dishonourable behaviour of his predecessor Thomas Spinelly, Sampson may have intended to prompt Wolsey into action, but his doing so suggests a longer-term deficiency in the way the embassy was funded. Certainly, if one were to trace the ability of the English government to get resident ambassadors' diets to them in a timely manner it would be a story of repeated, but not complete failure. The case of Sir Amyas Paulet, English ambassador to the French king from October 1576 to October 1579, is telling here. Paulet was held up by Gentili as an ambassador whose liberality and hospitality had been widely commended.[141] He drew upon some of his own resources, as well as his allowance maintaining his household. When his budget was unexpectedly stretched, such as when he needed to maintain both his main household and support some of its members in Blois, he requested that these additional expenses be met.[142] Later, despite his fears that following the French king on progress would prove prohibitively expensive, he willingly admitted that household expenditure was much more manageable in the country.[143] Yet only two months later, money was so tight that he could scarcely afford to loan a visiting English nobleman an ambling nag.[144] As he perceptively observed when first confronted with the expense of Paris life 'I can be undon but once'—only one financial disgrace would damage his honour and credit.[145] Gary Bell rightly argued that the situation improved in the last three decades of the century, when resident ambassadors were more regularly paid in a timely manner; he also downplayed any short-term pecuniary distress experienced by Tudor ambassadors because, when their overseas service ended, the individuals concerned often acquired higher office domestically that came with large monetary rewards.[146]

But the promise of future financial reward did not help pay the bills and we would be wise not to overlook the cultural codes of early modern courts. Inadequate financial resources damaged the honour of the individual diplomat and, by casting into question his ability to manage his household, threatened his status as a patriarchal householder. By extension, it also damaged the honour of his principal.

Further evidence of the importance of maintaining the household appropriately emerges from a series of accusations and counter accusations made by the Henrician ambassadors Sir Thomas Wyatt, Edmund Bonner, and Stephen Gardiner in the late 1530s. These accusations all arose from two missions undertaken by Bonner: a special embassy to Charles V, which overlapped with Wyatt's residency, and his appointment as resident ambassador to the French court, where he succeeded Gardiner. When Bonner wanted to bring into question Wyatt's suitability as his fellow ambassador at the imperial court, one of the charges he levelled was that Wyatt managed his diplomatic household ineffectively, licentiously, and dishonourably. He accused Wyatt of not being a 'good husband' when managing his expenses, wasting money, and openly complaining that his diets from the king were wildly inadequate; moreover, he alleged that Wyatt and his secretary were engaging in extra-marital sexual relations with nuns and prostitutes respectively.[147] Wyatt in turn accused Bonner of 'unmanerly behhavyour', being pompous, and using mules to get around when he could easily have walked, and implied that the cleric had succumbed to the charms of a woman on the ship they had travelled in together.[148] Upon arriving at the French court, Bonner was met by accusations from Gardiner—who had heard from other diplomats of Bonner's behaviour—that he had behaved niggardly while in Spain and for his part Bonner claimed that Gardiner was ungenerous, unhospitable, and intemperate. Worse still, Bonner alleged that Gardiner's pride led him to insist that only he entertain if there were multiple ambassadors, which brought the king's honour into question, as it suggested that the English king only gave his ambassadors enough money for one of them to maintain a table.[149] Given the importance of ambassadorial hospitality to early modern diplomacy, such behaviour would also limit the ability of the ambassadors to operate effectively.[150] Crucially for our understanding of the relationship between masculinity and diplomacy, regardless of who was accusing whom, the accusations centred around the association between dishonour and either mismanaged household expenditure or disorderly conduct or both.

Conclusion

There was a significant overlap between the construction of masculinity in early modern books for gentlemen and those specifically dealing with ambassadors. To some extent this is no surprise—it was not just Humfrey Braham who believed that gentlemen should undertake embassies. What we see in Gentili's and Hotman's tracts is the application of notions of manhood to the particular activities at the heart of diplomacy, or to put it another way, a particularly diplomatic construction of manhood. Their treatises suggested to their readers that diplomacy was an arena in which masculinity could be proven, just as it could on the battlefield. If they emphasised the dangers involved in diplomatic service, it merely served to establish that those undertaking it ably must possess the key masculine quality of fortitude, thus downplaying the potential incompatibility between the ways in which fortitude was usually displayed and the practical circumstances of embassy. The potential gap between the prescriptive models of normative manhood and the actual experience of everyday diplomatic duties may have led ambassadors to emphasise certain aspects of their profile and activities where a component of the ideal of manliness and the expectations of them as ambassadors could happily overlap. Their learning and prowess with words and languages was one area where such compensatory strategies were adopted.

Recent scholarship has emphasised that ambassadors could pursue personal agendas alongside their official ones, agendas which were concerned with protecting and enhancing their personal honour and status.[151] Maintaining their manly reputation was no doubt of significant concern to diplomats, if their frequent expressions of anxiety about the possibility of loss of personal honour due to financial depredation are any indication. It was often in the less formal paradiplomatic activities such as hunting and hospitality that ambassadors found opportunities to validate their masculinity. Moreover, several, such as William Fitzwilliam, utlized the formal mechanics of diplomacy in order to stake claims to the physical side of manhood at home and abroad. Ambassadors used their letters to significant domestic politicians to fashion their reputations and at least some later Tudor ambassadors exploited their letter books to create a positive image for posterity.

Understanding that manhood and male honour were important to early modern diplomats, as well as their principals, encourages us to re-evaluate several aspects of diplomatic practice. Take, for instance, the way in which we should approach the regularity and adequacy of ambassadorial diets. At the very least the link between manhood and household management should make us take more seriously the financial plight of many ambassadors, who were concerned over their immediate ability to do their job properly and to maintain their own and their prince's honour and the longer-term implications for their reputations, regardless of any rewards they may have hoped for upon their return.[152] The ambassador's personal interests in effective fiscal management largely coincided with his prince's when it came to the embassy household, but when multiple ambassadors coincided at the same court their individual efforts could be mutually undermining, rather than mutually reinforcing. Moreover, there were instances where privately held conceptions of appropriate expressions of manly behaviour were less than compatible with monarchical notions of diplomatic representation. Individually-held ideas of masculinity could lead ambassadors to take courses of action of which their rulers strongly disapproved and which ultimately threatened to harm the very honour of the prince they were supposed to uphold, as the case of our putatively duelling diplomat, Henry Unton, reveals.

More broadly, the evidence presented here suggests that scholars would be well advised to give greater consideration to masculinity in diplomatic practice and diplomatic texts. At the very least we need to be attuned to the ways that concerns about manhood have shaped the records that have come down to us. As the cases above suggest, ambassadors' concerns over their masculinity have shaped the documentary records ambassadors have left us: their letters are rife with information about their masculine performances in the physical pursuits of the court, as well as their concerns of falling short of contemporary notions of responsible household management that were associated with patriarchal manhood. The context discussed here may specifically be sixteenth-century English diplomacy, but similar issues were at stake—undoubtedly with specific contextual nuances—across all diplomatic corps in this period. Manhood was a constitutive factor in honour and as such deserves closer scholarly attention as a significant aspect of the lived experiences of diplomats.

---

* I would like to thank Florian Kühnel, Glyn Redworth, and Ruggero Scuito for their comments.

[1] Alberico Gentili, *De legationibus libri tres*, trans Gordon J. Laing (New York: Oxford University Press, 1924), II.201.

[2] Brief details of their missions are given in Gary M. Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives 1509–1688* (London: Boydell & Brewer, 1990), 58, 90–1, 94–6, 135, 182, 186–7, 247, 256.

[3] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.vi. On Sidney and Gentili's connection see Joanna Craigwood, 'Sidney, Gentili, and the Poetics of Embassy', in Robyn Adams and Rosanna Cox (eds.), *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 82–100.

[4] For example, J. A. Van Dorsten, Arthur F. Kinney, and Dominic Baker-Bates, *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend* (Leiden: Brill, 1986); Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney: Courtier Poet* (New

Haven: Yale University Press, 1991); Blair Worden, *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's Arcadia and Elizabethan Politics* (London: Yale University Press, 1996).

[5] Edmund Spenser, *The shepheardes calender conteyning tvvelue aeglogues proportionable to the twelue monethes* (London: Hugh Singleton, 1579).

[6] See for example Thomas Churchyard, *The epitaph of Sir Phillip Sidney Knight, lately Lord Gouernour of Floshing* (London: George Robertson for Thomas Cadman, 1586); Angel Day, *Vpon the life and death of the most worthy, and thrise renowmed knight, Sir Phillip Sidney a commemoration of his worthines, contayning a briefe recapitulation, of his valiant vsage and death taken, in her Maiesties seruices of the warres in the Low-countries of Flaunders* (London: Robert Waldegrave, 1586).

[7] On martial values and masculinity see for example Peter Sherlock, 'Militant Masculinity and the Monuments of Westminster Abbey', in Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline van Gent (ed.), *Governing Masculinities in the Early Modern Period: Regulating Selves and Others* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 131–52; David J. B. Trim, '" Warlike Prowesse and manly courage": Martial Conduct and Masculine Identity in Late Tudor and Early Stuart England', in Matthew Woodcock and Cian O'Mahony (eds.), Early Modern Military *Identities, 1560-1639: Reality and Representation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 25–55.

[8] For an overview of recent developments in diplomatic history see Tracey A. Sowerby, 'Early Modern Diplomatic History', *History Compass*, xiv (2016), 441–456 <doi: 10.1111/hic3.12329>; Jan Hennings and Tracey A. Sowerby, 'Introduction: Practices of Diplomacy', in Tracey A. Sowerby and Jan Hennings (eds.), *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World, c.1410–1800* (London: Routledge, 2017), 1–21.

[9] Joyceleyne G. Russell, *Diplomats at Work: Three Renaissance Studies* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1992), 94–152; John Watkins, *After Lavinia: A Literary History of Premodern Marriage Diplomacy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2017).

[10] Anuschka Tischer, 'Eine franzosische Botschafterin in Polen 1645–1646: Die Gesandtschaftsreise Renee de Guebriants zum Hofe Wladislaws IV.', *L'Homme*, xii (2001), 305–21; Lucien Bély, *L'art de la paix en Europe: Naissance de la diplomatie moderne* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2007), 213–24; Corinna Bastian, Eva K. Dade, Hillard von Thiessen, and Christian Windler (eds.), *Das Geschlecht der Diplomatie: Geschlechterrollen in den Außenbeziehungen com Spätmittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Cologne: Bohlau, 2014); Glenda Sluga and Carolyn James (eds.), *Women, Diplomacy and International Politics since 1500* (London: Routledge, 2016); Florian Kühnel, '"Minister-like Cleverness, Understanding and Influence on Affairs": Ambassadresses in Everyday Business and Courtly Ceremonies at the Turn of the Eighteenth Century', in Sowerby and Hennings (eds.), *Practices of Diplomacy*, 130–46; Gemma Allen, 'The Rise of the Ambassadress: English Ambassadorial Wives and Early Modern Diplomatic Culture', *The Historical Journal*, lxii (2019), 617–38.

[11] Dorothea Nolde, 'Was ist Diplomatie und wenn ja, wie viele? Herausforderungen und Perspektiven einer Geschlechtergeschichte der frühneuzeitlichen Diplomatie', *Historische Anthropologie*, xxi (2013), esp. 195–8; Tracey A. Sowerby, 'Sir Henry Unton (c. 1558–1596), Elizabeth I (r. 1558–1603) and Chivalric Diplomacy', in Roberta Anderson, Laura Olivan Santaliestra, and Suna Suner (eds.), *Gender and Diplomacy: Women and Men in European Embassies from the 15th to the 18th Century* (Vienna: Hollitzer, 2020), 93–114.

[12] Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England, 1500–1700* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014; 2nd edn); Elizabeth A. Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (London: Routledge, 2014; 2nd edn); Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Keith M. Botelho, *Renaissance Earwitnesses: Rumor and Early Modern Masculinity* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009); Courtney Erin Thomas, *If I Lose Honour I Lose Myself: Honour Among the Early Modern English Elite* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), esp. 25–75.

[13] See for example Bernard S. Capp, '"Jesus Wept" But Did the Englishman? Masculinity and Emotion in Early Modern England', *Past & Present*, ccxxiv (2014) 75–108; Kirsten Gibson, 'Age, Masculinity and Music in Early Modern England', in Catherine Haworth and Lisa Colton (eds.), *Gender, Age and Musical Creativity* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 41–59; Linda P. Austern, 'Domestic Song and the Circulation of Masculine Social Energy in Early Modern England', in Leslie C. Dunn and Katherine R. Larson (eds.), *Gender and Song in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 123–38; Will Fisher, '"Had it a codpiece, 'twere a man indeed": The Codpiece as Constitutive Accessory in Early Modern English Culture', in Bella Mirabella (ed.), *Ornamentalism: The Art of Renaissance Accessories* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan University Library, 2011), 102–29. See also Tim Reinke-Williams, 'Manhood and Masculinity in Early Modern England', *History Compass*, xii (2014), 685–93 < https://doi.org/10.1111/hic3.12188 > .

[14] See András Kiséry, 'Diplomatic Knowledge on Display: Foreign Affairs in the Early Modern English Public Sphere', in Tracey A. Sowerby and Joanna Craigwood (eds.), *Cultures of Diplomacy and Literary Writing in the Early Modern World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 146–59.

[15] Humfrey Braham, *The institucion of a gentleman* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1555), F5r–G1v.

[16] A largely complete list of embassies sent by English monarchs from 1509 can be found in Bell's *Handlist*.

[17] On Europe in general and the aristocratization of diplomacy in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries see Hamish Scott, 'Diplomatic Culture in Old Regime Europe', in Hamish Scott (ed.), *Cultures of Power in Old Regime Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 58–85; Hillard von Thiessen, 'Diplomaten und Diplomatie im frühen 18. Jahrhundert', in Heinz Durchhardt and Martin Espenhorst (eds.), *Utrecht – Rastatt – Baden 1712–1714: Ein europäisches Friedenswerk am Ende des Zeitalters Ludwig XIV* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 21–9; Hamish Scott and Paul Dover, 'The Emergence of Diplomacy', in Hamish Scott (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern European History 1350–1750: Volume II: Cultures and Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 663–95. On the importance of aristocracy in some areas earlier in the seventeenth century see Hillard von Thiessen, 'Diplomatie vom *type ancien*: Überlegungen zu einem Idealtypus des frühneuzeitlichen Gesandtschaftswesens', in Hillard von Thiessen and Christian Windler (eds.), *Akteure der Außenbeziehungen: Netzwerke und Interkulturalität im historischen Wandel* (Cologne: Bohlau, 2010), 471–503.

[18] This is easily deduced from Bell's *Handlist*.

[19] For a recent discussion of several of Henry VII's ambassadors see Steven J. Gunn, *Henry VII's New Men and the Making of Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 93–7. For a discussion of the increased proportion of gentry engaged in Elizabethan diplomacy see Gary M. Bell, 'Elizabethan Diplomacy: The Subtle Revolution', in Malcolm R. Thorp and Arthur J. Slavin (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Honour of DeLamar Jensen* (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994), 267–88.

[20] Foyster, *Masculinities*, 5.

[21] Fletcher, *Gende*r, 126, 142.

[22] Ibid., 101–25; Foyster, *Masculinities*, 3–5; Shepard, *Meanings*, 52–85.

[23] Fletcher, *Gender*, 103–11; Foyster, *Masculinities*, 55–114; Shepard, *Meanings*, 70–91.

[24] Fletcher, *Gender*, 139–44; Foyster, *Masculinities*, 37–8; Shepard, *Meanings*, 186–213.

[25] Fletcher, *Gender*, 129–35; Foyster, *Masculinities*, 30–1; Roger Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 4–56.

[26] Braham, *Institucion*, H2r–I4v; Thomas Elyot, *The boke named the Governour* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1537), H2v–I4v, M4r–M5v.

[27] Jennifer A. Low, *Manhood and the Duel: Masculinity in Early Modern Drama and Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Markku Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness, and Honour* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[28] Trim, '"Warlike prowess"'; Fletcher, *Gender*, 129–31; Rory Rapple, *Martial Power and Elizabethan Political Culture: Military Men in England and Ireland, 1558–1594* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[29] Braham, *Institucion*, D8r.

[30] For example Steven J. Gunn, 'Chivalry and the Politics of the Early Tudor Court', in Sydney Anglo (ed.), *Chivalry in the Renaissance* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990), 107–28; Richard Cust, 'Chivalry and the Elizabethan Gentleman', in Malcolm Smuts (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of the Age of Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 458–76; Richard McCoy, *The Rites of Knighthood: The Literature and Politics of Elizabethan Chivalry* (London: University of California Press, 1989).

[31] Fletcher, *Gender*, 127–8; Foyster, *Masculinities*, 37–8, 115–21. See also Richard Cust, 'The "Public Man" in Late Tudor and Early Stuart England', in Peter Lake and Steve Pincus (eds.). *The Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 116–43.

[32] The figures given are based on information in the English Short Title Catalogue and Universal Short Title Catalogue. The Latin imprints of *De officiis* were varied—not all included the whole work and several printed it as part of a larger collection of Cicero's works.

[33] Cicero, *Marcus Tullius Ciceroes thre bokes of duties*, trans. Nicholas Grimald (London: Richard Tottel, 1556), ¶4r. On Cecil, see Henry Peacham, *The compleat gentleman fashioning him absolute in the most necessary & commendable qualities concerning minde or bodie that may be required in a noble gentleman* (London: John Legat for Francis Constable,1622), H1r.

[34] Braham, *Institucion*, D3v–G7r.

[35] Ibid., F3r.

[36] David J. B. Trim, 'The Art of War: Martial Poetics from Henry Howard to Philip Sidney', in Cathy Shrank and Mike Pincombe (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature: 1485–1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 587–605; Fiona S. Dunlop, 'Mightier than the Sword: Reading, Writing and Noble Masculinity in the Early Sixteenth Century', in Elizabeth L'Esrange and Alison More (eds.), *Representing Medieval Genders and Sexualities in Europe: Construction, Transformation, and Subversion, 600–1530* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 161–72.

[37] See the discussion in Foyster, *Masculinities*, 8–9, 31–2, 38–9; Shepard, *Meanings*, 1–19.

[38] Braham, *Institucion*, esp. B6v–D3v.

[39] William Turner, *A nevv booke of spirituall physik for dyuerse diseases of the nobilitie and gentlemen of Englande, made by William Turner doctor of Physik* (Emden: [Egidius van der Erve], 1555); B3v–B4r.

[40] See for example Elyot, *Boke named the Governour*; Braham, *Institucion*, A8v–B2r, B7r–B7v, C4r–D3v; Giovanni Battista Nenna, *Nennio, or A treatise of Nobility Wherein is discoursed what true nobilitie is*, trans. William Jones (London: Peter Short for Paule Linley and John Flasket); Henry Crosse, *Vertues Common-wealth:* or *The high-way to honour* (London: Thomas Creede for John Newbery,1603), C4r–D1r , M3v–M4r.
[41] Braham, *Institucion*, B5v.
[42] Some authors saw the four virtues as joining together to make one true virtue. See Crosse, *Vertues Common-wealth*, B2r, C2r; Cornelius Valerius, *The Casket of Iewels: Contaynynge a playne description of Morall Philophie*, trans. John Chardon (London: William How for Richard Johnes, 1571), Dvr.
[43] Elyot, *Boke named the Governour*, U4r–U5r; Crosse, *Vertues Common-wealth*, B3r; John Bossewell, *Workes of armorie deuyded into three books* (London: Richard Tottell, 1572), A5v.
[44] Braham, *Institucion*, D5r; Crosse, *Vertues Common-wealth*, B3v–4r; Cicero, *Thre bokes of duties*, D2r. Quotation from Bossewell, *Workes of armorie*, A6v.
[45] Elyot, *Boke named the Governour*, Z3v–Z4r; Valerius, *Casket of Iewels*, H7r.
[46] Valerius, *Casket of Iewels*, H8r.
[47] Elyot, *Boke named the Governour*, K6v; Crosse, *Vertues Common-wealth*, B2v.
[48] Bossewell, *Workes of armorie*, A4v.
[49] Ibid., A7v–A8r; Crosse, *Vertues Common-wealth*, C1v, F3v.
[50] Crosse, *Vertues Common-wealth*, C1v.
[51] Todd W. Reeser, *Moderating Masculinity in Early Modern Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).
[52] Shepard, *Meanings*, 21–46.
[53] Ibid., 152–86.
[54] Bossewell, *Workes of armorie*, A7r. See also the nearly identical passage in Cicero, *Thre bokes of duties*, D1v.
[55] Valerius, *Casket of Iewels*, G5r–7v. Quotation from Crosse, *Vertues Common-wealth*, K1r.
[56] Elyot, *Boke named the Governour*, Aa7r–Aa8r; Braham, *Institucion*, D4r. Quotation from Valerius, *Casket of Iewels*, I1r.
[57] Patience: Elyot, *Boke named the Governour*, Aa2r–Aa3v; Valerius, *Casket of Iewels*, I2r–I4r. Constancy: Elyot, *Boke named the Governour*, Cc2v–Cc5v. Sobriety: ibid., Dd1v–Dd2v. Compassion: Valerius, *Casket of Iewels*, G4r–G4v.
[58] Susan Doran, 'Monarchy and Masculinity in Early Modern England', in Christopher Fletcher, Sean Brady, Rachel E. Moss, and Lucy Riall (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Masculinity and Political Culture in Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 201–23.
[59] Ibid., 202.
[60] See Glenn Richardson's article in this special issue and his 'Boys and their Toys: Kingship, Masculinity and Material Culture in the Sixteenth Century', in Sean McGlynn and Elena Woodacre (eds.), *The Image and Perception of Monarchy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2014), 183–206.
[61] Doran, 'Monarchy', 209–14. The theory that a well-ordered commonwealth comprised a collective of well-ordered households can be found for example in Crosse, *Vertues Common-wealth*, V2v.
[62] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.139. For an overview of the development of representative character in the late Middle Ages see Donald Queller, *The Office of Ambassador in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), 99–101.
[63] See for example the discussion in Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 121–48.
[64] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.iv.
[65] Mark Greengrass, 'Unton [Umpton], Sir Henry (c.1558–1596)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) <https://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2095/10.1093/ref:odnb/28001>.
[66] References to Thynne's work are to the 1652 edition: Francis Thynne, *The perfect ambassadour treating of the antiquitie, priveledges, and behaviour of men belonging to that function* (London: Printed for John Colbeck, 1652).
[67] Linda Frey and Marsha Frey, *The History of Diplomatic Immunity* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1999), 167–74.
[68] Alberico Gentili, *De legationibus libri tres* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1585); Jean Hotman, *Ambassador* (London: Valentine Simms for James Shawe, 1603). Book III of *De legationibus* focuses on ambassadors. There is a large literature on Gentili, which largely focuses on his writings on international law. On Homan's tract see Lucien Bély, 'La polémique autour de *L'Ambassadeur* de Jean Hotman: culture et diplomatie au temps de la paix de Lyon', *Cahiers d'histoire*, xlvi (2001), 327–54.
[69] See Tracey A. Sowerby, 'Francis Thynne's *Perfect ambassadour* and the Construction of Diplomatic Thought in Elizabethan England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, lxxxii (2020), 539–57.

[70] Thynne, *Perfect ambassdour*, B4r–v.
[71] Ibid., D10r, I1r, I3r–I3v, I5v, I9r.
[72] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.200.
[73] Ibid., II.182.
[74] Ibid., II.164–5; Hotman, *Ambassador*, E1v–E2r; Thynne, *Ambassadour*, E2v–F7v. Thynne used the terms stout and valiant, rather than courage or fortitude (*ibid*. B4r, I8r).
[75] On the Rincón-Fregoso affair see Megan K. Willians, 'Re-Orienting a Renaissance Diplomatic Cause Celebre: The 1541 Rincón-Fregoso Affair', in Szymon Brzeziński and Áron Zarnóczki (ed.), *A Divided Hungary in Europe: Exchanges, Networks and Representations, 1541–1699, Volume 2: Diplomacy, Information Flow and Cultural Exchange* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 11–30.
[76] The French original of Hotman's work was dedicated to Nicolas de Neufville, signeur de Villeroy, who had accrued extensive negotiating experience and who dealt with ambassadors' reports and instructions as secretary of state: Jean Hotman, *L'Ambassadeur* (s.n, 1603). The English translation was dedicated to William, earl of Pembroke who had no diplomatic credentials at the time. Thynne dedicated his work to William Brooke, Lord Cobham, who had led several special embassies.
[77] Hotman, *Ambassador*, C8r–C8v, D2r, F3r–F3v, F5r, G3r.
[78] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.169–72.
[79] Ibid., II.192–7.
[80] See Daniela Frigo, 'Prudence and Experience: Ambassadors and Political Culture in Early Modern Italy', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, xxxviii (2008) esp. 24–6.
[81] Ibid., II.172, 182.
[82] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.165, 168.
[83] Hotman, *Ambassador*, D6r–D6v, D7v–D8r. Gentili also believed that a prudent and temperate ambassador would largely refuse gifts: Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.166–8, 189–91.
[84] Hotman, *Ambassador*, E3r.
[85] Ibid., D7r.
[86] See Alexandra Shepard, '"Swil-Bols and Tos-Pots": Drink Culture and Male Bonding in England, *c.*1560–1640', in Laura Gowing, Michael Hunter, and Miri Rubin (eds.), *Love, Friendship and Faith in Europe 1300–1800* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 110–30.
[87] Hotman, *Ambassador*, C4v.
[88] Braham, *Institucion*, D6r–v.
[89] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.170.
[90] Ibid., II.170–1.
[91] Hotman, *Ambassador*, C4v; Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.170.
[92] This is in contrast to modern scholars who discuss the body as a site of masculinity. For instance Reinke-Williams, 'Manhood', 685–6; Jennifer Jordan, '"That Ere with Age, His Strength is Utterly Decay'd": Understanding the Male Body in Early Modern England', in Kate Fisher and Sarah Toulalan (eds.), *Bodies, Sex and Desire from the Renaissance to the Present* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 27–48.
[93] Thynne, *Perfect ambassdour*, B4v; Hotman, *Ambassdor*, C5r. Hotman further invoked an ancient saying that outward imperfections were signs of defects of the soul.
[94] Thynne, *Perfect ambassdour*, D2r–D2v; Hotman, *Ambassdor*, C5v. The reference is from Plutarch, *Life of Cato the Elder*, 9.1.
[95] Pauline Croft, 'The Reputation of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, n.s. i (1991), 42–69.
[96] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.141.
[97] Braham, *Institucion*, D5v. Robert Cecil's career evidences that skills were more valued than appearance in practice.
[98] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.198.
[99] Braham, *Institucion*, F8v.
[100] Hotman, *Ambassador*, C8r.
[101] Ibid., C5r.
[102] Ibid., C6v.
[103] Ibid., E4v.
[104] Braham, *Institucion*, F8v; Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.190; Hotman, *Ambassador*, C7r–C8r.
[105] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.138–9, 198. Quotation at Hotman, *Ambassador*, E3v. Hotman also suggested that it should be calibrated according to local court culture.
[106] Hotman, *Ambassador*, C5v.
[107] Ibid., C5v–C6v. Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.197.
[108] Hotman, *Ambassador*, D6r.
[109] Ibid., D5v–D6r. Braham, Gentili, and Thynne did not discuss ambassadors' wives.

[110] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.145, 153–8, 160–1; Hotman, *Ambassador*, B8r–C2r.
[111] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.147–8; Hotman, *Ambassador*, C2v–C3v.
[112] Gentili, *De legationibus*, II.149–50; Hotman, *Ambassador*, C2v–C3r.
[113] Thynne, *Perfect ambassdour*, H7r–H9r.
[114] Hotman, *Ambassador*, D6v–D7r.
[115] For example Étienne Dolet, *De officio Legati, quem vulgo Ambassiatorem vocant* (Lyon: Étienne Dolet, 1541), C1r.
[116] For instance, Luke MacMahon found that just over one third of Henry VIII's diplomats were clerics: 'The Ambassadors of Henry VIII; The Personnel of English Diplomacy', University of Kent Ph.D. thesis (2000), 64.
[117] For a broad overview of English ambassadresses see Allen, 'Rise of the Ambassadress'.
[118] See for example Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, 93–213; Jennifer Jordan, '"To Make a Man Without Reason": Examining Manhood and Manliness in Early Modern England', in John H. Arnold and Sean Brady (eds.), *What is Masculinity? Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World* (Basingstoke, 2011), 245–62.
[119] Robert Barrington, 'Two Houses both Alike in Dignity: Reginald Pole and Edmund Harvel', *The Historical Journal*, xxxix (1996), 906–9.
[120] Huntington Library, Pasadena, MS HM 31,188.
[121] Tracey A. Sowerby, ''The Cambridge Connection and the Early Elizabethan Diplomatic Corps', in John McDiarmid and Susan Wabuda (eds.), *The Cambridge Connection and the Mid-Tudor Polity* (Leiden: Brill, 2021), ch. 10
[122] Tanner to Chaloner, 14 June 1563, TNA SP 70/58, fo. 101r; National Portrait Gallery, London, NPG 2445.
[123] National Portrait Gallery, London, NPG 710.
[124] For a detailed discussion see Sowerby 'Sir Henry Unton'.
[125] Dorset to Wolsey, 22 Nov. 1514, B[ritish] L[ibrary] Cotton MS Caligula DVI, fo. 196. For a brief discussion of the embassy see Steven J. Gunn, *Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk 1484–1545* (Oxford, 1988), 32–4.
[126] Elizabeth R. Williamson, 'Diplomatic Letters as Political Literature: Copying Sir Henry Unton's Letters', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, lxxxii (2020), 559–78. On the self-promotional strategies employed by Venetian ambassadors in the textual and oral versions of their *relazioni* see Filippo de Vivo, 'How to Read Venetian "Relazioni", *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, xxxiv (2011), 38–42.
[127] On the recording of diplomatic speech see Filippo de Vivo, 'Archives of Speech: Recording Diplomatic Negotiation in Late Medieval and Early Modern Italy', *European History Quarterly*, xlvi (2016), 519–44. On the affective nature of diplomatic interactions see Isabella Lazzarini, *Communication and Conflict: Italian Diplomacy in the Early Renaissance, 1350–1520* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 213–38; Susan Broomhall, 'Diplomatic Emotions: International Relations as Gendered Acts of Power', *The Routledge History of Emotions in Europe, 1100–1800* (London: Routledge, 2019), 283–302.
[128] See for example Dorset to Wolsey, 9 Nov. 1514, BL Cotton MS Caligula DVI, fo. 192r; Tunstall and Wingfield to Henry VIII, 12 June 1516, BL Cotton MS Galba BIV, fo. 85r; Sussex to Cecil, 22 Aug. 1567, TNA SP 70/93, fo. 63r; Buckhurst to the Queen, 4 March 1571, TNA SP 70/117, fo. 2r. On the importance of hunting to Henry VIII see James Williams, 'Hunting and the Royal Image of Henry VIII', *Sport and History*, xxv (2005), 41–59.
[129] See for example Wingfield to Henry VIII, 18 April 1520, T[he] N[ational] A[rchives] SP 1/20, fo. 3; Fitzwilliam to Henry VIII, 1521, TNA SP 1/21, fo. 213r; Fitzwilliam to Wolsey, 11 Feb. 1521, TNA SP 1/21, fo. 214; Fitzwilliam to Wolsey, March 1521, BL Cotton MS Caligula DVIII, fo. 22r; Clerk etc. to Wolsey, 28 July 1527, Cotton Caligula DX, fo. 115r; Browne to Henry VIII. 21 Aug. 1527, TNA SP 1/44, fo. 7r; Wallop to Henry VIII, 17 Nov. 1540, TNA SP 1/163, fo. 231r; Howard to Henry VIII, 26 Aug. 1541, SP 1/167, fo. 5r; Wallop to Henry VIII, 11 June 1542, TNA SP 1/171, fo. 10r.
[130] See for example Hackett to Norfolk, 8 Jan. 1533, TNA SP 1/74, fo. 19r; Hackett to Norfolk, 22 April 1533, TNA SP 1/75, fo. 154r; Randolph to Cecil, 31 March 1562, TNA SP 52/7, fo. 54v.
[131] See for example Dorset to Wolsey, 9 Nov. 1514, BL Cotton MS Caligula DVI, fo. 192r; Wallop to Henry VIII, 11 June 1542, TNA SP 1/171, fo. 10r; Paget to Wallop, 7 March 1543, TNA SP 1/176, fo. 111; Paget to Petre, 7 May 1546, TNA SP 1/218, fo. 5r; Howard to Elizabeth I, 2 March 1559, TNA SP 70/3, fo. 18v; Paulet to the Queen, 31 Jan. 1577, TNA SP 70/142, fo. 142v–143r; Tracey A. Sowerby, *Renaissance and Reform in Tudor England: The Careers of Sir Richard Morison c.1513–1556* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 211.
[132] Fitzwilliam to Henry VIII, 1521, TNA SP 1/21, fo. 213r; Fitzwilliam to Wolsey, 11 Feb. 1521, TNA SP 1/21, fo. 214r.
[133] Fitzwilliam to Wolsey, 14 May 1521, BL Cotton MS Caligula DVIII, fo. 37. Similar self-fashioning strategies can be seen in Dorset's reporting of his exemplary display during the tournament in 1514 discussed above.
[134] For example Fitzwilliam to Wolsey, 11 Feb. 1521, TNA SP 1/21, fo. 214r; Cheyne to Henry VIII, 13 Feb. 1522, TNA SP 1/24, fo. 23r; Clerk etc to Wolsey, ?July 1527, BL Cotton MS Caligula DX, fo. 51v; Wallop to Henry VIII, 17 Nov. 1540, TNA SP 1/163, fo. 230v.
[135] Buckhurst to the Queen, 4 March 1571, TNA SP 70/117, fo. 2r.

[136] On anxiety surrounding early modern masculinity see Mark Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
[137] Diplomatic convention was that an ambassador was treated as one rank above his actual social status by virtue of his position, entitling the gentry ambassadors to treatment as lower-ranking noblemen, even though their personal means might fall short of contemporary noble incomes.
[138] Wingfield to the Council, 6 Oct. 1514, TNA SP 1/9, fo. 99r.
[139] Mason to the Council, 27 April 1551, TNA SP 68/9A, fo. 302r.
[140] Sampson to Wolsey, 3 July 1523, SP 1/28, fo. 96r.
[141] Gentili, *Legationibus*, II.140.
[142] Paulet to Walsingham, 31 Jan. 1577, TNA SP 70/142, fo. 146r.
[143] Paulet to Burghley, 9 May 1577, TNA SP 70/145, fo. 28r; Paulet to Walsingham, 24 Aug. 1577, TNA SP 78/1, fo. 22r.
[144] Paulet to Walsingham, 24 Sept. 1577, TNA SP 78/1, fo. 36r.
[145] Paulet to Walsingham, 12 Oct. 1576, TNA SP 70/140, fo. 30v.
[146] Gary M. Bell, 'Elizabethan Diplomatic Compensation: Its Nature and Variety', *Journal of British Studies*, xx (1981), 1–25.
[147] John S. Brewer, James Gairdner, and Robert H. Brodie (eds.), *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII* (23 vols., London, 1862–1932), XIII part 2, no. 270.
[148] Wyatt's 'Defence' in Kenneth Muir (ed.), *Life and Letters of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1963), 203–4, 206.
[149] Stephen R. Cattley and George Townshend (eds.), *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, 8 vols. (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837–41), V.156–9.
[150] Catherine Fletcher, '"Furnished with gentlemen": The Ambassador's House in Sixteenth-century Italy', *Renaissance Studies*, xxiv (2010), 518–35.
[151] See for example Niels F. May, 'Staged Sovereignty or Aristocratic Values? Diplomatic Ceremonial at the Westphalian Peace Negotiations (1643–1648)', in Sowerby and Hennings (eds.), *Practices of Diplomacy*, 80–94. On broader entanglements of personal interests and diplomatic duties see Hillard von Thiessen and Christian Windler (eds.), *Nähe in der Ferne: Personale Verflechtung in den Außenbeziehungen der Frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2005).
[152] Financial concerns plagued other diplomatic corps too. See for example, Paul Dover, 'The Economic Predicament of Italian Renaissance Ambassadors', *Journal of Early Modern History*, xii (2008), 137–67; Michael Levin, *Agents of Empire: Spanish Ambassadors in Sixteenth-century Italy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), 149–50.