



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

*“Wee Reign in Heaven”:
The Representation, Commemoration and Enduring Memory of the
Deceased Prince under the Stuart Monarchy.*

Catriona Murray

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
History of Art Department
University of Edinburgh, 2012

Vol. I

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification, except as specified.

Signature:

Date:

Abstract

This thesis examines the consequences and implications of the premature deaths of royal heirs in seventeenth-century Britain. In just four generations between 1603 and 1700 the Stuart dynasty suffered the loss of over twenty-five legitimate offspring before their twenty-first year. Several of these deaths had significant political repercussions, threatening both the continuity of the royal line and consequently the security of the nation. The cultural memory of these lost heirs continued decades and even centuries later. My work seeks to establish the historical significance of their long-lasting appeal by assessing their princely representation in life and analysing its development after death.

This study is firmly located within visual culture. However, definitions and classifications of the “visual” are necessarily broad. The emphasis is upon the consideration of seventeenth-century British art as part of a wider cultural process. The opening chapter addresses an apparently obvious, though somewhat neglected, issue - the critical importance of royal heirs. Through examination of the imagery and ceremonial attached to Stuart childbearing and christenings, it asserts the real symbolic significance of princely progeny. Chapter Two develops the study of youthful princely representation. It assesses the portrayal of Stuart heirs as they matured and seeks to identify the principal characteristics. Specifically, it is argued that, from a young age, the projection of Protestantism and martial aptitude was crucial to the formation of their *personae*. Chapter Three analyses how deceased Stuart heirs were commemorated in the months and years immediately after their deaths. It is contended that the enduring memory of these princes was the result, not of official commemoration, but of the large-scale public response to their deaths. The loss of an heir not only threatened the future of the dynasty but also the stability of the realm. The fourth chapter explores how, through visual and cultural propaganda, the surviving Stuarts attempted to re-group and to assuage social and political anxieties. Chapters Five and Six assess the long-term legacy of these princes in the decades and centuries after their deaths, as well as the political circumstances which gave rise to their enduring memory. These concluding chapters reveal the extent to which memories of deceased Stuart princes lingered, asserting that their representations were often employed for negotiation of the issues and anxieties of later ages.

Throughout, my work seeks to establish the importance of these lost heirs and protectors of the Stuart Protestant line. I have endeavoured to retrieve the reputations of princes who came to represent potent symbols of both promise and loss.

Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed towards the completion of this thesis. Special thanks go to my supervisor, Professor David Howarth, for his time, encouragement and support throughout. In particular, as the end came into sight, his advice, criticism and enthusiasm were of great help in developing and honing my thesis. I am grateful to my second supervisor, Dr. Tom Tolley, for many stimulating and productive discussions. David Taylor, formerly of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, and now Curator of Paintings and Sculpture at the National Trust, has shown a sustained interest in my work and I have enjoyed our (often heated) conversations and debates. For their assistance and encouragement in many forms, I am also indebted to Dr. Ulrike Weiss of the University of St. Andrews; Dr. Michael Ullyot of the University of Calgary; Catharine MacLeod and Clare Gittings of the National Portrait Gallery, London; Daniel Bell and Penny Russell of the Royal Collection; Noreen Marshall, formerly of the Victoria and Albert Museum of Childhood; and Amanda Kohn of the Portland Art Museum.

I have accessed primary and secondary source material at a range of libraries, archives and collections. I would like to thank the staff of the National Library of Scotland; the British Library; the Bodleian; the National Archives; the Heinz Archive at the National Portrait Gallery; the Ashmolean Museum; and the Department of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum. In particular, I am grateful to Robert Yorke, the archivist of the College of Arms, and the volunteer staff at Monteviot House, Roxburghshire and Sint-Sebastiaansgilde, Brugge. Ideas were developed, challenged and refined through presentations to and conversations with fellow postgraduates and academics. Special thanks are owed to Julie Fergusson, Sophie Carney, Maria Anesti, Nicholas Uglow and the audiences of the *British History in the Seventeenth Century Seminar* at the Institute of Historical Research and the *2011 Annual Meeting of the Renaissance Society of America* in Montreal.

My research has been supported financially by a series of bursaries and scholarships. The *Theodora Bosanquet Bursary* provided accommodation for my first foray into the London archives. A year later, another extended research trip to Oxford and London was supported by the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art. The University of Edinburgh has funded my research with a series of maintenance and travel grants, while, more recently, the Institute of Historical Research, University of London, has provided financial and academic support in the form of a Junior Research Fellowship.

Finally, I have to thank my friends and family. John and Morag Goldfinch were model landlords during my regular stopovers in London. Their generosity is very much appreciated. For being the perfect antidote to the sometimes lonely world of academic research, I am sincerely grateful to Gordon Morrison. His patience, forbearance and good humour - especially when faced with countless visits to historic houses and art collections -

have been truly saint-like. Most importantly, I would like to thank my dad, Peter Murray, for his constant financial, practical and emotional support. His encouragement and understanding have been invaluable to the progress of my research. This thesis is for him, in gratitude.

An excerpt from Chapter Two will appear as “The Pacific King and the Militant Prince? Representation and Collaboration in the Letters Patent of James I, creating his son, Henry, Prince of Wales” in *The Electronic British Library Journal*, forthcoming. Sections of Chapter Three have been published as “Sir Robert Cotton, James VI and I and an English Cenotaph for Two Scottish Princes” in *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, Vol. 139, 2009, pp. 305-313; and “‘Great Britaine, All in Blacke’: The Commemoration of Henry, Prince of Wales in a Portrait of his Father, King James I” in *The British Art Journal*, Vol. XII, No. 3, 2012, pp. 20-26.

Table of Contents

<i>Volume I</i>	<i>Page</i>
Declaration	2
Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	4
List of Abbreviations	7
List of Illustrations	8
Introduction	15
Chapter 1: “ <i>The Cradle of Jove</i> ” – <i>Celebrating Royal Infants</i>	28
Chapter 2: “ <i>A Terror to God’s Enemies</i> ” – <i>Representing the Stuart Prince</i>	58
Chapter 3: “ <i>Joy Turned to Mourning</i> ” – <i>The Princely Death</i>	104
Chapter 4: “ <i>A New Race of Princes</i> ” – <i>The Dynasty Recovers</i>	158
Chapter 5: “ <i>The Temple of Fame</i> ” – <i>Enduring Memories</i>	201
Chapter 6: “ <i>The Mere Parade of Truthfulness</i> ” – <i>Re-telling the Past</i>	250
Conclusion	276
Bibliography	281
<i>Volume II</i>	
Illustrations	

List of Abbreviations

B.L.	British Library, London.
Bod. Lib.	Bodleian Library, Oxford.
N.L.S.	National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh.
N.R.S.	National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.
TNA	The National Archives, Kew.

List of Illustrations

- Figure 1: William Marshall, *Charles, Prince of Great Britaine* (1630). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.
- Figure 2: Joannes Meyskens, *Henrietta Maria, Queen of Great Britain, France and Ireland* (c.1640). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.
- Figure 3: Jacob Gole, *Princess Anne of Denmark* (1689). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.
- Figure 4: Anon., *A View of the Fireworks on the Thames for Englands [sic] Triumphs for the Prince of Wales* (1688). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.
- Figure 5: John Michael Wright, *James, Duke of Cambridge* (1666). Oil on Canvas, Private Collection.
- Figure 6: Peter Lely, *The Youngest Children of Charles I* (1647). Oil on Canvas, Petworth House, West Sussex.
- Figure 7: Peter Lely, *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1647). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.
- Figure 8: Anthony Van Dyck, *The Five Eldest Children of Charles I* (1637). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.
- Figure 9: Adriaen Hanneman, *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (c.1653). Oil on Canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.
- Figure 10: Adriaen Hanneman, *King Charles II* (c.1648). Oil on Canvas, Government Art Collection, London.
- Figure 11: Wenceslaus Hollar after Anthony Van Dyck, *Charles II* (1649). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.
- Figure 12: Johann Boeckhorst, *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1656). Oil on Canvas, Sint-Sebastiaansgilde, Brugge.
- Figure 13: Isaac Oliver (attrib.), *Letters Patent of James I, creating his son, Henry, Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester* (1610). Illuminated Manuscript, Add MS 36932, British Library, London.
- Figure 14: *Initial Portraits from Letters Patent of James I, creating his son, Henry, Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester* (1610). Illuminated Manuscript, Add MS 36932, British Library, London.
- Figure 15: Anon., *The Creation of Edward II as Prince of Wales* (early fourteenth century) from *Flores Historiarum*. Illuminated Manuscript, Cotton MS Nero D II, British Library, London.

Figure 16: Anon., *Edward, the Black Prince, receiving Aquitaine* (1386-99). Illuminated Manuscript, Cotton MS Nero D VI, British Library, London.

Figure 17: *Impression from the Great Seal on the Letters Patent of James I, creating his son, Henry, Prince of Wales* (1610). British Library, London.

Figure 18: Anon., *James VI and I* (c.1590). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 19: Isaac Oliver, *Henry, Prince of Wales* (1610). Watercolour on Vellum on Card, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

Figure 20: Isaac Oliver (attrib.), *The Lyte Jewel* (1610). Watercolour on Vellum, Department of Prehistory and Europe, British Museum, London.

Figure 21: Nicholas Hilliard, *James VI and I* (c.1609). Watercolour on Vellum, Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh.

Figure 22: Nicholas Hilliard, *Charter authorising Sir Walter Mildmay to found Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (1584). Illuminated Manuscript, Emanuel College, Cambridge.

Figure 23: Anon., *The Effigies of the Two Illustrious Princes, Hen: D: of Glocester & Maria P Dowager of Aurange lately deceased* (1661). Engraving, Author's own.

Figure 24: Bernard Lens II, *His Royall Highnes, the Young Prince* (1689). Mezzotint, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 25: Pieter Schenk (attrib.), *Beigtrader Pieters, met de Rykxvorstin en Zoon* (1688). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 26: Pieter Schenk after Jacob Toorenvliet, *Venal Love* (1675-88). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 27: Bernard Lens II, *The Duke of Clocester* [sic] (1689). Mezzotint, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 28: Nicolas de Largillière, *Prince James Francis Edward Stuart* (1691). Oil on Canvas, Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh.

Figure 29: John Smith after Godfrey Kneller, *His Highness The Duke of Glocester* (c.1692). Mezzotint, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 30: Godfrey Kneller, *William, Duke of Gloucester* (1699). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 31: John Smith after Godfrey Kneller, *His Royal Highness, William, Duke of Gloucester* (1699). Mezzotint, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 32: François de Troy, *Prince James Francis Edward Stuart* (c.1700). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 33: Anon., *The Embassy of the Prince de Ligne received by Charles II* (1660). Oil on Canvas, Chateau de Belœil, Hainault, Belgium.

Figure 34: Anon., *Frontispiece to The Pourtraiture of His royal Highness, Oliver late Lord Protector* (1659). Engraving, British Library, London.

Figure 35: Anon., *Frontispiece to Great Britaine, All in Blacke* (1612). Woodcut, British Library, London.

Figure 36: *Altar poem from Mausoleum, or The Choisest Flowres of the Epitaphs, written on the Death of the never-too-much-lamented Prince Henrie* (1613). Engraving, University of Glasgow Library, Glasgow.

Figure 37: Maximillian Colt, *Monuments to Princess Sophia* (foreground, 1606) and to *Princess Mary* (background, 1607). Painted Alabaster, Henry VII Chapel, Westminster Abbey, London.

Figure 38: Paul Van Somer, *James VI and I* (1615). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, Edinburgh.

Figure 39: Executed under Jacob Halder, *Armour for the field, tourney, tilt and barriers* (c.1608). Iron and steel embossed, etched, gilded and blued, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 40: Maximillian Colt (attrib.), *Tomb of Sir Francis de Vere* (c.1609). Alabaster and Black Marble, Chapel of St. John the Evangelist, Westminster Abbey, London.

Figure 41: Robert Peake, *Henry, Prince of Wales on Horseback* (c.1610). Oil on Canvas, Parham Park, Sussex.

Figure 42: Marcus Gheeraerts, *Anne of Denmark* (1613). Oil on Canvas, National Portrait Gallery, London.

Figure 43: Anon., *Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia* (1613). Oil on Canvas, National Portrait Gallery, London.

Figure 44: Paul Van Somer (attrib.), *Charles I, when Prince of Wales* (1616). Oil on Canvas, Monteviot House, Roxburghshire.

Figure 45: Adam de Cologne, *James VI and I* (1623). Oil on Canvas, Newbattle Abbey College, Midlothian.

Figure 46: Anthony Van Dyck, *James VI and I* (c.1635-6). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 47: Anthony Van Dyck, *Henry, Prince of Wales* (c.1637-8). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 48: William Hole, *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* (1612). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 49: Anon., *Locket commemorating Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1660). Silver with gold relief portrait, Ham House, Surrey.

Figure 50: Anon., *Prince Henry of Scotland Cenotaph* (c.1615). All Saints Church, Conington, Huntingdonshire.

Figure 51: Inigo Jones, *Drawing for the Tomb of Lady Cotton* (c.1608). Pen and Wash, Royal Institute of British Architects Drawings Collection, London.

Figure 51: Inigo Jones, *The Tomb of Lady Cotton* (begun 1610). Alabaster, Parish Church, Norton-in-Hales, Shropshire.

Figure 52: Anon., *Frontispiece from A Cordial Elegie and Epitaph upon the Much Lamented Death of that Incomparable Prince Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1660). Woodcut, British Library, London.

Figure 53: William Hole, *The Effigy and Hearse of Henry, Prince of Wales* (1612). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 54: Anon., *William, Duke of Gloucester* (1700). Mezzotint, MacBean Jacobite Collection, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen.

Figure 55: Anon., *The Royal Family of Great Britain* (c.1694). Engraving, Time Inc. Archive, New York.

Figure 56: Willem van de Passe, *The Family of James I* (First State, 1624). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 57: Willem van de Passe, *The Family of James I* (Second State, c.1627). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 58: Anon., detail of *The Family of James I* (Third State, c.1660). Engraving, Sutherland Collection, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

Figure 59: Frances Delaram, *Charles, Prince of Wales* (1616). Engraving, Huntington Library, California, U.S.A.

Figure 60: Peter Lely, *The Duke and Duchess of York with their Daughters, Princess Mary and Princess Anne* (begun 1667, completed c.1680). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 61: Anthony Van Dyck, *Charles I, Henrietta Maria and their Eldest Children* (1632). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 62: Peter Lely, *Mary II, when Princess of York* (c.1672). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 63: Peter Lely, *Mary II, when Princess of York* (c.1677). Oil on Canvas, Whereabouts Unknown.

Figure 64: Peter Lely, *Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland* (c.1665). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 65: Peter Lely, *Mary II, when Princess of York* (c.1674). Oil on Canvas, Berkeley Castle, Gloucestershire.

Figure 66: Peter Lely, *Mary II, when Princess of Orange* (c.1677). Oil on Canvas, Syon Park, Brentford, Middlesex.

Figure 67: Peter Lely, *Mary II, when Princess of Orange* (c.1677). Oil on Canvas, Portland Art Museum, Portland, Oregon, U.S.A.

Figure 68: Anon., After Sir Peter Lely, *Mary II, when Princess of Orange* (1678-80). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawing, British Museum, London.

Figure 69: Peter Lely, *Mary of Modena* (1679). Oil on Canvas, Kedleston Hall, Derbyshire.

Figure 70: Peter Lely, *Mary II, when Princess of Orange* (1677). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 71: Peter Lely, *Mary II, when Princess of Orange* (1677). Oil on Canvas, National Portrait Gallery, London.

Figure 72: O. Müller, *Medal Commemorating the Marriage of William of Orange and Princess Mary* (1677). Silver Medal, Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum, London.

Figure 73: Anon., *Allegory of the Marriage of William of Orange to Princess Mary* (1677). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 74: Romeyne de Hooghe, *A Mirror of French Tyranny* (1673). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 75: Caspar Netscher, *Mary II, when Princess of Orange* (c.1683). Oil on Canvas, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Figure 76: Willem Wissing, *Mary II, when Princess of Orange* (1685). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 77: Willem Wissing, *Mary of Modena* (1685). Oil on Canvas, National Portrait Gallery, London.

Figure 78: Willem Wissing, *Mary II, when Princess of Orange* (c.1686). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 79: Anon., *The Monarchs of the Stuart Dynasty* (c.1702). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 80: Designed by Raimund Faltz, executed by Samuel Lambelet, *The Matilda Medal* (1701). Silver Medal, Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum, London.

Figure 81: William Faithorne the Younger, *The True Effigies of the Most Illustrious Anna Sophia of Hanover* (c.1702). Mezzotint, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 82: Simon Gribelin, *The Effigies of Four Protestant Princes* (1703). Engraving, National Portrait Gallery, London.

Figure 83: Frances Delaram, *Henry Prince of Wales* (1618). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 84: Willem or Magdalena de Passe (attrib.), *Henry, Prince of Wales* (1620). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 85: Willem or Magdalena de Passe (attrib.), *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* (1620). Engraving, National Portrait Gallery, London.

Figure 86: Simon de Passe, *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* (1616). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 87: George Vertue, *Henry, Prince of Wales* (1736). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 88: Jacobus Houebracken, *Henry, Prince of Wales* (1738). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 89: Anon., *Henry, Prince of Wales* (1713). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 90: Anon., *The Hearse of Robert Devereux, third Earl of Essex* (1646). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 91: George Vertue, *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1736). Engraving, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 92: Willem Wissing, *James, Duke of Cambridge* (c.1686). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, Edinburgh.

Figure 93: Peter Lely, *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (c.1649). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 94: Anon., *The House of Stuart* (c.1714). Engraving, National Portrait Gallery, London.

Figure 95: Jacobus Houbraken, *William, Duke of Gloucester* (1745). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 96: Bernard Lépicier after Jean Raoux, *King Charles Taking Leave of His Children, 29th of January 1648/49* (1728). Etching, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Figure 97: William Bromley after William Stothard, *Charles I Taking Leave of His Children* (1794). Engraving, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh.

Figure 98: Alexandre-Evariste Fragonard, *Charles I Taking Leave of His Children* (1830). Oil on Canvas, Musée des Augustins, Toulouse, France.

Figure 99: Carlo Marochetti, *Monument to Princess Elizabeth* (1856). Carved Marble, St. Thomas' Church, Newport, Isle of Wight.

Figure 100: Charles Lucy, *The Parting of Charles I with his Two Youngest Children, the Day Previous to his Execution* (1850). Oil on Canvas, Hartlepool Museum, Hartlepool.

Figure 101: Charles West Cope, *Royal Pensioners at Carisbrooke Castle* (1855). Oil on Canvas, Carisbrooke Castle, Newport, Isle of Wight.

Figure 102: T.P. Downes, *Last Moments of the Princess Elizabeth, Daughter of Charles I* (1863). Oil on Canvas, Sold at Christies London, 8th November, 1996, Lot 78.

Figure 103: After Anthony Van Dyck, *King Charles I* (1635-6). Oil on Canvas, National Portrait Gallery, London.

Figure 104: John Everett Millais, *Princess Elizabeth in Prison at St. James's* (1879). Oil on Canvas, Royal Holloway Art Collection, London.

Figure 105: Daniel Maclise, *An Interview Between Charles I and Oliver Cromwell* (1836). Oil on Canvas, National Museum of Ireland, Dublin.

Figure 106: Anthony Van Dyck, *George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham and Lord Francis Villiers* (1635). Oil on Canvas, Royal Collection, London.

Figure 107: Margaret Isabel Dicksee, *The Children of Charles I* (1895). Oil on Canvas, Oldham Gallery, London.

Figure 108: James Northcote, *King Edward V and his brother Richard, Duke of York, Murdered in the Tower by Order of Richard III* (1786). Oil on Canvas, Whereabouts Unknown.

Figure 109: Alfred Joseph Woolmer, *The Royal Captives of Carisbrooke Castle* (1850s). Oil on Canvas, Whereabouts Unknown.

Figure 110: Anon., *George I and his eldest son, Prince George, Duke of Cambridge* (1714). Woodcut, Society of Antiquaries of London, London.

Introduction

I

On the 13th of May 1629, Queen Henrietta Maria gave birth to a short-lived Prince. Just over a year later, the prayers of both the queen and of her subjects were answered with the delivery of a healthy son, the future Charles II. His older brother, the first Prince Charles, was not forgotten, however. An engraving by William Marshall (1630, See Figure 1), produced to celebrate the birth of the surviving heir, depicts both Stuart Princes. The living Prince sits, chubby-faced, propped up on some cushions, arranged to resemble a throne, topped with the feathers of the Prince of Wales. Above him lies his brother, eyes closed and wrapped in swaddling.¹ His insubstantial cradle is borne by two cherubs who support a banner proclaiming: “Charles Prince of Great Britaine borne, baptiz’d and Buried May 13 1629.” This central image is contained within a border, adorned with birds, flowers and insects – a symbolic arrangement, suggestive of fertility and abundance. Meanwhile, the accompanying verse reads:

“Two sweet May-Flowers did produce
Sprung from Rose and Flower-de-Luce.
Th’One Heav’ns hand, soone cropt, transplanted,
T’Other, lovely, lively’s granted.”

Thus here divisions between the living and the dead have been blurred and a Prince, who lived fewer than twenty-four hours, is remembered and honoured. The engraving also had an afterlife. With minor adjustments it was reissued following the births of Princess Anne in

¹ This arrangement may well be derived from the tomb of a similarly short-lived royal baby, Princess Sophia, daughter of James VI and I – See Figure 37.

1637 and Henry, Duke of Gloucester, in 1640. Ten years after his demise then memories of the deceased Prince Charles persisted. Death by no means constituted an end.

This thesis examines the implications and impacts of the premature deaths of princes and royal heirs in seventeenth-century Britain. In just four generations between 1603 and 1700 the Stuart dynasty suffered the loss of over twenty-five legitimate offspring before their twenty-first year, the age of majority. Several of these deaths had political ramifications, threatening both the continuity of the royal line and consequently the security of the realm. They were often met with public outpourings of grief and the mass production of commemorative ephemera. Yet, after the public mourning was over and the funeral blacks taken down, memories endured. Texts and images portraying these lost heirs continued to be produced decades and even centuries later. This study seeks to establish the historical significance of their long-lasting appeal by assessing their princely representation in life and analysing its development after death. Specific issues relating to the position and representation of Stuart heirs are dealt with, while wider areas of historical debate are also addressed, including the cultural display of royal power, seventeenth-century attitudes to death and mourning and the construction and projection of early modern memory.

This work is firmly rooted in visual culture. However, definitions and classifications of the “visual” are necessarily broad. It is a study which follows in the footsteps of David Howarth’s *Images of Rule*, by exploring principally “the *use* of art” rather than its quality or originality.² Consequently the painted portraiture of court artists, such as Isaac Oliver, Anthony Van Dyck and Peter Lely, is examined alongside engravings, woodcuts and medals, executed by both the master and the mediocre. All are approached as historical documents. Other forms of cultural representation are analysed - in particular, court ceremonial - but also masques, tilts, contemporary literature and poetry, music, broadsides and pamphlets. The

² Howarth, 1997. p. 4.

emphasis is upon the consideration of seventeenth-century British art as part of a wider cultural process. In terms of chronology and geography, the study begins in Scotland in 1594 with the birth of Henry Frederick, son of King James VI. Following the Union of the Crowns in 1603, focus moves south to London, although, where possible, efforts have been made to provide a British perspective. The last prince to be considered is William, Duke of Gloucester, son of Queen Anne, who died in 1700, aged eleven. However, the time-span of the thesis extends well beyond this, exploring the enduring appeal of these princes in the eighteenth century and, in the case of Henry, Duke of Gloucester, son of Charles I, well into the Victorian period.

Analysis of the continuities and discontinuities of the seventeenth century has long been a contentious matter.³ This study is principally concerned with continuities. Of real significance is the appropriation and adaptation of earlier models and precedents - whether in the employment of Tudor ceremonial by the early Stuarts or in the adoption of Caroline artistic motifs by the later Stuarts. The stress upon the importance of connections is maintained in the chapters which focus on the posthumous representation of these princes in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. While primary interest is focused on the inner workings of the royal Court, the increasing independence evident in acts of popular commemoration and the steady growth of a commercial trade in memorial paraphernalia are also examined. The repeated invocation of these deceased Stuart heirs was often in spite of - rather than because of - official intervention. Finally, it should be recognised that the Stuart Court was subject to considerable change throughout the century and represented different values and beliefs at different times. This study follows the Court into exile during the Commonwealth and discusses the rival regimes at Whitehall and St.-Germain-en-Laye after

³ See Barry Coward's discussion of the historiography surrounding the long-term effects of the Civil War, the Restoration and the Glorious Revolution - Coward, 2003. pp. xxxv-xxxvii; pp. 281-284.

the Glorious Revolution. It examines continental influences and differences. Thus, while the thesis principally considers the representation of the Stuart prince in the seventeenth century, on occasion chronological limits are crossed and geographical boundaries blurred.

II

Although the subject is virgin territory, my analysis, approach and methodology owe a significant debt to a number of cultural historians and their work. Roy Strong's research on early modern court politics, patronage and display, for example, is still a starting point for the student of seventeenth-century British art, while his *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance*, published in 1986, remains the standard work to which scholars of the Prince repeatedly return. The essays in Timothy Wilks' *Prince Henry Revived* have gone some way in re-examining and challenging Strong's often over-simplistic arguments and assumptions.⁴ This thesis continues that reassessment. In particular, it challenges Strong's characterisation of the relationship between Henry and his father and his assertion that their Courts and policies were in direct conflict.⁵ Oliver Millar's pioneering work into royal art and architecture has also proved influential. Yet his emphasis on connoisseurship has frequently rendered him guilty of viewing the fine arts in isolation - both from popular and material culture and from contemporary political, religious and intellectual developments.⁶ The monographs and catalogues of Strong and Millar have been instrumental in shaping perceptions of seventeenth-century British art. However, their focus on continental influences and official court art has somewhat misrepresented the nature of Stuart visual culture.

⁴ See for example, Aysha Pollnitz, "Humanism and the Education of Henry, Prince of Wales"; Michael Ulliot, "James's Reception and Henry's Receptivity: Reading Basilicon Doron after 1603"; and Timothy Wilks, "The Pike Charged" - all in Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (Southampton, 2007).

⁵ Strong, 1986. pp. 14-15, p. 72, pp. 140-141 and *passim*.

⁶ See Margaret Whinney and Oliver Millar, *English Art 1625-1714* (Oxford, 1957).

To different extents, the approaches pursued by David Howarth, Graham Parry, Malcolm Smuts and Kevin Sharpe have made considerable efforts to counter this. Howarth's *Images of Rule* examines the relationship between political power and the visual arts in Renaissance Britain. He has attempted to redress the continental bias attached to the study of early modern British art and to revive the reputations of native-born artists.⁷ More than that, his work presents a variety of art forms - paintings, sculpture, medals, jewellery and engravings - as different elements of the same dialogue, exploring how they were received and understood. Yet, while Howarth's text is extensive, it is not comprehensive. It is perhaps surprising then that since its publication in 1997 no other monograph on the subject has appeared and no attempt has been made to produce a similar study on the later Stuarts.

This may betray a literary bias in the study of the cultural history of the seventeenth century. Indeed, while the works of Parry, Sharpe and Smuts do explore visual culture, it often plays a secondary role to analysis of political writings, prose, poetry, plays and masques. On occasion weaknesses in their art historical apparatus are evident, resulting in sketchy visual analysis, or even worse, the employment of images as window-dressing without appraisal.⁸ Yet historians of visual culture could learn much from the "historicist or interdisciplinary turn" which has characterised early modern literary studies in recent years.⁹ Perhaps it is appropriate then that a political historian, Smuts, has highlighted an important misunderstanding and bias in approaches to seventeenth-century visual culture. His examination of art and material culture has exposed the range and scale of visible display at

⁷ Howarth, 1997. p. 2. See also, for example, Howarth's discussion of Robert Peake's portrait, *Prince Henry and John, 2nd Lord Harington of Exton* (1603) and its influence upon Anthony Van Dyck's *Charles I a la Chasse* (1635), p. 132.

⁸ Despite Sharpe's passionate pleas for early modern art historians to pursue a broader ideological history, his own analysis of paintings by Lely, Kneller and "Bernard" (actually Paul) Van Somer fails to penetrate much further. See Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 26-29. Parry's chapter on *The Wedding of Princess Elizabeth*, contains an engraving of *Princess Elizabeth and Frederick, Elector Palatine* (1613) by Reynold Elstrack. Yet at no point is the imagery mentioned or assessed. See Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd* (Manchester, 1981), p. 96.

⁹ Sharpe, 2000. p. 27.

the Courts of James I and Charles I.¹⁰ Analysis of the roles of entourages, jewellery, clothing, progresses, public festivities and paintings has drawn into question the predominance of the fine arts in studies of Stuart visual culture.¹¹ Smuts asserts:

“In seventeenth-century courts visible display was not a separate sphere of activity, left to artists like Inigo Jones and Van Dyck. It was a pervasive facet of social, political and intellectual life that needs to be understood within the broadest possible frame of reference.”¹²

This thesis aims to work within those tenets. Kevin Sharpe’s recent ambitious studies of early modern authority and image have also seized upon this approach, analysing an extensive collection of textual, visual and ceremonial representations of princely power.¹³ Significantly, his research is also concerned with the role of the Stuart public as audience and the increasingly collaborative process of fashioning the royal image. As he argues:

“Representations of monarchy . . . were inseparable from perceptions of monarchy: the image of the ruler was forged in and out of dialogues with subjects.”¹⁴ In his analysis of the first two Stuart monarchs, he rightly stresses the importance and appeal of their cultivated *personae* as husband and father.¹⁵ He argues that, despite tensions within the family of James I, occasions which saw the ceremonial appearance of his wife or children were also celebrations of the King.¹⁶ Moreover, he mitigates the alleged tensions between James and his son, Henry, highlighting how the Prince’s martial image could be beneficial, allowing the Stuarts to

¹⁰ Smuts, 1996. pp. 86-112.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 112.

¹² *Ibid.* p. 112.

¹³ See Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy, Authority and Image in Sixteenth Century England* (New Haven and London, 2009) and Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars, Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England 1603-1660* (New Haven and London, 2010). The third forthcoming posthumous volume of the trilogy will explore representations of rule from the Restoration until the Hanoverian accession.

¹⁴ Sharpe, 2009. p. xiv.

¹⁵ Sharpe, 2010. p. 100; p. 207.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 100.

represent both peace and war.¹⁷ Sharpe stresses the continuity between representations of James I and Charles I, asserting that Charles developed and enhanced his father's image as *paterfamilias*.¹⁸ In his discussion of Stuart family portraits he goes so far as to state that "the royal progeny themselves represented Caroline rule."¹⁹ Sharpe's assessment of the symbolic importance of dynasty and issue highlights the need for careful analysis of the portrayal of royal offspring. By addressing this area of scholarly neglect, my work endeavours to further our understanding of the political and cultural concerns of the Stuart monarchy.

The post-Restoration Court has received limited attention from cultural historians. Matthew Jenkinson's *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II* follows the approach encouraged by Sharpe, examining how late Stuart culture was influenced by and related to Restoration politics.²⁰ Focusing on literature, his research has attempted to rehabilitate the Court of Charles II from its profligate and lurid reputation.²¹ His book comprises a series of essays rather than a wide-ranging survey, however. As such, it leaves a number of important issues overlooked and questions unanswered, underlining the need for further research in this area. Anna Keay's *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* stresses the importance of royal ritual and display at the Restoration Court. Like Jenkinson, Keay down plays Charles' reputation for informality and frivolity.²² Instead, she argues that Charles II was acutely aware of the power of ceremonial, which he employed to articulate the authority of the monarchy and to underline hierarchical order.²³ Unfortunately, neither work is concerned with the visual image. Jenkinson's unhelpful assertion that court culture was in steady decline under the last Stuart monarchs may indicate why cultural historians have failed

¹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 110.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 140.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 207.

²⁰ Jenkinson, 2010. p. 5.

²¹ *Ibid.* p. 6.

²² Keay, 2008. pp. 2-3.

²³ *Ibid.* p. 209.

to analyse with any real conviction the arts under William and Mary or Queen Anne.²⁴ It is hoped that the late Kevin Sharpe's forthcoming monograph on the later Stuarts will go some way towards remedying this situation, advancing both knowledge of and interest in the cultural developments of this period. In contrast, the Jacobite Court in exile has attracted considerable academic interest. In particular, the work of Edward Corp has stressed the importance of display and continuity in supporting and promoting the Jacobite right to rule.²⁵ Yet there has, perhaps, been a tendency to view the rival Stuart courts in isolation. A study which considers and assesses cultural dialogues between the royal households at home and in exile would enhance significantly our understanding of the later Stuarts.

Given the involved and complex relationship between the Stuart dynasty and death, it is surprising that research on the subject has remained piecemeal. While historians have scrutinised the funerals, hearses, monuments and memories of individual Stuart princes, a comprehensive study examining royal mourning and commemoration, both official and public, has yet to be attempted.²⁶ Jennifer Woodward's *The Theatre of Death* examines royal funeral management, ceremony and display in the English Renaissance. While her archival research is extensive and her descriptions of princely obsequies informative, her analysis and conclusions are at times questionable. Her emphasis on the social and political motives for and the effects of royal funerals is astute; yet a reluctance to consider in depth specific, shifting contexts undermines her argument.²⁷ Woodward's research is complemented by that

²⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 13-15.

²⁵ See for example, Edward Corp (ed.), *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France 1689-1718* (Cambridge, 2004) and Edward Corp, *The King Over the Water 1688-1706* (Edinburgh, 2001).

²⁶ See for example, Elizabeth Goldring, "'So just a sorrowe so well expressed': Henry, Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration" in *Prince Henry Revived*, Timothy Wilks (ed.), (Southampton, 2007); John Peacock, "Inigo Jones' Catafalque for James I", *Architectural History*, Vol. 25 (1982); R.A. Beddard, "Wren's Mausoleum for Charles I and the Cult of the Royal Martyr", *Architectural History*, Vol. 27 (1984); and Richard Ollard, *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II* (London, 2000) – see the final three chapters: Early Notices (pp. 161-175), The Stuarts under the Georges (pp. 176-188) and Romantic Revivals (pp. 189-200).

²⁷ Woodward, 1997. p. 2. As Malcolm Smuts has observed, Woodward's "monolithic" thesis that funerals served to smooth the transfer of power and to promote social cohesion, is weakened by her case studies. The first rites of Mary, Queens of Scots, in 1587 and the obsequies of Henry, Prince of Wales, Anne of Denmark and

of Paul Fritz. Fritz's articles on the move from public to private royal funerals and on their increasing commercialisation in the late seventeenth century has shown how personal, political and economic factors all contributed to the changing nature of Stuart interments.²⁸ His articles make a strong case for the growing importance of popular acts of remembrance, as official forms of commemoration declined - a central argument of this study.²⁹ Like Woodward, Nigel Llewellyn may be guilty of promoting a general thesis over examination of specific circumstances.³⁰ His work on royal funeral monuments stresses the importance of tombs at the beginning of a dynasty as symbols of power and legitimacy. He argues that as the authority and security of the Stuart line were established, the need for tombs was less pressing and commissions were stopped or left unfinished.³¹ Yet surviving plans and stated intentions for the erection of royal monuments throughout the Stuart period would suggest that more complex individual issues were involved.³² Peter Sherlock's *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* attempts to reassess some of Llewellyn's materials and arguments, while also providing a revealing insight into the workings of seventeenth-century memory.³³ Informed by Pierre Nora's work on *lieux de memoire* or sites of memory, Sherlock emphasises how monuments were employed to "fix" a particular version of the past, discouraging the viewer from remembering and instead "making memory a self-conscious

James I are unpersuasive in this regard, since only James was actually a ruling monarch and his son's legitimacy was effectively above question. See R. Malcolm Smuts, "Review", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 104, No. 2 (April, 1999), p. 629.

²⁸ See Paul Fritz, "From 'Public' to 'Private': the Royal Funerals in England, 1500-1830" in *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death*, Joachim Whaley (ed.) (London, 1981) and Paul Fritz, "The Trade in Death: Royal Funerals in England 1685-1830", *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (Spring, 1982).

²⁹ Fritz, 1982. pp. 298-304; Fritz, 1981. p. 68.

³⁰ See Nigel Llewellyn, "Monuments to the Dead for the Living" in Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (eds.), *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture c.1540-1660* (London, 1995).

³¹ Llewellyn, 1995. p. 225. See also Nigel Llewellyn, *Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England* (Cambridge, 2000). p. 313.

³² See for example, Sir Christopher Wren's plans for a Mausoleum to Charles I, 1678 (All Souls College, Oxford); Grinling Gibbon's drawings for a Monument to William III and Mary II, 1702 (British Museum, London); and a description of the proposed tomb for Henry, Prince of Wales, in *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series)*, 1610-13 (29th December, 1612). p. 469.

³³ Sherlock, 2008. p. 2; p. 5.

and controlled act.”³⁴ Although my research is primarily concerned with more ephemeral forms of commemoration, this notion of constructed memory is pertinent. Also relevant is Sherlock’s argument that tombs recreate the politics and society of those who produced them.³⁵ The posthumous representations of Stuart princes in the paintings, engravings, manuscripts and printed texts examined here also offer an insight into the times in which they were created.

Of course, my research has been informed by and engages with the work of many other historians. Its extensive time-scale and the need to provide a broad framework of reference have directed me towards studies of political, religious, social and gender history, spanning the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This thesis contributes to and builds upon existing scholarship on early modern cultural history. It is hoped also that it will impact more generally on the work of historians of other fields.

III

The study is organised thematically. While various kings, queens, princes and princesses feature, there are four characters to whom it repeatedly returns: Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales (1594-1612), Henry, Duke of Gloucester (1640-1660), William, Duke of Gloucester (1689-1700) and, to a lesser extent, James, Duke of Cambridge (1663-1667). The opening chapter addresses an apparently obvious, though somewhat neglected, issue - the critical importance of royal heirs. The birth of a prince was a triumph for his parents, often marked by lavish courtly display and public rejoicing. Through examination of the imagery and ceremonial attached to Stuart childbearing and christenings, this chapter asserts the real symbolic significance of princely progeny. Analysis of the reception and treatment of these

³⁴ *Ibid.* p. 5. See Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire”, *Representations*, 26 (Spring, 1989).

³⁵ Sherlock, 2008. p. 1.

newborn babes reveals the extraordinary status of royal infants, their roles as instruments of propaganda and the changing political and dynastic preoccupations of their elders. Chapter Two develops the study of youthful princely representation. It assesses the portrayal of Stuart heirs as they matured and seeks to distinguish the principal, recurring characteristics. Wider political and social circumstances, as well as personality, helped to shape their *personae*. The effects of these influences are considered and the individuals behind this process are identified. Specifically, it is argued that, from a young age, the projection of Protestantism and martial aptitude was key. Within this context, the formation of a militant image for Henry, Prince of Wales, is examined, as evinced by his depiction in the festivities and Letters Patent for his Creation in 1610. This chapter also focuses on the relationship between the portraiture of Prince William, Duke of Gloucester, and that of his uncle, and Catholic rival to the throne, Prince James Francis Edward Stuart. It shows how images of these childhood adversaries were not only influenced by, but also reacted to each other, arguing that William's cultural portrayal repeatedly accentuated his Protestantism. Together, the first two chapters put forward a case for the propagandistic importance of heirs and the achievements of Stuart princely representation – both of which would ensure their enduring appeal after death.

Chapter Three analyses how deceased Stuart heirs were commemorated in the months and years immediately after their deaths. The execution of their funerals is considered, with particular focus on the management of post-Restoration interments and the importance of maintaining elements of display appropriate to the status of the dead, amidst an increasingly scaled-down funeral rite. With particular reference to the death of Henry Frederick, the chapter explores the peculiar absence of permanent official memorials to these princes, who were all buried in Westminster Abbey in the vault beneath the tomb of Mary, Queen of Scots. The want of a monument to Henry is striking, especially since his father,

James I, had only recently completed a programme of tomb erection. Through analysis of the responses to his death from his family, household and the general public, it is argued that political expediency may have informed this absence. However, the King's failure to erect a monument to his elder son did not preclude him from commemorating the loss by other means. This chapter also assesses how these deaths were marked in more personal terms by members of their families and by their Courts, through the commissioning of mourning paintings, posthumous portraits and provincial monuments. Yet what is striking is the contrast between state, private and popular acts of remembrance. Throughout it is argued that the enduring memory of these princes was the result, not of official commemoration but of the large-scale public response to their deaths. The fourth chapter is concerned with how the Stuart dynasty recovered and re-grouped after these de-stabilising losses, gauging how visual and cultural propaganda were employed to assuage social and political anxieties. For example, running through the course of the seventeenth century, it analyses engraved images of the dynasty, which blur divisions, showing the dead and the living united. The representation of surviving heirs is also assessed, in particular, the portrayal of Princess Mary, the future Mary II, following the repeated deaths of her brothers. The fixation with the production of a male heir persistently influenced her representation. Depicted as daughter, bride and consort, she was portrayed as the bestower of a future heir rather than as an heir in her own right. This chapter emphasises the long-term effects of the demise of Stuart princes and the problems in preparing and portraying heirs, who, like Mary or Sophia, Electress of Hanover, did not and could not fit the established mould of princely representation.

Chapters Five and Six assess the long-term legacy of these princes in the decades and centuries after their deaths, as well as the political circumstances which gave rise to their enduring memory. Focusing on posthumous representations of Henry Frederick, the fifth chapter demonstrates how he emerged as an exemplar of princely and virtuous living. Tracing

his portrayal from the late 1610s to the late eighteenth century, it shows how images and texts, produced by members of his household and circle in the first decades after his death, were instrumental in framing his later depiction. It is argued that ultimately Henry's biography was a cautionary one and that, as with later deceased Stuart heirs, his image stood for lost hopes and unfulfilled promise. Chapter Six builds upon this analysis, assessing the nineteenth-century depiction of Henry, Duke of Gloucester. In contrast to Henry Frederick's relatively consistent posthumous image, the Duke of Gloucester's representation was subject to distortion. Paintings of Henry and of his sister, Princess Elizabeth, in captivity represent the creation of a romantic Stuart myth, through which nineteenth-century audiences could negotiate a range of their own contemporary issues and debates about politics, religion and society. These concluding chapters reveal the extent to which memories of deceased Stuart princes lingered, examining how they were understood by different audiences at different times. A principal part of their allure was their tragedy. They represented alternative histories and futures, a rose-tinted notion of what might have been.

Throughout, my work seeks to establish the real importance of these lost heirs and protectors of the Stuart Protestant line, assessing the efficacy of their princely representation and the historical significance of their enduring appeal. I have endeavoured to retrieve the reputations of princes, now somewhat forgotten, but who, while living, stood for a series of hopes and aspirations. Greatness was denied them but so too were the inevitable disappointments and failures of their ascendancy. As such, their images came to represent potent symbols of both promise and loss.

Chapter 1

“The Cradle of Jove”: Celebrating Royal Infants

I

In early modern Europe the production of legitimate issue was essential for maintaining dynastic, political and social stability. When the prospective parents were of royal stock the successful delivery of an heir became a matter of state security. Consequently, a royal birth was a time of national celebration, marked by court and public festivities. It is surprising then that while in recent years historians have scrutinised with increasing detail royal death rites and ceremonial practices, little research has been conducted into the courtly display attached to princely births and to the beginnings of life. Analysis of contemporary descriptions of celebrations at the Stuart court reveals that many of these events were both lavish and highly theatrical expressions of royal power and dynastic aspiration.

With the accession to the English throne in 1603 of James VI of Scotland his new subjects were presented, for the first time in over fifty years, not just with the prospect of a new sovereign but, significantly, with that of a new royal family. The dynastic uncertainty and anxieties of the preceding decades under Elizabeth I and her siblings, Mary I and Edward VI, were swiftly calmed by the arrival of a monarch who had successfully fulfilled his princely obligation by taking a wife and fathering male children. It is surely no coincidence that James' preferred political *persona* was that of the nourishing father - in direct contrast to that of the Virgin Queen, Elizabeth's ideological identity. Viewed within this context the early Stuarts' ability to produce male heirs was an extremely important instrument of royal

propaganda. Memories of the preceding dynasty's failure to provide progeny heightened the significance of subsequent royal births and contributed to the symbolism, splendour and pomp which accompanied the celebrations. As the Stuart dynasty continued, political and religious tensions began to influence the execution of royal christenings. The baptisms of those infants born into controversy retreated from the public gaze into the private sphere. In the years after the Restoration, as the production and survival of heirs became increasingly precarious, the Stuarts continued to shy away from royal display until in 1688 a healthy boy was born to King James II and his wife, Mary of Modena. The royal festivities surrounding this event were unparalleled and yet ultimately failed to achieve their objective - to reconcile the British public to the prospect of a Catholic royal line. Thus examination of the reception of Stuart births and the treatment of royal babes reveals not only the extraordinary status of these children but also provides valuable insight into the changing political and dynastic concerns of their elders.

II

Child-bearing was an obligation for married women in early modern Europe, through which they gained social status and religious approval.¹ With added political implications, the pressures and rewards of childbirth for royal women could be profound. Those unable to satisfy found themselves in a vulnerable position. Despite prolonged stays at spas in Bath and Tunbridge Wells, Charles II's consort, Catherine of Braganza, was unable to provide an heir.² The Comte de Gramont recorded how the queen prayed assiduously for a child, making nine-day offerings in her chapel.³ Indeed, her infertility almost proved her downfall when the Duke of Buckingham proposed to the King that she be abducted and sent to a plantation in

¹ Cressy, 1997. p. 18.

² Mackay, 1937. p. 130; p. 155.

³ Hamilton, 1888. p. 140.

America. She would live there in comfort but never be heard of again, allowing the King to move for a divorce on the grounds of desertion.⁴ She was saved by the King's revulsion at the scheme.⁵ Even when a queen survived the dangers of labour and delivered a healthy child she could receive censure. A remarkable pamphlet from 1682, published after the birth of Princess Charlot Maria, ridicules her mother, Mary of Modena, for her failure to produce a son:

“While all the Grinning Whiggs do burst with Laughter
To See the Monarch *Son* should prove a Daughter.
We had design'd in Racy Gossips Bowls,
And Christening Caudles to refresh our Souls,
When the Majestick *Boy* should once appear
We'd Swim in Wine and would carouse in Beer,
And Feast our Bellys with the Richest Chear.
Proving a *Girl*, alas it proves our Woe!
Our Feast is spoil'd, and all our Cakes are Dough.”⁶

The anonymous writer sardonically continues by suggesting that perhaps the infant is a boy and that the mid-wife inadvertently severed more than just the umbilical cord.⁷ Printed in the wake of the Exclusion Crisis, the verse's tone is one of self-satisfied relief. While the long-awaited male heir remained elusive, at least the nation had been spared the prospect of a Catholic prince.

Other queens who were lucky enough to prove fruitful and to provide male heirs were quick to exploit the blessing. Despite fears over Henrietta Maria's Catholicism, she performed her most important duty effectively, delivering seven children who lived beyond

⁴ Burnet, 1875. p. 178.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 178.

⁶ Anon., *A Poem to Her Royal Highness, Upon the Birth of her Daughter* (1682). p. 1.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 2.

the trauma of the birthing room. Throughout the 1630s, the period of personal rule by King Charles I, when she gave birth to the majority of her children, she was to gain considerable influence, providing a source of counsel to her husband.⁸ As Kevin Sharpe has commented, her fecundity was an important propagandistic device, with panegyrics published regularly to celebrate “the birth of more royal children than any ruler of England in living memory.”⁹ Masques too, were employed to underline the fecundity and felicity of the royal consort.¹⁰ In 1631, eight months after the birth of Prince Charles, the queen and her ladies acted in *Chloridia*, a masque performed as a complement to the King’s masque, *Love’s Triumph Through Callipolis* (1631).¹¹ The Queen’s entry as Chloris, goddess of flowers, signalled the end of the preceding chaos and the transformation of her surroundings into a springtime bower, adorned with golden foliage, festoons, garlands and all sorts of fragrant flowers.¹² Just as Chloris’ fecundity had provided harmony and order, so, in reality, the birth of a male heir had brought with it stability and security.

As the political situation deteriorated during Charles’ personal rule, images of Henrietta Maria continued to play on her fertility. An engraving by Joannes Meyskens from the late 1630s (See Figure 2) appears to portray the queen, heavy with child. Although difficult to date exactly, it seems likely that this print was produced between 1639 and 1640 when she was pregnant with her third son, Henry, Duke of Gloucester, and as the authority of her husband’s government was becoming increasingly undermined. Based on a lost original by Anthony Van Dyck, now known through its numerous copies, Meyskens has adapted the original composition, re-presenting Henrietta Maria with a swollen abdomen.¹³ The Queen’s

⁸ Parry, 1981. p. 184; Smuts, 1987. p. 195; Smuts, 2008. p. 20; Carlton, 1995. p. 217.

⁹ Sharpe, 2010. p. 174.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 262-265.

¹¹ Parry, 1981. p. 187.

¹² Jonson, 1631. p. 12.

¹³ See for example, the version attributed to the Studio of Anthony Van Dyck (c.1636) in the Royal Collection, London.

hand has been re-positioned over her stomach with a sprig of foliage placed between her fingers, emphasising its significance. Her fecundity is further underlined by the accentuation and prominence of her breasts. Behind her sits the consort's crown of the queen of England. Thus the viewer is presented with the sources from which her authority derives. Through these visual demonstrations of her fruitfulness and supremacy, she is depicted as a consort who has repeatedly fulfilled her productive obligation and commands respect and obedience. The implied presence of her unborn child underlines the continued strength and ascendancy of the Stuart dynasty.

Later in the century, Princess Anne of Denmark, the future Queen Anne, was also to locate her authority in the production of an heir.¹⁴ Following the events of the Glorious Revolution, Anne found herself politically sidelined, having ceded her rightful place in the succession to the joint sovereignty of William III and Mary II. However, her situation was transformed with the birth in 1689 of William, Duke of Gloucester. Her standing was greatly increased, with those who had once slighted her, swiftly vying to pay their respects.¹⁵ An engraving by Jacob Gole, which probably dates from the year of William's birth (See Figure 3), would appear to acknowledge this improvement in her situation. Derived from a full length portrait of the Princess by Jan Van Der Vaardt and Willem Wissing, the French and Dutch inscriptions read:

“I could be Queen or mother of a King,

Virtue and Courage rewarded my Hope is Crowned with Glory.”¹⁶

Here, the Princess' status and power are equated both with her own standing, as next in line to the throne, and with her production of an heir and future king. The choice of French and

¹⁴ Bowers, 1996. p. 44.

¹⁵ Salmon, 1740. p. 19.

¹⁶ With thanks to Professor Peter Rietbergen (Professor of Cultural History, Radboud University, Nijmegen) for this translation. See Willem Wissing and Jan van der Vaart, *Queen Anne, when Princess of Denmark* (c.1685). Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh.

Dutch captions was no doubt a deliberately provocative gesture. By so doing the engraving imparted a message both to Jacobite and Williamite supporters on the Continent. It proclaimed that Anne and her progeny represented the future of the royal dynasty. The Princess was intensely aware of the benefits of fecundity and repeatedly endured the miscarriages and still-births of her children. Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, described the lengths to which she went in the hope of delivering more full-term, healthy offspring, reporting that:

“For several months . . . the Princess thinking herself with child, stayed constantly on one floor, by her physicians’ advice, lying very much upon a couch to prevent the misfortune of miscarrying.”¹⁷

The successful production of a healthy male heir was indeed a fundamental preoccupation for royal wives. Failure to oblige could render a queen vulnerable and subject to criticism, while for those able to comply, greater security, influence and standing were the rewards.

III

Even before a royal child had left the womb the thoughts and prayers of its future subjects were willing an auspicious outcome. While devout households prayed for the wellbeing of an expectant mother and her easy travail, the same was expected of the kingdom during the pregnancy of a queen. In 1605 and 1606 the government of James I published prayers for Anne of Denmark’s safe deliverance and production of “happy issue”.¹⁸ In 1629, a year after Henrietta Maria had given birth to a short-lived prince, prayers were again issued proclaiming:

¹⁷ Duchess of Marlborough, 1742. p. 105.

¹⁸ Anon., *Prayers appointed to be used in the church at morning and evening prayer by every minister, for the Queenes safe deliuerance Set forth and inioyned by authoritie* (1605, reissued 1606).

“Merciful Father, Since lineall succession is under thee the great security of kingdomes, and the very life of peace: wee therefore give thee most humble and hearty thanks, for the great blessing which thou hast begun to worke for our Royall King Charles and this whole State in giving the Queen’s Majestie second hopes of a long desired issue.”¹⁹ Following the birth of Prince Charles, the future Charles II, a thanksgiving was printed, entreating the Lord to supplement this blessing: “to more children: the prop one of another against single hope. Increase it to more Sons: the great strengthening of his Majesty & his Throne.”²⁰ The border of this pamphlet now stressed the fecundity of the royal parents with the decorative scrolls and coils of the earlier prayer evolving into an elaborate pattern of flowers and foliage. The crowned rose, fleur-de-lys and thistle, supported by the English lion and Scottish unicorn, underlined the illustrious lineage of this new royal babe and announced that his parent’s royal union had at last borne fruit.

Clearly the production of progeny was at the forefront of royal concerns. However, its importance was intensified in the first years of a new dynasty when the need to establish the line’s continuity and authority was at its most pressing. One key means of expressing magnificence and power was through royal display. Thus in 1493, Henry VII, the first monarch of the Tudor dynasty, charged that *Certain Artycles* regarding court ceremonial and the regulation of his household be recorded and strictly observed.²¹ Two copies of his instructions survive at the British Library, one in a sixteenth century hand (used here) and the

¹⁹ Anon., *A Thankesgiving and Prayer for the safe Child-bearing of the Queenes Majestie* (1629).

²⁰ Anon., *A Thankesgiving for the safe delivery of the Queene, and happy birth of the yong Prince* (1630). Prayers of this type were issued throughout the 1630s in response to Henrietta Maria’s numerous pregnancies. Similar pamphlets were issued in 1688, during Mary of Modena’s pregnancy and after the birth of Prince James. See for example, Anon. *A form of prayer with thanksgiving for the safe delivery of the Queen; and happy birth of the young Prince . . . By His Majesties special command* (1688).

²¹ *Certain Artycles apoynted by the kyng and Soverayne lord kyng henry the VIIth at his pallays of Westminster last day of December the ixth year of his most noble rayne whych in most Heyghtest voyce hys highness chargyd to be kept so observyd upon the payn that may ensue.* B.L. Add MS 4712.

other a later seventeenth-century version.²² The similarities between King Henry's orders and the execution of early Stuart ceremonial occasions strongly suggest that these articles were employed as a point of reference well over a century later.

Among his orders were directions for the deliverance of a queen. They show that even within the confinement chamber regulations and ritual played an important symbolic role. The orders begin by stipulating that the chamber appointed for the birth should be hung with rich arras - the windows, walls and ceiling all covered, with the exception of one window which might be revealed, should the queen require light.²³ As such, the birthing room of a royal consort followed the same basic form, albeit on a much grander scale, as those across early modern Britain, where labours were conducted in closed, dark and muffled surroundings.²⁴ However, within this room two beds were to be prepared. The first was a pallet bed, or an inferior bed, with a rich canopy of crimson satin, embroidered with crowns of gold and the queen's arms.²⁵ The second was the great bed, covered with ermine and cloth of gold, above it a canopy, adorned with more gold crowns and the king's and queen's arms.²⁶ The instructions for their furnishing and adornment indicate that it was the pallet bed which was intended for the delivery with the great bed initially serving an emblematic function, perhaps denoting the conception of the child and the monarch's symbolic presence in the chamber. Most probably following her labour, the queen was transferred into this bed for her lying-in and the reception of congratulatory dignitaries. It would appear that almost two hundred years later this same arrangement was still in use. An eye-witness account, given at an Extraordinary Council meeting, organised to refute rumours that Prince James, son of

²² The sixteenth century copy is inscribed "Robert Cotton 1602". Presumably this records when Cotton acquired the manuscript. I shall be working from this transcription throughout. An antiquarian, Cotton was frequently employed by James I to investigate historical precedents and to advise on court pomp and formality. For the seventeenth century version see B.L. Harleian MS 305.

²³ Certain Artycles. B.L. Add MS 4712. f. 15r.

²⁴ Cressy, 1997. p. 53.

²⁵ Certain Artycles. B.L. Add MS 4712. f. 15v.

²⁶ *Ibid.* f. 15r.

King James II and Mary of Modena, was an impostor, reveals the continuity of royal ceremonial. It also shows that these dictates could be compromised by practical necessity.

Thus Mrs Margaret Dawson, gentlewoman to Mary, reported that:

“She found her all alone upon a stool by the Bedshead when the Queen said to her this Deponent, she believed herself in Labour and bid her the Deponent get the Pallet Bed, which stood in the next room, to be made ready quickly for her; But that Bed having never been aired, the Deponent perswaded the Queen not to make use of it: after which the Queen bid the Deponent make ready the bed she came out of which was done accordingly.”²⁷

In addition to the instructions regarding the provisions for the confinement room, Henry VII's *Artycles* also contain a description of the rituals to be performed before the birth:

“And if it plesse the queene to take to her chamber, shee shall be brought thithyr with lords and ladys of estate and brought into the chapel or chirch ther to be howselid (*to receive the communion*) then to come into the great chamber and tak spice and wine under the clothe of estate.”²⁸

In this way, by this symbolic ingestion, both the queen and her unborn child were presented before the spiritual and temporal authorities. In the first instance, they received God's grace before their perilous travail, while in the second a common practice of early modern child-birth was elevated and ritualised. The reference to wine and spice probably alludes to a caudle, a warm alcoholic drink (thought to have medicinal properties), which was routinely given to women in labour.²⁹ By performing these actions in a public ceremonial space the mother and child's exalted status were underlined and the prospect of an imminent addition to the ruling dynasty was proclaimed. Following these public displays the two highest-ranking nobles present were to lead the queen to her chamber where the birth was conducted away

²⁷ Privy Council Registers, James II. 4th April, 1687 - 16th December, 1688. TNA. PC 2/71. p. 763.

²⁸ Certain Artycles. B.L. Add MS 4712 f. 15r.

²⁹ Cressy, 1997. p. 83.

from the public gaze.³⁰ From that moment no man was to be present and the household offices were assumed by the ladies and gentlewomen of the court.³¹ The relative privacy allotted to Henry's queen, however, was to diminish gradually as royal births became increasingly public events. Indeed, well over thirty named witnesses of both sexes, were recorded at Mary of Modena's delivery and descriptions of the birth suggest that many more were present.³² Lord Godolphin, Commissioner of the Treasury, reported that the room was so full he could not get near the bed.³³

Clearly royal births in early modern Britain were public events manipulated for courtly display. Highly ritualised, they were designed to assert the distinguished position of mother and child, as well as the imminent strengthening of the dynasty. Within this spectacle both the queen and her offspring were actors whose comfort and ease were subordinate to the verification of the authenticity of the heir and to the symbolic representation of regal authority, magnificence and continuity. Yet by enduring this process and successfully delivering an heir, queens consort validated their conjugal and dynastic role and also increased their influence and authority. Royal parents basked in the reflected glory of a newborn prince and, consequently, went to great lengths to advertise their achievement.

IV

Baptism was a religious and social rite which was expected for every early modern child.³⁴ For most families the ceremony built kindred and community bonds; for royalty it could reinforce political alliances and strengthen international relations. One such christening

³⁰ Certain Artycles. B.L. Add MS 4712 f. 15r.

³¹ Certain Artycles. B.L. Add MS 4712 f. 15r.

³² Privy Council Registers, James II. 4th April, 1687 - 16th December, 1688. TNA. PC2/71. pp. 759-776.

³³ *Ibid.* p. 772. *The London Gazette* records a similarly public birth for Princess Anne of Denmark's delivery of William, Duke of Gloucester, in 1689: "The King with most of the persons of quality about the Court came into her Royal Highness's Bedchamber before she was delivered." See Issue 2473, 25th July, 1689. p. 2.

³⁴ Cressy, 1997. p. 99.

was held in 1594 to celebrate the birth of Henry Frederick, the first son of King James VI of Scotland. Henry's birth was a triumph for James, through which he moved one step closer to the throne of England. As next-in-line to Elizabeth I's crown, James was well aware that the production of a son and heir helped strengthen his claim and enhanced his appeal to the English public. Following his son's birth on the 19th of February, James sent for his nobility and civic dignitaries to settle the form of the baptism.³⁵ The sum of one hundred thousand pounds Scots was granted to the King for the grand accomplishment of the christening.³⁶ In addition, it was decided that ambassadors should be sent to the courts of France, England, Denmark and the Low Countries, as well as to the Dukes of Brunswick and Magdeburg, informing them of this most auspicious event and requesting the presence of their representatives at the ceremony.³⁷

Clearly James wanted to make an impression and the preparations reveal that with this event he wished to set the Scottish court on a European stage, proclaiming its wealth, refinement and aspirations. First, the Chapel Royal at Stirling Castle, considered too small and in a poor state of repair, was razed to the ground and in its place a larger, more commodious building was erected.³⁸ Inside, the ceiling was painted gold, the walls adorned with pictures, sculptures and other ornaments.³⁹ The Castle too, was refurbished with three thousand pounds spent on beating and mending the tapestries, buying new tablecloths, stools, chairs, velvets and other movables for the decoration of the chambers.⁴⁰ Four thousand pounds were granted to the Queen for the clothing of her gentlewomen and servants, who

³⁵ Fowler, 1594. p. 2r.

³⁶ *Ibid.* p. 2r.

³⁷ Fowler, 1594. p. 2r. Moysie, 1813. p. 117.

³⁸ Fowler, 1594. p. 2v. Moysie, 1813. p. 117.

³⁹ Rogers, 1882. p. lxxxii.

⁴⁰ *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, Vol. 5, 1592-99 (11th June, 1594). p. 132.

were decked out in silks, taffetas, satins, cloth of gold and silver and embroidery work.⁴¹ Nothing was permitted to spoil the event. James expected his nobles to impress and brooked no excuse for failure to attend.⁴² The general populace was also expected to toe the line. Before the festivities began on the 24th of August, a herald was charged to order from the Mercat Cross in Stirling that all the King's subjects behave civilly towards the foreign visitors and refrain from "prevocatioun of displeasour in worde, deid or countenance, outhir for auld fied or new, or for quhatsumevir caus or occasioun, in cuming to this toun . . . undir the pane of death."⁴³ Even before the celebrations began then, their surroundings had been carefully controlled and manicured to impress the state guests.

In advance of the baptism itself, the ambassadors were treated to a series of banquets and amusements.⁴⁴ Two days were set aside for grand entertainments with the first intended for a royal tournament and the second for "rare shewes and singular inventions."⁴⁵ The participants in the martial exercises of the first day were divided into three groups and dressed accordingly, before running at the glove and ring. The King and two of his nobles were cast as Christian knights of Malta, three others played Turks and a further three were clothed in women's attire as Amazons.⁴⁶ Each combatant was accompanied by a page carrying his master's impress or device. Upon James' shield was a lion's head with open eyes, which represented fortitude and vigilance; beneath which were the words: "*Timeat et*

⁴¹ Volume of accounts of the King's and Queen's apparel furnished by Robert Jousie, merchant, at the direction of George Home of Spott, Master of the Wardrobe 1590-1600. N.R.S. E35/13. ff. 5-22.

⁴² See James' mildly threatening letters to Sir John Ogilvie and Patrick Gray, Master of Gray, summoning them to the baptism: Letters to Sir John Ogilvy from James VI asking him to prepare to be present at the Baptism of Prince Henry. N.R.S. GD205/1/21; GD205/1/22; and Royal Letter summoning the Master of Gray to the baptism of Prince Henry, scribed James. N.R.S. GD1/212/55. See also Moysie, 1813. p. 118.

⁴³ *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, Vol. 5, 1592-99. 24th August 1594. p. 165.

⁴⁴ Fowler, 1594. p. 3v.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* p. 4r.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* p. 4v. It is interesting to note that these dramatised martial exploits would later appeal to Henry, himself, when directing his own ceremonial occasions. For example, see *Prince Henry's Barriers* (1610).

primus et ultimus orbis.”⁴⁷ Adapted from the end of book one of Ovid’s *Fasti*, its meaning may be interpreted as: “May the world far and near fear his sons”.⁴⁸ Ovid’s original text references Aeneas, as the progenitor of the Ancient Romans.⁴⁹ Thus here, the use of “sons” denotes not only James’ descendants but also his subjects. The King was presented, therefore, both as a father and as *pater patriae*, a dual *persona* which he would continue to employ throughout his reign. The second day’s entertainment, which had promised to be a spectacle to surpass all those previously performed in Scotland, was cancelled. Strangely, it was claimed that the artisans and workmen were required elsewhere.⁵⁰ One can only guess at what might have been staged, with brave and strangely attired actors, as well as lions, elephants, unicorns, gryphons and a hydra all in attendance.⁵¹

Finally, after over six months of planning, preparation and postponements, on the 30th of August, Henry Frederick was baptised.⁵² The Chapel Royal was hung with tapestries and furnished with a seat of state for the King, on either side of which were the chairs of the foreign representatives, each crowned with their nation’s arms and surrounded by multi-coloured velvets, taffetas and cloth of gold.⁵³ In the absence of a French representative, an empty chair, set with the Arms of the King of France, was placed to James’ right.⁵⁴ At the outset the ambassadors were conveyed to the young Prince’s presence chamber where he lay in his vast cradle of state, richly embroidered with the legends of Hercules.⁵⁵ Again, classical

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* p. 4v.

⁴⁸ Ovid’s verse is “horreat Aeneadas et primus et ultimus orbis”. Interestingly, viewed within its original context this phrase supports the pursuit of peace over war and reflects the pacific foreign policy which James was later to pursue.

⁴⁹ Boyle, A.J. and Woodward, R.D. (eds.), 2004. p. 25.

⁵⁰ Fowler, 1594. p. 5r.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* p. 5r.

⁵² *Ibid.* p. 3v. State Papers Scotland, Elizabeth I. August – December, 1594. TNA. SP52/54. f. 25r.

⁵³ Fowler, 1594. pp. 5r-5v.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* p. 5r. Ferguson (ed.), 1899. p. 173. In a letter dated 11th July 1594, Henry IV, occupied with the besieging of Laon, apologises for the delay in sending his representatives - TNA. SP52/53. f. 257r.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* p. 6v. The Dutch ambassador described the prince as a “very fine thriving child” – see James Ferguson (ed.). *Scots Brigade in Holland*, Vol. 1, Scottish History Society (Edinburgh, 1899). p. 163.

symbolism was employed, with Henry cast as a masculine figure of strength and justice.⁵⁶ Presenting him in this way was, of course, particularly evocative of Hercules' first legendary feat, when he killed two serpents sent to his cradle by Juno.⁵⁷ The meaning was plain - already the prince had adopted this legendary mantle - he was a child destined for greatness, endowed with a semi-divine aura and equipped to battle his enemies. The royal babe, attired in a purple robe, richly set with pearls, was then delivered to the English ambassador who carried him to the Chapel Royal beneath a crimson velvet canopy, fringed with gold.⁵⁸ Two lords carried Henry's train, followed by the ambassadors, nobility and heralds.

After the baptism proper, the Bishop of Aberdeen gave an oration praising and commending Henry. He then turned to the ambassadors, addressing them individually and considered the history, associations and blood ties which each foreign prince shared with Scotland.⁵⁹ The implications of this speech would surely have been recognised by those present. By beginning with the representatives of England and underlining the proximity of the Scottish royal line to the English one, James sent a not so subtle message about his own dynastic rights as heir to Elizabeth's crown. He also emphasised the prestige and standing of his son's lineage and international connections. His meaning did not escape Robert Bowes, Ambassador Ordinary of England. In his report on the occasion he observed that the Bishop "labored much to make knowne howe this prince was conn(ect)ed and discended from those prince(s) namely the K(ing)s of Englande."⁶⁰ It would appear however, that the oration may have overstepped the mark, recalling the verses of the theologian, Andrew Melville, who had previously predicted that Henry would unite the thrones of Scotland and England.⁶¹ Bowes was in no doubt that these sentiments were unacceptable and would call those responsible to

⁵⁶ Williamson, 1978. p. 3.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, p. 2r.

⁵⁸ Fowler, 1594. pp. 6v-6r. Moysie, 1813. p. 118.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*. p. 8v. State Papers Scotland, Elizabeth I. August – December, 1594. TNA. SP52/54. f. 24r.

⁶⁰ State Papers Scotland, Elizabeth I. August – December, 1594. TNA. SP52/54. f. 24r.

⁶¹ *Ibid*. f. 24r. See Melville's *Principis Scoti Britannorum Natalia* (Edinburgh, 1594). p. 2.

account.⁶² At the end of the ceremony Lyon King of Arms cried out: “God save Frederick Henrie, Henrie Frederick, by the Grace of God, Prince of Scotland.”⁶³ The call was repeated by the other heralds, proclaiming through an open window of the Chapel Royal, followed by the sound of trumpets.⁶⁴ Even the young prince’s name reinforced his illustrious lineage with “Frederick” in honour of his maternal grandfather, Frederick II of Denmark, and his great-grandfathers, the Dukes of Brunswick and Mecklenburg, and “Henry”, chosen in honour of Henry IV of France and Queen Elizabeth’s father, Henry VIII.⁶⁵

The day concluded with a magnificent banquet. Following the first course, a chorus of trumpeters and oboes sounded, announcing the arrival of the second.⁶⁶ Into the King’s Hall entered a blackamoor drawing a massive triumphal chariot, “decked with all sortes of exquisite delicates and dainties, of patisserie, frutages and confections.”⁶⁷ As the guests ate, a silent comedy was presented, again drawing on classical symbolism and devised as much in praise of the royal parents as of the young prince. Six women, richly attired in satin, embellished with gold and silver, and wearing crowns, jewels and garlands in their hair, were cast as classical personifications, complete with their attributes. Ceres (Mother-earth), Fecundity, Faith, Concord, Liberality and Perseverance posed before the diners, each with her own Latin caption.⁶⁸ Fecundity bore messages proclaiming that the nation had been blessed by a child of the gods and imploring that this offspring may grow into thousands more.⁶⁹ Liberality stood holding two crowns and two sceptres, accompanied by another caption asserting that those who possess this virtue shall receive more than they give.⁷⁰ It seems

⁶² State Papers Scotland, Elizabeth I. August – December, 1594. TNA. SP52/54. f. 24r.

⁶³ Fowler, 1594. p. 8r.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* p. 8r.

⁶⁵ Ferguson, (ed.), 1899. p. 164. The King had initially favoured the names “Charles James”.

⁶⁶ Fowler, 1594. p. 10r.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* p. 10r. Originally, it had been planned that a lion should haul this vehicle before the diners but at the last minute, rather wisely, he had been replaced.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* p. 10v-11r.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* p. 10v.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* p. 11r.

probable that this symbolism was again inspired by the King's dynastic ambitions, presenting James as a father of nations and evoking once more the union of the crowns of Scotland and England. Yet by so doing, James was treading a fine line, as his succession was by no means certain. After his mother's execution in 1587, he was technically barred from his inheritance by the Act of Association and as an alien he was forbidden by common law to inherit English land.⁷¹ Furthermore, Elizabeth's refusal to discuss the issue of her successor meant that there was no consensus on the critically important question of how the right to succeed her was to be determined.⁷² Within this uncertain political climate, the persistent assertion of James' hereditary rights is striking for its audacity.

Following this tableau, the next course was brought in upon a vast ship - 18 feet long and 40 feet tall, richly painted red, silver, gold and azure with white taffeta sails.⁷³ Then the evening ended with a recital of the 128th psalm, performed in seven harmonies by fourteen singers.⁷⁴ Its verses brought the occasion to a close and yet again underlined its significance, declaring that those who fear the Lord and walk in his ways shall be as a fruitful vine:

“Thou shalt thy children's children see,
to thy great joyes encrease,
And likewise grace on Israel,
prosperitie and peace.”⁷⁵

With Henry's birth, his father's position was greatly strengthened both at home and abroad. The Prince's baptism was designed to emphasise this, while also augmenting the house of Stuart's international connections and asserting its political and dynastic aspirations. Time and again the iconography and symbolism of the christening celebrated James' fertility,

⁷¹ Mayer (ed.), 2003. pp. 14-15.

⁷² *Ibid.* p. 14.

⁷³ Fowler, 1594. p. 11v.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* p. 13r.

⁷⁵ Hopkins, 1595. p. 81.

portraying him not only as *paterfamilias* but also as *pater patriae*, father to his subjects and progenitor of nations. In turn, Henry was presented as heir to the thrones of two realms - the future unifier of Scotland and England. Traces of the strong masculine, militaristic *persona* which would develop around the Prince are already evident, revealing his father's complicity in its creation, while the international guests, representative of Europe's Protestant interests, served to position and underline the Stuarts' religious policies.

Although international opinion was important to James, the perception of him at home was also of undoubted significance. In the years leading up to his son's birth, religious tensions within the Scottish nobility posed an increasing threat to James' authority. On one side was the ultra-protestant Francis Stewart, Earl of Bothwell, who had made several attempts to obtain possession of the King's person, culminating in April 1594 with a raid which compelled James to retire rapidly from Leith to Edinburgh.⁷⁶ On the other side, a coalition of northern earls represented the Roman Catholic interest. In 1592, a supposed plot was uncovered whereby these earls were to aid Spain in an invasion of the west of Scotland.⁷⁷ Viewed within this volatile political context, the birth of an heir considerably enhanced the King's standing, offering him significant political leverage. James was no doubt acutely aware of this and it appears that during the preparations for Henry's baptism he toyed with the idea of securing the public submission of the rebellious northern earls. In one of his dispatches Robert Bowes recorded that:

"I have been informed that at this baptisme the forfeited Erles will offer to give assurance aswell [sic] to the k(ing) and the kirke as also to hir ma(jes)tie to submit themselves

⁷⁶ Donaldson, 1965. p. 191.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* p. 190.

for the satisfaccon of hir ma(jes)tie the k(ing) and the kirke, and under suche p(ro)visions for their lyves and safetyes as shalbe founde p(ro)fitable for both realmes.”⁷⁸

It would appear that this ritual submission did not take place;⁷⁹ nevertheless, the fact that it was considered confirms that the domestic situation contributed greatly to the baptism’s significance. Indeed, its message was to reach far beyond the walls of Stirling Castle. In the months following, Robert Waldegrave, Printer to the King, published *A True Reportarie of the Most Triumphant, and Royal Accomplishment of the Baptisme of the Most Excellent, right High and mightie Prince Frederick Henry*, while in England the Widow Butter obtained a licence for its publication.⁸⁰ Thus the baptism’s spectacle and display was consciously employed to send covert and not-so-covert messages about James’ rule and policy to both his existing and future subjects. In 1603, after his accession to the English throne, an anglicised edition of the *Reportarie* was printed in London.⁸¹ Subsequent editions were published throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, notably by the Jacobites in 1745.⁸² The preface to John Reid the Younger’s 1703 reprint may provide some insight into the romance and appeal of Henry’s baptism:

⁷⁸ State Papers Scotland, Elizabeth I. August – December, 1594. TNA. SP52/54. f. 17r.

⁷⁹ I have been unable to find mention of any such occurrence in either the printed accounts or documentary descriptions of the baptism.

⁸⁰ See *A True Reportarie of the Most Triumphant, and Royal Accomplishment of the Baptisme of the Most Excellent, right High and mightie Prince Frederick Henry; By the Grace of God, Prince of Scotland. Solemnized the 30 day of August. 1594. Printed by R. Walde-graue, printer to the K. Maiestie. Cum priuilegio regali.* (Edinburgh, 1594); also *A true reportarie of the most triumphant, and royal accomplishment of the bapbtisme of the most excellent, right high, and mightie prince, Frederik Henry, by the grace of God, prince of Scotland. Solemnized the 30. day of August 1594. Printed by Peter Short, for the Widdow Butter, and are to be sold at her shop vnder Saint Austines Church.* (London, 1594).

⁸¹ *A true report of the most tryumphant, and royall accomplishment of the baptisme of the most excellent, right high, and mightie prince, Henry Fredericke, by the grace of God, Prince of Scotland, and now Prince of Wales as it was solemnized the 30. day of August. 1594. Printed by Thomas Creede for John Browne, and are to be solde at his shop in S. Dunstons Church-yard in Fleetstreete.* (London, 1603).

⁸² Buchanan, 1836. p. 470.

“We have therein in some measure a view of the antient glory and splendour of this kingdom, and in what estimation it was had with neighbouring countries, tho ever since the union of the crowns, our greatness has been declining.”⁸³

Thus James’ intentions were to be fully realised years later. The splendour and symbolism of this royal christening resonated with subsequent generations, evoking an era of eminence, power and aspiration.

V

Nothing of the scale and splendour of Henry’s christening was performed for his younger siblings. However, following the birth of Princess Mary in 1605, James opted once more for a lavish baptismal ceremony. Mary was the first child born to her parents following her father’s accession to the English throne. As such, she was also the first royal babe born to an English monarch since the birth of Edward VI, some sixty-eight years earlier. Although her sex no doubt dampened the celebrations, for James this was still an accomplishment to be lauded - further confirmation of the fecundity of the royal marriage and a boost to his self-styled *persona* of the nourishing father. Several aspects of this christening followed the form of that of her older brother and help to elucidate the central features of a royal public baptism. The *Old Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal* records that the Gentlemen of the Chapel processed two by two in their surplices to the nursery door, followed by the Dean of the Chapel and the Archbishop of Canterbury.⁸⁴ The royal infant was then carried in silence underneath a canopy of cloth of gold to the lower chapel with the King, Prince Henry, the Earls, Bishops, Lords and Barons all in attendance.⁸⁵ With the baptismal rite over, the heralds donned their coats and Garter-King-at-Arms proclaimed the style of the princess in a loud

⁸³ *Ibid.* p. 470.

⁸⁴ Ashbee and Harley (eds.), 2000. p. 94.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* p. 94.

voice to which the trumpeters sounded cheerfully.⁸⁶ Music played a significant part, with anthems of dedication and thanksgiving sung throughout.⁸⁷ The service ended with a final anthem, *Singe Joyfullye*.⁸⁸ The musicologist, Richard Turbet, has convincingly argued that this must be a reference to William Byrd's most famous anthem.⁸⁹ Taken from the eighty-first psalm, the celebratory text proclaims:

“Sing joyfully to God our strength; sing loud unto the God of Jacob!
Take the song, bring forth the timbrel, the pleasant harp, and the viol.
Blow the trumpet in the new moon, even in the time appointed, and at our feast
day.”⁹⁰

Here, the reference to Jacob also stands for James, from the Latin form, *Jacobus*.⁹¹ Thus the christening concluded with a self-congratulating flourish, calling all present to rejoice in this auspicious event. With this child, the first of the line to be born south of the border, the alien Stuart dynasty had begun to establish itself as the English royal family.

Subsequent generations of Stuarts also recognised the importance of spectacle and display following a royal birth. The christening of the future Charles II was conducted with a similar emphasis on pomp and opulence. Sir John Finet, Master of Ceremonies under Charles I, recounted how the young prince was brought to the Chapel Royal through the King's presence and guard chambers - all richly hung.⁹² Before him marched the aldermen of the city, the judges and Lord Mayor, followed by the nobility, with the courtyard leading to the Chapel, railed-in to keep out the “crowding multitude”.⁹³ The Chapel itself was hung with cloth of gold and arras. Purpose-built galleries were supported by pillars covered with

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* p. 95.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 94-5.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* p. 95.

⁸⁹ Turbet, 2004. p. 85.

⁹⁰ Le Huray, 1978. p. 148.

⁹¹ Turbet, 2004. p. 85.

⁹² Loomie, (ed.), 1987. p. 88.

⁹³ *Ibid.* p. 88.

crimson satin and flowered with gold silk and silver, while on a platform in the middle of the chapel stood a large font of silver gilt.⁹⁴ After the baptism, the heralds, both inside and out, proclaimed the prince's titles. In reply, the people gave "loud acclamations, seconded by the sound of drums and trumpets, and by the thundering of canons from the Toure and the ships on the Thames."⁹⁵ This account is particularly valuable for its brief references to popular rejoicing. The cheering hoards outside the palace suggest that the King's subjects were, indeed, gratified by the birth of their new prince. Unfortunately, this was not always to be the case.

In 1688 the festivities surrounding the birth of Prince James, son of James II and Mary of Modena, were of a scale hitherto unseen. The production of a male heir had been a pressing concern in the minds of their people for over twenty-five years. Yet, with the successful delivery of this Prince of Wales, the public were confronted with the unwelcome probability of a Catholic royal dynasty presiding over a Protestant majority. Thus it was both with a sense of relief and with some trepidation that James' subjects received the news. Moreover, rumours had begun to spread that the Prince was an impostor, secreted into his barren mother's bed by the agents of Catholicism. Narcissus Luttrell recorded in his diary how people openly voiced their concerns about their new Prince, "with strange reflections on him not fit to insert here."⁹⁶ A full-scale propaganda campaign was mounted in response, with a plethora of public thanksgivings and celebrations ordered to mark the birth. *The London Gazette* of the 11th of June 1688 announces the instructions for a general thanksgiving in London and Westminster on the 17th of June and throughout the rest of the kingdom the following fortnight.⁹⁷ Its later issues are littered with descriptions of the masses, bonfires, illuminations, feasts and public revels, which were organised by royal envoys across

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 89.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 90.

⁹⁶ Luttrell, 1857. Vol. I, 7th July, 1688. p. 449.

⁹⁷ *London Gazette*, Issue 2354, Thursday June 7th to Monday June 11th, 1688. p. 1.

the major cities of Europe.⁹⁸ In London thousands of spectators gathered on the 17th of July to see *England's Triumphs for the Prince of Wales*, a water pageant presented on the Thames before Whitehall Palace, commemorating this “happy birth” and the Queen’s up-sitting.⁹⁹ Its iconographic programme was designed to impress and underline both the King’s and his son’s divine and hereditary rights, as well as the benefits of their government. On the central barge a sun was suspended, representing the new heir and flanked by two pyramids with an imperial crown and a cipher of the King’s and Queen’s initials displayed below (See Figure 4).¹⁰⁰ In front of that a great Bacchus was presented, straddling a beer cask and toasting the birth with the Latin caption, *Latita [sic] Populi*, or *The Joy of the People*, suspended above it. Also included were two female personifications - the first, representing Peace and Plenty, and the second, Steadfastness and Stability of Empire.¹⁰¹ Each barge was strewn with an array of fireworks, shells, bombs, mortars and rockets, which, it was reported, were ignited at nine o’clock to the delight of the assembled crowds.¹⁰²

Imitated by civic authorities throughout the realm, these lavish festivities also reveal the limitations of the effects of royal display. John Evelyn was clearly underwhelmed, commenting that: “Indeede they were very fine, & had cost some thousands of pounds about the pyramids and statues &c: but were spent too soone, for so long a preparation.”¹⁰³ More importantly, the King’s enemies had been quick to exploit the doubts raised over the circumstances of the Prince’s birth and a rival campaign was launched, employing the printed

⁹⁸ Between 8th July and 16th August lavish public celebrations are recorded in Paris, The Hague, Madrid, Venice, Copenhagen, Vienna, Hamburg and Rome.

⁹⁹ Anon., *Englands triumphs for the Prince of Wales, or, A short description of the fireworks, machines &c. which were represented on the Thames before Whitehall to the King and Queen, nobility and gentry, forreign ministers and many thousands of spectators, on Tuesday-night July 17, 1688* (1688). p. 1.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* p. 1.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.* p.1.

¹⁰² *Ibid.* p. 2.

¹⁰³ De Beer (ed.), 2000. Vol. IV, 17th July, 1688, p. 591.

word and image to intensify these uncertainties.¹⁰⁴ Engravings, broadsides and pamphlets touted a range of conspiracy theories. They alleged that the young heir was, in fact, a miller's son, smuggled into the Queen's bed in a warming pan; that the real prince had died and been replaced by the son of his wet nurse; or that the child was actually the product of a liaison between Mary and her confessor, Father Petre.¹⁰⁵ In this way the torrent of state propaganda was repeatedly undermined. The readiness with which James' subjects questioned the validity of the birth is also telling. Ultimately, the King was unable to reconcile the majority of his subjects to the troubling prospect of a Catholic ruling dynasty.

Thus throughout this period princely births were marked by impressive public celebrations. Royal parents employed spectacle and splendour to proclaim their achievement, to announce the strengthening and continuity of the Stuart line and to underline their own authority. Although of mixed success, the scale, magnificence and complexity of these occasions do convey the political and dynastic significance of these heirs, as well as the aspirations and anxieties of their parents.

VI

Of course, only a few of the Stuart offspring were honoured with public baptisms or celebrations. With the exception of Princess Mary, daughter of King James, the births of female children were invariably subdued affairs. The Venetian Ambassador, Piero Mocenigo,

¹⁰⁴ See, for example, *The declaration of His Highnes [sic] William Henry, by the grace of God Prince of Orange*. Sig A2r; and Pieter Schenk's satirical prints of Prince James, *De Prins Van Wales and Biegrader Peters, met de Rykxvorstin en Zoon*, both 1688. Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London. William III's agent, James Johnstone, even suggested that the Prince, himself, anonymously sponsor a pamphlet which would repeat these suspicions, calling for the Prince of Orange to intervene – see Rachel J. Weil, "The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the Warming-pan Scandal" in Lois G. Schwoerer (ed.), *The Revolution of 1688-89* (Cambridge, 1992). p. 68.

¹⁰⁵ Kenyon, 1963. p. 425.

described the mood following the birth in 1669 of Henrietta, third daughter of James II (while Duke of York) and his first wife, Anne Hyde:

“The foreign ministers have offered their congratulations to the King and the Duke of Hiorch [sic]. These have been welcomed rather as a sign of respect for them personally than for the cause itself, as they would have preferred an increase of male issue.”¹⁰⁶

Such a response was typical. More complex motives often lay behind the decision to hold a private christening for a prince. Although both of his older brothers had been baptised publicly, the birth of Prince Henry, Duke of Gloucester, in 1640 was marked with a private ceremony.¹⁰⁷ In a rather domestic arrangement, his older siblings, Prince Charles, James, Duke of York, and Princess Mary, held him at the font.¹⁰⁸ Interestingly, his maternal grandmother, Marie de Medici, was not permitted to be present owing to religious considerations.¹⁰⁹ It would appear that Henry’s father, Charles I, did not want the service tainted by an association with Catholicism. This exclusion may, in fact, provide a clue to the private nature of the ceremony. Henry was born during the Second Bishops’ War, as political and religious tensions posed a growing threat to the King’s authority. As puritan zeal grew throughout England, certain baptismal rituals - such as the use of a font or the signing of the cross - became increasingly controversial.¹¹⁰ Many disapproved of the High Church rites and ceremonies favoured by the King, considering them superstitious and popish, while fear of Catholic counsels close to Charles, as well as of papist threats to the nation, provoked suspicions of royal policy.¹¹¹ It may well be that, because of this, it was deemed expedient to conduct the baptism behind closed doors, away from the scrutiny of the King’s detractors.

¹⁰⁶ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1669-70*, 25th January, 1669. p. 9.

¹⁰⁷ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1640-42*, 3rd August, 1640. p. 62. Both Prince Charles and James, Duke of York, had received public christenings. See Loomie (ed.), 1987. pp. 88-90; pp. 144-145.

¹⁰⁸ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1640-42*, 3rd August, 1640. p. 62.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* p. 62.

¹¹⁰ Cressy, 1997. p. 173.

¹¹¹ Cust, 2005. pp. 261-2; p. 147. Sharpe, 2010. p. 275.

Sharpe has observed how the royal children were frequently “presented as counterweights to Catholic influences and threats.”¹¹² Certainly, by naming this son Henry, Charles’ no doubt sought to call upon memories of his own popular and fervently Protestant brother, Henry Frederick. The fact that the newborn Prince’s older brothers and sister presided over the occasion may also have reinforced this intimation of Protestant devotion. Having said that, characteristically Charles undermined his own efforts by capitulating to his wife and pardoning all imprisoned recusants in celebration of the event.¹¹³

Following the Restoration, Charles, Duke of Cambridge, the first son of James, Duke of York, was also christened privately, despite the fact that directions for a public christening had been drawn up.¹¹⁴ The provisions charged that the Prince should be presented in his inner chamber, dressed in a mantle of cloth of gold, lined with ermine and lying in a cradle with a canopy above.¹¹⁵ In his outer chamber, a great cradle of state was to be prepared, some five feet long, with the Duke of York’s arms displayed at each corner.¹¹⁶ The instructions for the procession and service follow the basic form.¹¹⁷ The reasons why a private ceremony was preferred most probably lie in the circumstances of this Prince’s birth. Shortly before the Restoration, the Duke of York, had secretly married Anne Hyde, one of his sister’s maids of honour.¹¹⁸ Finding his wife pregnant in the spring of 1660 and with his brother’s return to power imminent, James refused to recognise the marriage contract.¹¹⁹ The affair was soon a public scandal. During her labour Anne was questioned repeatedly as to the paternity of the child but remained insistent.¹²⁰ Eventually the King intervened and recognised the legality of

¹¹² Sharpe, 2010. p. 264.

¹¹³ Carlton, 1995. p. 214.

¹¹⁴ See Provisions for the Christening of a Prince. B.L. Add MS 38141. ff. 209r-211v.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.* f. 209r.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.* f. 211r.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* ff. 209r-210r.

¹¹⁸ Miller, 2000. p. 44.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 44.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.* p45. *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1659-61*, 5th November, 1660. p. 212.

the marriage. Born a child of controversy, it is perhaps unsurprising that this Prince was christened in domestic privacy at Worcester House, the home of his maternal grandfather, Sir Edward Hyde, with the King acting as godfather.¹²¹

Following the events of the Glorious Revolution, a Protestant male heir was finally born. The birth in 1689 of William, Duke of Gloucester (son of Princess Anne of Denmark, the future Queen Anne), was perceived by many as divine confirmation of the legitimacy of the Revolution Settlement. It is strange then that the public rejoicings which accompanied William's birth appear to have been subdued. Toasts were drunk and bells were rung but the extravagance which had marked the birth of Prince James a year earlier was decidedly absent.¹²² *The London Gazette* records William's christening at Hampton Court four days after his birth but in general the sources are remarkably silent on the matter.¹²³ It may be that with this absence of festivity the authorities drew a deliberate comparison between the rival infant heirs and between Catholic excess and Protestant austerity. William was not the son of a monarch and that in itself, may have contributed to the restraint of the celebrations.

However, a more likely cause is simply the deterioration in relations between Anne and the King and Queen, which would eventually lead to her banishment from Court.¹²⁴ Initiated by the Princess' resentment at having ceded her place in the succession to William and exacerbated by petty quarrels over lodgings and money, the rift would surely have dissuaded the King and Queen from celebrating the achievement of the Princess, who was increasingly becoming the focus of an opposition party.¹²⁵ Indeed, it may well be significant that, although William served as godfather, Mary, Anne's own sister, was passed over as godmother in

¹²¹ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1659-61*, 24th December, 1660. p. 228. *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1660-61*, 3rd January, 1661. p. 466.

¹²² Cressy, 2004. p. 92.

¹²³ *The London Gazette*, Issue 2475, Monday 29th July to Thursday 1st August, 1689. p. 2. See also Luttrell, 1857. Vol. I, 27th July, 1688. p. 564.

¹²⁴ Salmon, 1740. p. 20.

¹²⁵ Waller, 2002. p. 296.

favour of the Marchioness of Halifax.¹²⁶ Certainly, it would seem that the Princess was eager to proclaim her success, commissioning an ode from Henry Purcell to commemorate the birth.¹²⁷ Although it is uncertain when *The Noise of Foreign Wars* was actually performed, its message was plain – the people had been blessed with a new heir and Anne was the instrument of their deliverance. Its text asserts:

“Not a word of Battalions, or Fleets;
Nor of Mortars, and Bombs;
No Complaining be heard in our Streets.
No, no; a Young Prince to the Kingdom is given:
With the Voice and the Lute
The Violin and Flute
We Thank the Royall Mother, and Heaven.”¹²⁸

With its references to troops and fleets, as well as to public criticism, the ode made a direct contrast between William’s auspicious birth and the unsettled political climate which had surrounded that of Prince James. The legitimacy and birthright of the young Duke of Gloucester were beyond question. Even when baptismal celebrations were subdued then, royal parents might find other means of advertising their success.

While private christenings, by their very nature, shied away from display and spectacle, they were still not without significance. Like their public counterparts, they were normally influenced by external events and attitudes. Indeed, examination of the circumstances surrounding these births offers considerable insight into the anxieties which afflicted the Stuarts at times when the political and dynastic securities of the line were uncertain.

¹²⁶ *The London Gazette*, Issue 2475, Monday 29th July to Thursday 1st August, 1689. p. 2.

¹²⁷ White, 2007. p. 76.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* p. 76.

VII

As has been shown, the production and survival of royal heirs was of paramount dynastic and political importance. The extraordinary status of these infants is also apparent in their treatment as they grew up. The early years of James, Duke of Cambridge, the short-lived son of James, Duke of York, and Anne Hyde, illustrate the great hopes invested in these infant princes. As it became increasingly evident that Charles II's marriage would remain childless, the standing of his nephew, the young Duke, achieved greater eminence. In 1664, one year after his birth, James was created Baron of Dauntsey and Earl and Duke of Cambridge with precedence over all other dukes of the realm, with the exception of his father.¹²⁹ The following year he was granted an annual pension of three thousand pounds and in 1666 a new life guard of horse was established in his name.¹³⁰ That same year, John Michael Wright painted James' first portrait (1666, See Figure 5). Represented in an ornate suit of rose-coloured pink within a circle of foliage, he holds his ducal coronet in his right hand. As the sole attribute of the Duke its presence underlines his exalted status but may also infer his future - for as second-in-line to the throne, James was destined to inherit the crown of England. Thus he is presented as a young heir with illustrious prospects. This composition was later adapted to commemorate James' election as knight of the Order of the Garter.¹³¹ His installation into that ancient and noble order at the tender age of three was not without controversy. Indeed, Sir Henry de Vic, Garter-King-of-Arms, delivered a speech on the matter, defending the appointment. His oration is valuable for illustrating how these royal heirs were perceived, or at least how the dynasty wished them to be:

¹²⁹ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1663-4*, 1st August, 1664. p. 657.

¹³⁰ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1664-5*, 4th May, 1665. p. 349. *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1666-7*, 16th March, 1666. p. 565.

¹³¹ See John Michael Wright, *James, Duke of Cambridge (1667)*. Royal Collection, London.

“As wee say commonly that the Kings of England doe never die, Soe wee may say that those of the Royall Blood are seldom or never young, they do not grow up to be men, but are borne soe, & as Our first Parents they come into the world in a State of perfection.”¹³²

He continues:

“It is seen by common experience that some diseases are hereditary, & likewise that fortitude, Magnanimity & the like heroic Vertues descend in great families as it were by way of Entaile from the Fathers upon the Children; they run in a blood nay the spirit of his Great Ancestors, (may) the celestiall fire w(hi)ch lyes hid in this young Duke, breakforth as a flame that is kept in, out of the clouds of his childhood.”¹³³

Unfortunately the Duke would never claim his birthright, dying one month before his fourth birthday. His death and those of his younger brothers prompted decades of dynastic uncertainty.

The birth of a prince was an occasion for national celebration as well as a triumph for his parents. The successful delivery of a son validated the royal match, secured the line of succession and reinforced the ruling dynasty’s authority. Both birth and baptism were, to a greater or lesser extent, public performances, designed to proclaim the strengthening of the line. Yet these acts of display also reveal the interests and concerns of the Stuart monarchy. Royal aspirations were asserted, international alliances were strengthened and public approval was courted. Splendour and intricacy typify these events, set within rich and opulent surroundings and accompanied by complex iconographic programmes. Of course, by no means every prince was welcomed into the world with an outburst of public rejoicing. Those who received a more subdued reception were often the victims of circumstance. Nevertheless, private christenings are worthy of attention for the insight which they afford into the

¹³² Speech of Sir Henry de Vic, on the election of the young Duke of Cambridge as Knight of the Garter, 3rd December 1666. TNA. SP 29/180.

¹³³ *Ibid.*

prevailing political climates and the anxieties which afflicted the dynasty. Analysis of the celebrations surrounding royal births and the subsequent treatment of these infants reveals the real importance of heirs as instruments of Stuart propaganda. Youth was their greatest asset; yet it also frequently proved their weakness. These were children destined for greatness, with the hopes of the nation pinned upon their survival to adulthood. Unfortunately, the Stuart line was to become increasingly blighted by the deaths of its offspring and the pressure to produce further heirs was repeatedly renewed. In consequence, the representation of those princes fortunate enough to survive the royal nursery was of considerable importance. As they grew up their public images continued to be shaped by dynastic, political and social circumstances. Their portrayal, however, moved away from the purely emblematic, focusing instead on the development of a popular and potent *persona*.

Chapter 2

***“A Terror to God’s Enemies”*: Representing the Stuart Prince**

I

Published in 1603 William Willymat’s *A Prince’s Looking Glasse* sets out the four most important virtues of a prince. Derived and selected from James VI and I’s *Basilicon Doron* (1599), the author singles out piety, justice, temperance and fortitude.¹ Over eighty years later an anonymous pamphlet, *The Character of a Prince* (1689), adopted four similar regal virtues: “*Piety, Prudence, Valour and Justice.*”² Willymat’s text, a combination of Latin and English verse, is dedicated to Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, for his “delight and pleasure”,³ while *The Character of a Prince* is a thinly veiled vindication and commendation of William III.⁴ Yet, despite differences in purpose and style, their tone and focus share common ground. For example, *The Character* contends that a Prince must be a source of protection for his people and that his glorious actions will always earn his subjects’ respect and admiration.⁵ Similarly, Willymat’s verses advise:

“Strive not alone your subjects to defend

From mutuall wrongs at home, but more contend

¹ Willymat, 1603. Sig. A3r. See James VI and I, *Basilicon Doron* (Menston, 1969 - facsimile reprint of the first edition of 1599).

² Anon., *The Character of a Prince* (1689). p. 3.

³ Willymat, 1603. Sig. A1r.

⁴ Anon., *The Character of a Prince* (1689). See p. 8: “A Prince therefore whose Birth and Education has been in a Country where laws flourish, and Property is sacred, whose Nature is just, and Temper merciful, who has refused Sovereign Power, because he would be true to his Trust . . . that Prince, if we are wise, may make us happy.”

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 6.

From wrongs of forraine kings to keep them sure,
And in their quarrels, warres you may procure.”⁶

Both texts also counsel moderation in religion.⁷ The earlier book asserts that the scriptures should be a prince’s guide and advocates a middle ground, maintaining the purity of the state by repressing and restraining puritans and papists alike.⁸ The pamphlet argues that “a Father to his People, and not to his Priests, is the Prince that *England* wants.”⁹ This emphasis upon the civil and spiritual protection of a ruler’s subjects is repeated in Giles Dent’s sermon on *The Character of a Good Prince*, delivered and published in 1712. Using Hezekiah, King of Judah, as a biblical precedent, Dent avows that a virtuous prince considers Evil and prepares for it: “He will not permit the One at Home, and as for the Other from Abroad, He interposes, and by His Piety, His Courage, and His Conduct, Himself hides his subjects from the Impending Storm.”¹⁰

As Stuart heirs emerged from the privacy of the nursery, it became increasingly important that these issues and concerns were addressed in their cultural representation. Princes had to be portrayed as heads of state in-the-making, who would safeguard the rights and religion of their people. By promoting these popular ideals, successful princely representation reinforced the authority of a ruling dynasty, smoothing the transfer of power from generation to generation. Through the construction of an appealing public image from childhood, royal heirs not only encouraged loyalty and obedience but were also invested with hopes and expectations. In response to popular anxieties, therefore, the Stuarts developed an effective formula for the portrayal of young princes, one which centred upon the projection of

⁶ Willymat, 1603. p. 36.

⁷ *Ibid.* p.28; Anon., *The Character of a Prince* (1689). p. 3.

⁸ Willymat, 1603. p. 28.

⁹ Anon., *The Character of a Prince* (1689). p. 4.

¹⁰ Dent, 1712. p. 14.

martial aptitude and Protestant devotion.¹¹ The public were presented with reassuring representations of future rulers, equipped with the skills and intentions to defend Church and state. Yet, while the reception of these princes was invariably enthusiastic, on occasion their portrayal was to prove problematic for their elders. A popular heir was an asset but it was never intended that he should overshadow the monarch. As will be shown, the representation of young princes was strictly monitored and carefully controlled. They could become a focus for opposition and their portrayal had to be negotiated cautiously. Many individuals were involved in the formation and development of a princely image - it was a collaborative process between patrons, subjects, artists and audiences. Specific political and social circumstances also impacted. Thus, throughout the seventeenth century, the results were often complex and certainly calculated - texts and images which adhered to established conventions but which might also convey diverse messages.

II

The militant prince was by no means a Stuart invention. Nevertheless, it was a conceit which the dynasty would exploit to great effect. As has been shown, the creation of a strongly masculine and warlike *persona* for Prince Henry Frederick had been initiated as early as the celebrations surrounding his baptism.¹² His princely successors were no different. Born amidst the political turmoil of the Bishops' Wars, Henry, Duke of Gloucester, was greeted as an infant delivered by Bellona, already set to fight for the cause of his father, Charles I:

“Come let the Cradle Stand

His Tent. His armour'd Innocence command

¹¹ The exception is James, Prince of Wales, Catholic son of King James II. For further discussion of his representation, see pp. 87-102.

¹² See pp. 40-44.

Obedience.”¹³

Eulogists proclaimed him a child who would grow to become a guardian of nation and Church, mixing “Vowes and Fights in one Concent.”¹⁴ However, after the withdrawal of his father’s Court from London in 1642, Henry’s representation was to become increasingly controversial, as it was managed and manipulated by the King’s adversaries. As a ward of Parliament, the Prince was placed under the care of the Countess of Dorset, residing at Petworth House until her death. He was then moved to Syon House, where he was placed in the charge of Algernon Percy, Earl of Northumberland.¹⁵ James Loxley has intriguingly argued that Northumberland, a stalwart of the Long Parliament, commissioned a series of portraits of the King’s children, intended to highlight the vulnerability and impotence of Charles I.¹⁶ Focusing on Peter Lely’s painting of *The Youngest Children of Charles I* (1647, See Figure 6), Loxley has shown how, in particular, Henry’s depiction was subverted. Executed some months after the Prince’s seventh birthday, rather oddly he is represented in skirts and apron, as yet unbreeched.¹⁷ It was usual for boys to relinquish their skirts around the age of seven - although some did so many years younger - and it was extremely rare for them to wear aprons past their fourth year.¹⁸ Both Henry’s brothers had been breeched at a much earlier age.¹⁹ Indeed, it is likely that the King’s displeasure with Anthony Van Dyck’s first painting of his eldest children was precisely because his heir, Prince Charles, had been represented in skirts.²⁰ Loxley argues, therefore, that Lely’s portrayal of Henry’s “prolongued

¹³ University of Oxford, 1640. Sig. E2v; Sig. C1v.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* Sig. A2v.

¹⁵ Loxley, 1997. p. 157.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 166.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 162.

¹⁸ Kuus, 2000. p. 81.

¹⁹ Loxley, 1997. p. 162.

²⁰ Brown and Vlieghe, 1999. p. 296. See Anthony Van Dyck’s *The Three Eldest Children of Charles I* (1635), Galleria Sabauda, Turin, Italy.

infancy” constituted a visual intimation of the King’s powerlessness and underlined Northumberland’s authority over the royal children.²¹

Loxley has also observed how these images appropriate and re-work Charles’ own iconography.²² This is evident in Lely’s portrait of the young Duke alone (1647, See Figure 7). Again shown in skirts, Henry clutches a small pile of fruit in his left hand, while carefully grasping the stem of a bunch of grapes between the fingers of his right. Eddy de Jongh has traced the symbolism of this grape motif in Dutch painting, back to the moralising texts of Jacob Cats and argues that it signifies virginity and sexual purity.²³ He has reasoned that when a child holds a bunch of grapes in this manner, it denotes the virtuous marriage of his mother and father.²⁴ As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the imagery of fruitfulness was one to which Charles and Henrietta Maria repeatedly returned and this notion would no doubt have appealed.²⁵ The prominence of fruit in this composition is reminiscent of the still life in Van Dyck’s *The Five Eldest Children of Charles I* (1637, See Figure 8), where a bowl, also filled with grapes and vines, sits on a table. This arrangement may have been intended to recall psalm 128:3:

“Like fruitful vines on the house side
So doth thy wife spring out
Thy children stand like olive-plants
thy table round about.”²⁶

Van Dyck’s painting, however, draws an important distinction between the youngest royal children, Princess Elizabeth and Princess Anne, who flank the laden table set against a pastoral landscape, and their older siblings, who stand against a stone wall and green velvet

²¹ Loxley, 1997. p. 164.

²² *Ibid.* p. 166.

²³ De Jongh, 1974. p. 175.

²⁴ *Ibid.* p. 180.

²⁵ See pp. 31-32 and p. 34.

²⁶ Hopkins, 1595. p. 81.

curtain. By use of these devices the younger tots are associated symbolically with nature, while the more mature members of the brood are connected to the material world. Comparison of the Van Dyck and Lely compositions, therefore, reveals further incongruities in Henry's representation. While the Prince's clothing infantilises him, so too do his attributes. For, if it was deemed unsuitable to portray the four-year-old James, Duke of York, alongside such imagery, it was certainly inappropriate for Henry. Thus by invoking and subverting the iconography of the royal marriage and its offspring, Northumberland and Lely highlighted the King's plight once more. Charles' family unit had become a victim of the Civil War. His wife, heir and youngest daughter were now exiled in France, while his other children were under parliamentary care, little more than captives. Kevin Sharpe has argued that representations of the royal family epitomised Caroline sovereign power.²⁷ In consequence, the King's separation from and loss of authority over his children seriously undermined both his image and his prerogative. Henry's figure, depicted alone and accompanied by symbolic attributes formerly favoured by his parents, emphasised the broken state of the King's family and Charles' own isolation. What is more, the focus on the monarch's youngest son harboured another anxiety. Rumours continued to circulate that the Duke would be established as a puppet-king, ruling under the control of the rebels.²⁸ His father took these reports seriously, repeatedly warning his son of the consequences of such action.²⁹ Indeed, during their final meeting, Charles pressed upon Henry the importance of maintaining the legal succession and of resisting any attempts to place him upon the throne ahead of his brothers.³⁰ Thus this representation of Henry came to constitute a threat. His

²⁷Sharpe, 2010. p. 207.

²⁸ Loxley, 1997. pp. 162-164.

²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 163.

³⁰See *Munday the 29th. January, 1648 A true relation of the Kings speech to the Lady Elizabeth, and the Duke of Gloucester, the day before his death* (London, 1649).

portrayal both invoked and subverted royal iconography, intimidating and frustrating the King, its intended audience.

Following Henry's release in early 1653 and his reunion with his family on the continent, a campaign was mounted to re-form and reclaim his Stuart cultural identity. The Prince's public image needed rehabilitation and he was quickly cast in the role of the militant prince. His liberation provided a much-needed boost to the Stuart cause and was greeted as a providential escape, rather than the ignominious discharge that it was. Sir Edward Hyde's response is informative:

“I have not felt my heart so much enlarged with Joy this long time as at the great news of your miraculous escape from that wicked people you are freed from, for what consent of theirs soever seemed to goe w(i)th it, I shall always reckon it a miraculous escape, wrought for you by God's singular mercy.”³¹

Less than two months after his arrival, arrangements were being made for Henry's installation to the Order of the Garter. His sister, the Princess of Orange, summoned Sir Edward Walker, Garter King of Arms, requesting that he consider “the aptest & most Hono(ura)ble way to performe the ceremony.”³² Four days later she, and the Queen of Bohemia, Henry's aunt, presided over the occasion, accompanied by all the English people of quality then present in The Hague.³³ Throughout the ceremony his royal status was underlined. The rites were performed beneath a canopy of state with Garter making his obeisance three times, supported by four Knights in recognition of the Prince's status.³⁴ Following the installation Walker delivered a discourse, detailing the history and nobility of the Order. Addressing Henry, he invoked the illustrious history of his title:

³¹ Letter from Hyde to the Duke of Gloucester, 14th March, 1653. Bod. Lib. Clarendon MS 45. f. 151r. See also Letter from The Duke of Gloucester to Hyde, 26th March, 1653. Bod. Lib. Clarendon MS 45. f. 186r.

³² College of Arms. Garters Register 1 (1644-64). f. 15r.

³³ *Ibid.* f. 16r.

³⁴ *Ibid.* ff. 15r-15v.

“As yo(u)r Highnesse beares the Title of Duke of Gloucester, so that you will inherit the great heroique virtue of the Excellent Prince yo(u)r Predecessor Humphrey Plantagenet Protector of the Realme & person of his nephew King Hen: 6th who by his great wisdom, bounty and Justice obtained the title & appellation of the Good Duke.”³⁵

Thus Henry was cast as the successor to a martial prince who had maintained and defended the prerogative of his King. His own role was clear – it was his duty to aid and support his brother’s struggle to regain the crown. With his speedy installation to the Order, he was publicly received back into the Stuart fold, his dynastic links were underlined and his rank and standing were asserted.

Adriaen Hanneman’s portrait of the Prince was probably painted around this time (c.1653, See Figure 9). It is the visual antithesis to Lely’s earlier portrayals. Here, Henry is depicted ready for action, in buff jerkin and breast plate, the blue of his Garter sash resplendent against the metallic sheen of his armour. In his right hand, he grips a military baton, while with his left he touches the hilt of his sheathed sword. It is likely that this image was conceived with reference to Hanneman’s earlier portrait of his elder brother, Charles II (1649, See Figure 10). Comparison of these paintings suggests that Hanneman’s composition was intended to realign Henry’s representation visually by depicting him in the mould of his sibling. Both are depicted in front of a rocky outcrop, with a wooded landscape in the distance and sunlight breaking through the clouded sky. Like Henry, Charles is shown in breast plate, jerkin and Garter sash with gold embroidered doublet. He too grasps a military baton at its top so that its base is hidden by the borders of the canvas. Although their dimensions differ, the similarities in setting, attire and pose are such that viewed together they seem almost mirror images and the Duke’s portrait may well have been intended as a partner to that of Charles. Indeed, Henry’s stance is derived from an earlier portrait by Van

³⁵ *Ibid.* f. 17v.

Dyck of the eleven-year-old Charles in armour, which in turn owes a debt to that painter's iconic portrait of his father, *Charles I a la Chasse* (1635).³⁶ Another version of the portrait, with Prince Charles decked in military dress, was engraved by Wenceslaus Hollar (1649, See Figure 11).³⁷ The similarities between this image and Hanneman's portrait of Henry are striking. Thus Hanneman's composition draws upon a long line of royal paintings. Through the appropriation of visual precedents, the Prince's pedigree is underlined and in particular, his close relationship is reinforced with his brother, the King. His Stuart identity had been reclaimed and, through his assumption of the accoutrements of martial prowess, the emasculation which his earlier representation had suffered at the hands of Northumberland was nullified.

The guise of the militant prince was one which Henry was to assume readily. Having joined Charles II in Bruges in 1656, he became active in the city's archery and artillery guilds.³⁸ A year later, during campaigns against the French, he served as nominal colonel of a regiment of Irish troops in Spanish service.³⁹ The portrait painted by Johann Boeckhorst to commemorate Henry's admission to the archery Guild of St. Sebastian in Bruges again stresses his dynastic identity and martial aspect (1656, See Figure 12). Depicted in full armour, the Prince is once more shown against a rocky protrusion within a wooded backdrop, one hand holding a military baton and the other resting upon his sword. Although a rather pedestrian composition, it is the portrait's ornate wooden frame which is worthy of special note. Decorated in carved relief, the royal arms sit upon its top, supported by lion and unicorn. Cannon balls lie at their feet, while field guns peak out from behind them. Below,

³⁶ See Anthony Van Dyck's *Charles, Prince of Wales* (1641), Private Collection, England - in Barnes et al, 2004. p. 484. See also Van Dyck's *Charles I a la Chasse* (1635), Louvre, Paris.

³⁷ See Anthony Van Dyck's *Charles, Prince of Wales* (1641) The Newport Restoration Foundation, Newport, Rhode Island, U.S.A. Hollar's engraving shows the Banqueting House in the distance. Printed shortly after Charles I's death, it constitutes a statement of resilience and continuity, presenting the new King in front of his father's place of execution.

³⁸ Renson, 1976. p. 140.

³⁹ Firth, 1903 . p. 71.

swords, drums, helmets, body armour, torches and a proliferation of bows and arrows are boldly delineated. Together, painting and frame constitute a grandiose statement of military skill and command under the patronage of the royal House of Stuart. Only three years after Henry's release then, his cultural representation was firmly located within the iconography of the warrior prince. His new *persona* effectively countered the negative aspects which had affected his earlier portrayal. It was an uncomplicated but appealing conceit, simultaneously expressing masculinity, status, fortitude and service to King and nation.

III

In many ways, the cultural representation of Henry, Prince of Wales, established a successful precedent for the militant Stuart Prince. It was a guise which he was eager to assume, cultivate and promote. King James had actively encouraged this *persona* during his son's early years, instructing him to follow the chivalric pursuits which would become so closely associated with his public image: "Use specially such games on horse-back as may teach you to handle your armes thereon, such as the Tilte, the Ring, and lowe riding for the handling of your sword."⁴⁰ However, as the Prince matured his bellicose portrayal began to prove problematic: iconographic and personal tensions developed between father and son. This relationship has received much scholarly attention in recent years. While Roy Strong's study *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* did much to open up the field for further research, his depiction of the King as debauched, feeble and resentful, in contrast with the virtuous, athletic and gallant Prince, has been re-evaluated and revised by a number of historians.⁴¹ Certainly, relations between father and son were strained, marked by grudging

⁴⁰ James VI and I, 1969. p. 144.

⁴¹ Strong, 1986. p. 15. For more recent appraisals of James' and Henry's relationship see Michael Ulliot, "James's Reception and Henry's Receptivity: Reading Basilicon Doron after 1603"; and Aysha Pollnitz,

respect and awkward regard, but to characterise their rapport as one of jealousy, suspicion and discord is over-simplistic. The interests and policies of the so-called *Rex Pacificus* and those of the warrior prince were not necessarily at odds. Nevertheless, those responsible for their cultural representation often had a fine line to tread to accommodate and satisfy their disparate ideologies and personalities. One of the few visual instances where this delicate balance is evident is in the *Letters Patent of James I, creating his son Henry, Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester* (1610, See Figure 13).⁴² Decorated with two superb and extremely detailed miniature portraits of James and Henry, it should be viewed as a carefully constructed statement, portraying father and son in diverse yet complementary roles.

The year 1610 marked the inauguration of Henry's public career. Masques, pageants and tournaments celebrated his coming of age and creation as Prince of Wales. The festivities centred on the creation itself, a parliamentary ceremony conducted on the 4th of June, meticulously stage-managed to pay tribute to the Stuart dynasty and, in turn, to loosen the purse strings of the House of Commons.⁴³ The *Letters Patent* played a crucial role in this ceremony, both practically and symbolically. Its imagery reflected the Prince's newly enhanced status and martial public image, preserving for posterity a visual representation of the moment of investiture itself. Like the ceremony and surrounding spectacles, the *Patent* was the result of collaboration. Several artistic hands were responsible for its decoration, while its Latin text had been drafted and re-drafted by a number of Court officials. The mind (or minds) responsible for this sophisticated union of iconographic programme and legal form must have been a cultivated intellectual, as well as a shrewd politician, adept at placating both the King and his heir. Thus the *Patent* presents a relatively unusual subject for the

"Humanism and the Education of Henry, Prince of Wales" – both in Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (Southampton, 2007).

⁴² For another example, see an anonymous engraving, *The Most Highe and Mightie King James the First and Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales* (c.1610), Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

⁴³ Croft, 1992. p. 192.

seventeenth-century art historian - which may explain why it has tended to be overlooked. It is an official document of aesthetic value, an object with a ceremonial and legal function, as well as a multi-authored and complex work of art.

As early as 1603, amidst the celebrations for James's accession to the English throne, thoughts had turned to the formal creation of Henry as Prince of Wales. A short inventory dated that year and entitled *Things to be provided for the creation of the Prince of Wales for his Principallity, Dukedome and Earldome*, lists the ornaments required for his investiture:

“First a Chaplett or Garland of gould curiously wrought
Secondlye a Scepter of Goulde
Thirdly a Ringe of Goulde.”⁴⁴

It also advises that “fit consideration” be made of the charter for his creation.⁴⁵ Six years later little further progress had been made and the Prince was growing increasingly impatient to enter his estates.⁴⁶ Crown finances were the principal barrier to his wishes. The loss of the revenues from Henry's estates and the establishment of a new, independent royal household would place a serious burden on the King's already depleted coffers.⁴⁷ The Prince was persuaded to consent to a delay but his eagerness to attain majority status was not to be subdued for long. His most important ally in this undertaking was Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, James's foremost minister, Secretary of State and Lord Treasurer.⁴⁸ Faced with an assertive and determined heir apparent, Cecil opted to appease the Prince, while also seeking to employ his popularity as a means of relieving the crown's financial situation. For him, Parliament posed the best hope of restitution and Henry was a powerful asset in encouraging

⁴⁴ *Things to be provided for the creation of the Prince of Wales for his Principallity, Dukedome and Earldome*. B.L. Cotton MS Vespasian C XIV. f. 135. See also *Things fitt to be provided for the creating of the Prince of Wales*. Bod. Lib. Ashmole MS 840. f. 233r.

⁴⁵ *Things to be provided for the creation of the Prince of Wales*. B.L. Cotton MS Vespasian C. XIV. f. 135.

⁴⁶ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1607-10*. 6th February, 1609. p. 227.

⁴⁷ Croft, 1992. p. 180.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* p. 182.

the Commons' generosity.⁴⁹ By December 1609 plans were afoot and enquiries were being made into the form such a ceremony should take.⁵⁰ Precedents were remote. England had not witnessed the creation of a Prince of Wales since Henry VIII's installation in 1504 - some 106 years earlier.⁵¹ A few days before the creation, however, Dudley Carleton reported that:

“The rest of the ceremonie that belongs to the prince shall be performed in a(s) privat manner as may be: and altogether after the fashion of Prince Arthur first son to Henry the 7th who you know was a goode husband.”⁵²

Again financial considerations had influenced this choice:

“The K(ing) in this time of necessitie, w(hi)ch is so prest to the Parliament is not willing to undergoe any needless expence: w(hi)ch is the cause that makes this creation so privat; whereas otherwise there would have bin a solmne entrie and passage through the citie of London.”⁵³

Sir John Holles also remarked upon the strain the royal purse was under, with the King also obliged to entertain the Dukes of Brunswick and of Wittemberg, who had arrived for the festivities.⁵⁴

Nevertheless, despite these constraints, the pomp, solemnity and splendour associated with the investiture appear to have greatly impressed observers.⁵⁵ A number of documentary and printed accounts of the ceremony survive, produced both to satisfy public interest in the occasion and to record it as a precedent for future creations.⁵⁶ Following Prince Arthur's

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* p. 182.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* p. 185.

⁵¹ Although he used the title, Edward VI was not formally created Prince of Wales.

⁵² Letter from Carleton to Sir Thomas Edmondson, 2nd June, 1610. B.L. Stowe MS 171. f. 233r.

⁵³ *Ibid.* f. 233v.

⁵⁴ Letter from Holles to Lady Margaret Stanhope. 10th May, 1610. Add MS 32464. f. 40.

⁵⁵ Carleton to Sir Thomas Edmondson, 17th June, 1610. Stowe MS 171. f. 247v. *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1607-10*. 16th June, 1610. p. 507. Foster (ed.), 1966. p. 126.

⁵⁶ See for example, Notes relative to the Creation of the Heir apparent to the Crown as Prince of Wales. TNA. SP 14/53/7; The Creation of Henry, Prince of Wales on the 4th of June 1610. B.L. Harleian MS 5176. ff. 203r-203v; The manner and Ceremony concerning the Creation of Henry eldest Sonne to our dread Sovereigne king James. B.L. Lansdowne MS 261. f. 136; The Order and Solemnity of the Creation of Prince Henry Eldest Sonne

example, Henry was conveyed to his creation by a procession of barges.⁵⁷ At about half past nine in the morning the Prince and his father passed from Whitehall to the Parliament House, accompanied by select members of the nobility.⁵⁸ However, whereas Arthur had been invested in the parliament chambers,⁵⁹ this ceremony was performed in the more accommodating Court of Requests, with seating for members of both houses - a gesture designed to express the respect in which they were held.⁶⁰ With the spectators seated and the King enthroned, the heralds entered, followed by twenty-five newly installed Knights of the Bath.⁶¹ Then came the insignia of the office of the Prince of Wales. Garter, King of Arms headed the procession carrying the *Letters Patent*, followed by six earls bearing the purple mantle and train of Henry's princely robes, the sword, ring, golden wand and cap of state.⁶² A memorandum on *The Creation of a Prince*, probably drawn up around this time, explains the special symbolism of these accoutrements. According to its directions the sword signified that as former princes had received the Duchy of Cornwall at birth, so Henry was a duke without creation.⁶³ The ring denoted his duty to deliver justice without bias, the gold wand that he should be victorious and subdue his enemies, while the coronet represented his responsibility to be steadfast and righteous.⁶⁴ The Prince knelt by his father and Garter kissed the *Patent* which he passed to the Lord Chamberlain.⁶⁵ It was then presented to the King who,

to his Sacred Majestie, Prince of Wales, as it was celebrated in the Parliament House on Monday the 4 of June 1610. College of Arms. Vincent MS 151. f. 456r; Samuel Daniel, *The Order and Solemnitie of the Creation of the High and mightie Prince Henrie* (London, 1610).

⁵⁷ Creatio: Principis Arthuri. B.L. Cotton MS Julius B XII. f. 59r.

⁵⁸ The Creation of Henry, Prince of Wales. B.L. Harleian MS 5176. f. 203r; Daniel, 1610. Sig. B2r.

⁵⁹ Creatio: Principis Arthuri. B.L. Cotton MS Julius B XII. f. 60v.

⁶⁰ Croft, 1992. p. 189.

⁶¹ The Creation of Henry, Prince of Wales. B.L. Harleian MS 5176. f. 203r.

⁶² *Ibid.* f. 203v. The account of Prince Arthur's creation similarly details the Prince's symbols of office: "the cape and cornatt . . . golden rode and the ringe of gold." No mention is made of a sword or, indeed, of Letters Patent. See Creatio: Principis Arthuri. B.L. Cotton MS Julius B XII. f. 61v.

⁶³ Ceremony to be observed on the Creation of a Prince. B.L. Add MS. 4712. f. 43.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* f. 43.

⁶⁵ Ceremony used att the Creation of the Noble Prince Henry Eldest sonne to our Sovereigne Lo: King James. TNA. SP 14/55/10.

in turn, gave it to the Secretary, Robert Cecil, for its proclamation.⁶⁶ At the words, *fecimus et creavimus* (we have made and created), the mantle was delivered to the King who passed it to two assistants who placed it upon the Prince.⁶⁷ Upon the words *serti in capite et annuli aurei*, James placed the coronet on his son's head and the gold ring on his finger, delivering the rod as the corresponding words were read.⁶⁸ Following the reading the King handed the *Letters Patent* to Henry - the moment depicted in the initial letter portraits. Throughout James displayed great affection, assuring his son that he must not mind humbling himself to his father.⁶⁹ Henry then rose and sat on the left hand side of his father. With the rites over, the whole company proceeded solemnly from the Court, accompanied by the sound of trumpets.⁷⁰ Thus the *Patent* itself played a central part in the creation, both as a mark of the Prince's new status and as a ceremonial device. The majority of contemporary descriptions comment on its reading.⁷¹ Like the Prince's regalia, it was bestowed upon Henry and was symbolic of his new office, while the reading of its text, in both Latin and English, directed the proceeding of the ceremony and legally proclaimed the creation.⁷² Its fate afterwards, however, is unclear. As an open document there is a possibility that it may have been displayed. It certainly was not published, as some others had been.⁷³ Its survival suggests

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ The Creation of Henry, Prince of Wales. B.L. Harleian MS 5176. f. 203v.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* f. 203v; Letters Patent of James I, creating his son, Henry, Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester. B.L. Add. MS 36932. The Latin in the account of the ceremony differs from that in the *Letters Patent*. I have used the Latin from the *Patent*.

⁶⁹ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1607-10*. 16th June, 1610. p. 507.

⁷⁰ The Creation of Henry, Prince of Wales. B.L. Harleian MS 5176. f. 203v; Daniel, 1610. Sig. B3r.

⁷¹ See for example, Ceremony used att the Creation of the Noble Prince Henry. TNA. SP 14/55/10; The Creation of Henry, Prince of Wales. B.L. Harleian MS 5176. f. 203v; Daniel, 1610. Sig. B2v.

⁷² The importance of the charter of creation as a mark of the enhanced rank and status of a new Prince of Wales is revealed by a later etching from 1664 by Wenceslaus Hollar (Auckland Art Gallery, Auckland, New Zealand). Part of a series illustrating ceremonial robes of the English nobility, its depiction of Charles II as Prince of Wales shows him with all the accoutrements of his office: robes, coronet, ring, rod and sword, as well as prominently displaying Letters Patent. The engraving is of special interest since Charles II was never formally created Prince of Wales.

⁷³ See for example *His Maiesties commission to all the Lords, and others of the Priiue Counsell, touching the creation of baronets whereunto are annexed diuers instructions, and His Maiesties letters patents containing the forme of the said creation. Also the forme of an oath to be taken by the said baronets* (London, 1611) and *The*

that, despite its aesthetic value, it was first and foremost a legal deed and was eventually stored and treated as such.⁷⁴

Despite the predominance of the *Letters Patent* during the ceremonial of Prince Henry's creation, it would appear that its illuminated decorations failed to provoke any comment. Measuring approximately half a metre in height by seventy centimetres in length (just smaller than the size of a large poster print), it is a sizeable document and, while being read, its rich ornamentation would surely have been visible at least to those seated nearby. As Erna Auerbach's pioneering work into the miniature portraits on another set of legal documents, the Plea Rolls, has shown, richly illuminated official documents were being produced in England throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁷⁵ However, few of those still extant are comparable with this manuscript in terms of quality, brilliance, complexity and sheer abundance of decoration. At first glance, its imagery would appear to be a straightforward celebration of Henry's titles and martial public image. The heraldic coats of arms which decorate the golden border represent the dignities and estates of the Prince in ascending order: the badge of the Earl of Chester, with its sheaves or *Garb Or*; that of the Duke of Cornwall, with its fifteen gold coins; and the feathered badge of the Prince of Wales. The uppermost central arms with lion and unicorn supporters are those of King James, while to their right are Henry's royal arms. Below the initial portraits are the ancient arms of the Principality of Wales. Interlaced with these heraldic devices are illustrations of armour and weaponry – representative of Henry's interests but seemingly at odds with King James's peaceful policies. On closer examination, however, it becomes apparent that these martial emblems are not necessarily synonymous with the battle-field but instead, are redolent of the

copie of the Kings Maiesties letters patents for the making of allomes, in England, Scotland; and Ireland, or in any other his Maiesties dominions (London, 1610).

⁷⁴ The whereabouts of the Letters Patent is uncertain for almost the next three hundred years. It re-emerges from obscurity in 1904 when the British Library bought it from a Francis P. Wheeler for £45. With thanks to Michael St John-McAlister, Curator of Manuscripts at the British Library, for this information.

⁷⁵ Auerbach, 1954. p. 1.

tournament. The plumed helmets and suits of armour with their coloured sashes, the pasteboard shields, banners and decorated pavilions, as well as the lances, pikes and pole-axes were all associated with the tilt-yard.⁷⁶ A cult of chivalry had grown around Henry in the preceding years. He both promoted and aspired to its values of gallantry and heroism.⁷⁷ The Prince's official entry into this romanticised and ritualised martial world came on the 31st December 1609, when under the guise of Moeliades, Lord of the Isles, Henry issued a challenge to all the knights of "greate Brittain".⁷⁸ The terms of his challenge provide a valuable insight into his chivalric concerns:

"First: That noe garment beseemeth a knight soe well, as that w(hi)ch is soyled with the rust of Armour.

Secondly: That a knight ought to be as readye, to mantayne a Ladyes honour as his owne words.

Thirdly: That it is more glorious to be overcome in the defence of an honourable cause, then to remayne victorious in an ill quarrel."⁷⁹

Half masque, half feat of arms, *Prince Henry's Barriers*, staged the following year, presented him as an Arthurian hero, the restorer of ancient virtue.⁸⁰ It is within this context then, that the *Patent's* illustrations should be viewed. There has been a tendency among historians to interpret the Jacobean tournament as a nursery for real combat; yet as Alan Young has argued, its "role was not solely or even principally that of preparation for war."⁸¹ Rather, it had become increasingly detached from the realities of Renaissance warfare, focusing on courtly codes of behaviour, extravagant display and royal power.⁸² Even the *Patent's*

⁷⁶ Young, 1987. p. 143; p. 131; p. 95; pp. 12-14.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* p. 38.

⁷⁸ Meliadus Lord of the Isles, to the Valorous knights of the Courte of greate Brittain. Add. MS 12514. f. 135r.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* f. 135r.

⁸⁰ Strong, 1986. p. 141.

⁸¹ Young, 1987. p. 23.

⁸² *Ibid.* p. 185.

depictions of firearms can be identified with gentlemanly pursuits rather than military activities.⁸³ Thus, while its iconographic programme at first appears to be incompatible with the King's pictorial presence, it actually represents a conciliation. It was after all James who presided over these events and to whom the participants paid service. Indeed, he had recommended the practice of these exercises to his son.⁸⁴ Care has to be taken, therefore, not to overstate James' pacifism. He was principally a pragmatist and efforts to accentuate the differences between the attitudes of father and son are misguided.⁸⁵ Indeed, when necessary, James had counselled his son to wage war:

“Sen the sword is given you by God, not onely to revenge upon your own subjects the wrongs committed upon others; but farther to revenge and free them of forraine injuries done unto them: & therefore warres upon just quarrelles are lawful.”⁸⁶

The problem lay in Henry's rapid emergence as the champion of a vigorous war party, intent upon restoring England to the halcyon days of Elizabeth I.⁸⁷ The Prince's person and *persona* were increasingly becoming a focus for opposition. Thus by representing his interests under the veil of the chivalric tournament, potential ideological conflicts were diminished.

The initial portraits (See Figure 14) provide further evidence of a carefully managed pictorial relationship. Miniature portraits of the sovereign had appeared on legal documents as early as the reign of Henry VI but did not commonly feature likenesses of other figures,⁸⁸ though near precedents for this type of composition can be found in the Plea Rolls of Queen Mary I. Between 1557 and 1558 representations of the monarch and her husband, Philip II of Spain, are accompanied by a kneeling figure, probably the principal clerk of the King's

⁸³ See for example, Henry Peacham's *The Compleat Gentleman* (London, 1622). “Shooting is also a very healthful and commendable recreation for a Gentleman; neither doe I know any other comparable unto it for stirring every part of the body.” p. 181.

⁸⁴ James VI and I, 1969. p. 144.

⁸⁵ Ulliyot, 2007. p. 73.

⁸⁶ James VI and I, 1969. p. 66.

⁸⁷ Badenhause, 1995. p. 22; Sharpe, 2010. p. 110.

⁸⁸ Auerbach, 1954. p. 1.

Bench, who also holds a legal deed.⁸⁹ At the time of Henry's investiture eight charters were extant from the creations of earlier Princes of Wales.⁹⁰ While records of these documents survive, the originals appear to have been lost. It is impossible to determine, therefore, whether these earlier charters provided models for the decoration of Henry Frederick's *Letters Patent*. However, two early illuminated manuscripts depicting *The Creation of Edward II as Prince of Wales* (early fourteenth century, See Figure 15) and *Edward, the Black Prince, receiving Aquitaine* (1386-99, See Figure 16), may have been employed. Both belonged to the manuscript collections of Sir Robert Cotton, who had already played an important part in researching the history of the princes and principality of Wales.⁹¹ In particular, the prominence of the charter within the illustration of the Black Prince and his father, Edward III, would suggest that it was consulted.

The portrait of James I appears to be derived from his representation on the *Great Seal* (1603, See Figure 17), where he also sits enthroned beneath a canopy of state (the *Patent* itself carries a dark bronze green impression of the seal, attached by gold and silver thread). Thus James is portrayed resplendent - an icon of kingship and of majesty. Above his head a little gold-haired *putto* holds a wreath of laurel and a palm frond, both traditional symbols of victory. Meanwhile, Henry is depicted in profile, looking up at his father. The initial 'J' in which this scene is illustrated also serves to highlight James' achievements. Depicted among the golden knots and scrolls is a lion's head and the elongated lizard-body of a wyvern. The same two beasts are present in an engraving executed before his accession to the English throne (c.1590, See Figure 18). The supporters of the Scoto-Danish arms of James and his wife, Anne of Denmark, bear two royal banners - that of Scotland displays a lion rampant and that of Denmark a writhing wyvern. Thus in the *Letters Patent* these two creatures symbolise

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* p. 100.

⁹⁰ Notes relative to the Creation of Princes of Wales. Harleian MS 5176. f. 204v.

⁹¹ Croft, 1992. p. 182. It is possible that Cotton also advised on the Patent's decoration.

the royal union of the King and Queen, a match which had born fruit and produced Henry. The cornucopia, foliage and budding blossoms which decorate its first line continue this theme of fertility. James's foreign policy of diplomacy and international alliance through the marital bed is tacitly acknowledged, while his favoured imagery of fecundity surrounds father and son. These symbols of abundance also denote the benefits of peace and plenty under James. Thus the Prince's figure is contained within the iconography of his father's government and he is presented as yet another blessing of the King's rule.

Many of the themes depicted in the *Patent's* decoration are echoed in its text. A heavily re-worked draft of the preamble provides further insight into the dynastic and political messages which the King was eager to convey.⁹² The importance of James's achievement in securing a royal succession and its role in protecting both state and church is underlined throughout, while his deep paternal affection is professed in grandiloquent terms:

“That regard, which from the Springes of private men is distilled to their Issue, must never be compared with that ocean of Love, w(hi)ch flows from the hartes of royall kings.”⁹³

One of the most telling additions to the draft is the introduction of the term “olive branches” to describe the royal progeny.⁹⁴ With its dual connotations of fertility and peace it was an expression which would no doubt have appealed to the King. Another series of additions re-enforces the unifying intentions of the *Patent*. The adage that children are created in the image of their forbears is repeatedly employed. Towards the end of the preamble Henry is proclaimed as literally the same person as his father:

“We are perswaded that we cannot doe a worde of greater honour to ourselfes then by honouring him that is in reputation of law *Eadem Persona cum Patre*.”⁹⁵

⁹² Translation of the Preamble of a Patent creating Prince Henry Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester. TNA. SP 14/53/73.

⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

Thus both text and image were recruited to underline James's position as father and sovereign, and Henry's as son and heir. Viewed as a whole, the iconography of the *Letters Patent* represents a carefully constructed programme designed to honour Henry Frederick and to proclaim his martial interests within a strictly controlled framework. Although its imagery focuses on and celebrates Henry, the militant prince, it is the King who dominates and it is his policies which are literally crowned with success.

So who was responsible for this rich and complex decorative programme? The clues would point to a senior Court official and an astute politician, eager to satisfy both the King and his heir, as well as a connoisseur with a developed understanding of aesthetics and symbolism. The most likely candidate is a man already heavily associated with the Prince's creation - Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury. As previously noted, Cecil was principal minister to James but also an enthusiastic supporter of the young Prince. It was Cecil who had masterminded the form of Henry's creation and who had persuaded the King, against his judgement, to recall parliament for the occasion.⁹⁶ He directed Henry's training in diplomacy and politics, while encouraging his growing interest in paintings.⁹⁷ Cecil's own artistic collections were considerable and he was an important patron.⁹⁸ Among his manuscripts is a letter from Sir David Murray, Henry's Groom of the Stool, requesting that the Earl bring some of his pictures for the Prince's perusal and appreciation.⁹⁹ Having masterminded Henry's creation, it likely that his attentions also turned towards the *Patent* - after all it was Cecil as Secretary, who was responsible for reading out the text to the assembled houses.¹⁰⁰ Indeed, although the legal wording was formulated by Sir Henry Hobart and Sir Francis

⁹⁶ Croft, 1992. p. 182.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 181.

⁹⁸ Bracken, 2002. p. 121.

⁹⁹ See *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury: The Cecil Manuscripts*, Vol. xxi, 1609-12 (London, 1970). p. 39.

¹⁰⁰ Ceremony used at the Creation of the Noble Prince Henry Eldest sonne to our Sovereigne Lo: King James. TNA. SP 14/55/10.

Bacon, as Attorney and Solicitor General respectively, his hand is surely detectable in the wording of the preamble and his corrections are present in the surviving drafts.¹⁰¹

If Cecil was responsible for the visual programme of the *Letters Patent*, he did not work alone. Several artists were involved in its creation. Roy Strong's brief appraisal of this document attributed the faces of the King and his son to the miniaturist, Nicholas Hilliard, while ascribing the rest of the decoration to a second inferior hand who, he believed, was also responsible for the general design.¹⁰² It is my belief that this manuscript displays evidence of at least three separate artistic hands. The first, responsible for the coats of arms and tournament paraphernalia was most probably a heraldic painter of competent but not marked ability. The second, probably a lesser artist attached to a limner's workshop, was responsible for rendering the robes, figures, putto and setting of the initial portraits. It is tempting to attribute the third expert hand - who executed the delicately modelled faces of James and Henry - not to Hilliard, but to his pupil and rival, Isaac Oliver. There may even have been a fourth hand, who supplied the golden calligraphy and marginalia. The attribution of the faces to Oliver rests principally on the depth, vibrancy and finesse of the portraits but is supported by other circumstantial evidence. It was Oliver, rather than Hilliard, who was particularly associated with Henry's court, producing two of the most iconic images of the Prince around 1610: one depicting him in armour with a military encampment in the distance (1610, Royal Collection, London), and the other showing him in profile dressed *alla romana* (1610, See Figure 19). While not strictly speaking identical, the similarity of the second miniature to the profile portrait is striking. The Prince's accounts, drawn up after his death in 1612, record payments to Oliver for a number of pictures,¹⁰³ while he also participated in the funeral

¹⁰¹ Croft, 1992. p. 191. See, for example, Translation of the Preamble of a Patent. TNA. SP 14/53/73.

¹⁰² Strong, 1983. p. 147.

¹⁰³ Privy Purse of Henry, Prince of Wales, 1st October 1610 - 6th November 1612. TNA. E 351/2794.

procession as his “Paynter”.¹⁰⁴ James’s face is derived from a pattern in use between c.1609 and 1614.¹⁰⁵ It is closely associated, although in reverse, with the miniature portrait from the *Lyte Jewel* also from 1610 (See Figure 20). Indeed, I would go so far as to say that, contrary to Strong’s attribution, both of these miniatures are by the same hand and are by Oliver. Comparison with a Hilliard miniature of James, painted around the same time (c.1609, See Figure 21), reveals the difference in style, finish and modelling. Both the *Letters Patent* and the *Lyte Jewel* have a subtlety and depth, which is largely absent from Hilliard’s later work. Further comparison with another illuminated initial - more convincingly attributed to Hilliard - the *Charter authorising Sir Walter Mildmay to found Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (1584, See Figure 22), with its meticulously controlled and detailed pattern-work, also highlights the stylistic differences between Hilliard’s hand and that of the *Letters Patent*. It is surely plausible that Oliver employed and adapted the official face pattern of the sovereign, as several artists had during Elizabeth’s reign.¹⁰⁶ Although Robert Cecil had a long-standing working relationship with Hilliard this did not stop him from commissioning miniatures from Oliver.¹⁰⁷ It is unlikely that Henry, who considered himself a connoisseur, would have accepted Hilliard for the illumination of such an important document. Rather, a younger artist was chosen, a prolific draughtsman associated with continental influences, who would continue to rise in the Prince’s esteem. Thus the *Letters Patent* was the product of a series of collaborations, as rich, layered and diverse as its iconographic programme.

In many ways, the *Letters Patent of James I, creating his son, Henry, Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester* is a document full of contradictions, which raises as many questions as it answers. It played a crucial role in the creation of Henry as Prince of Wales and several

¹⁰⁴ The p(ar)ticular accompte of the right honorable the Lord Hay, M(aste)r of His Ma(jes)t(y)s Great Warderoabe for the funeral of the high and mightie Prince Henry, Prince of Wales. TNA. LC 2/4/6. f. 43v.

¹⁰⁵ Strong, 1983. p. 147.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.* p. 143.

¹⁰⁷ Stone, 1954. p. 323. The Cecil Papers at Hatfield House record a payment to Oliver in June 1611.

commentators describe its reading; yet surprisingly, it would appear that its vibrant and finely executed decoration went unmarked, while its fate following the ceremony remains uncertain. At first glance, the *Patent* celebrates Prince Henry and his militant public image; yet on closer examination this aspect of his representation has been contained and balanced with the King's preferred imagery of majesty and fecundity. While the evidence points to Robert Cecil, politician, patron and architect of the creation ceremony, as the mind behind the decorative scheme, the identities of several of those responsible for its execution are more elusive. What is certain is that this is a unique and important document which provides further insight into how tensions between James and his son were negotiated within a cultural context. It represents a carefully controlled statement which creates a sense of harmony through conciliation. In Henry's case, the guise of the militant prince proved almost too effective. The martial principles for which he stood brought him popularity but also threatened to undermine his father's position. Yet, while their divergent images and policies admittedly provoked tensions, they also enabled the Stuart dynasty to represent a range of conflicting interests. As the *Letters Patent* demonstrate, for all their differences, James and Henry were at their strongest when united.

IV

While representations of the militant prince proved powerful and appealing, its success was underpinned by a close alliance with the projection of Protestant piety. Stuart princely representation responded to popular anxieties and centred on the portrayal of heirs with the martial aptitude and religious devotion required to protect their subjects' liberties and faith. Again, in many ways, Henry Frederick established a precedent. Strong has demonstrated how he was cast as a potential leader of Protestant Europe in "its battle against

Habsburg and Papal domination.”¹⁰⁸ One of his earlier biographers informs us that around the age of fourteen he became a “reverent and attentive hearer of sermons”, encouraging others to follow suit.¹⁰⁹ As early as 1606, Henoah Clapham dedicated his book, *An Abstract of Fayth*, to the Prince, asserting his own hopes that Henry would become the Church’s protector, upholding the true faith and eradicating superstition.¹¹⁰ When in 1612 Samson Lennard dedicated his translation of *The Myserie of Iniquitie* to him, his language was not so restrained, beseeching “that I may live to march over the Alpes, and to trayle a Pike before the walls of Rome, under your Highnesse standard.”¹¹¹ Henry, Duke of Gloucester, too displayed signs of piety from a tender age. His somewhat obsequious biographer reported that “he proceeded in so sweete a method, that he was able in point of Religion (wherein he was excellently well grounded) to render an account beyond many whose years should have manifested a surer and more certain judgment.”¹¹² Having been exposed to Puritan practices and doctrine during his captivity, following his release, he was swiftly confirmed into the Anglican faith.¹¹³ Royalist clergyman, Richard Watson, approvingly observed this further effort to reintegrate the Prince with his family:

“I thought Dr Morley knew very well how to assist the noble Lady [Princess Mary] in that ceremony w(hi)ch doubtless was performed much to the Dukes content as otherwise so in that he might there meet with the religion of his Father (for I presume he had the Comon prayer at least) and w(hi)ch I hope he means to make and continue as his owne.”¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁸ Strong, 1986, p. 84.

¹⁰⁹ Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641, p. 11.

¹¹⁰ Clapham, 1606. Sig. A1v.

¹¹¹ Mornay, 1612. See the dedicatory epistle: *To the Most High and Mightie Prince, Henry, Prince of Wales, Sonne and Heire apparent to our soueraigne Lord the King*.

¹¹² Manley, 1661, p. 17.

¹¹³ Letter from Watson to William Edgeman, March 24th, 1653. Bod. Lib. Clarendon MS 45. f. 184v.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.* f. 184v.

Henry's spiritual guidance was entrusted to a chaplain known to be "very loyall to the King and aright affected to the Episcopal Church."¹¹⁵

Fears over the Duke's contact with Puritan elements were compounded by anxieties regarding the influence of his Catholic mother. In April 1653 he travelled to Paris at Henrietta Maria's insistence and took up residence at her court.¹¹⁶ With Charles II's removal from Paris to Cologne in July 1654, Henry was reluctantly left with the Queen, upon the condition that she would make no attempts to secure his conversion.¹¹⁷ Nevertheless, within months he had been placed under the charge of her confessor, Walter Montagu, and had been forbidden to attend Anglican services.¹¹⁸ Rumours of these efforts to turn Henry from the Protestant Church alarmed the exiled royalist community, who feared it would jeopardise any chance of a Stuart restoration:

"If this newes get thither [England and Scotland] (as you are not to doubt but it will soe this comes to you) he believes it will overthrow all . . . I doe assure you the Papists are already busey with their old prophecy that Hen(ry) 9 must repair what Hen(ry) 8 ruined."¹¹⁹ Indeed, the consequences of the Prince's conversion could have been serious.¹²⁰ Anti-royalist propaganda consistently represented the Stuarts as a popish dynasty.¹²¹ The public conversion of one of its princes would add credibility to these claims, alienating the cause from Protestant support at home.¹²² Charles II repeatedly wrote to his brother and mother, warning of the irreparable damage it would reap upon his hopes of returning to England.¹²³ Despite the enticement and coercion of Henrietta Maria's agents and even the intervention of the

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.* f. 184v.

¹¹⁶ Greenspan, 2003. p. 399.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 400.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 400.

¹¹⁹ Letter from Christopher, Baron Hatton to Sir Edward Nicholas, 25th September, 1654. Bod. Lib. Clarendon MS 49. f. 246r.

¹²⁰ Greenspan, 2003. p. 418.

¹²¹ *Ibid.* p. 419.

¹²² *Ibid.* p. 419.

¹²³ *Ibid.* pp. 420-421.

French royal family, Henry resisted.¹²⁴ He maintained that he could not stray from the faith of his father's and brother's subjects.¹²⁵ In response to his obduracy, Henrietta Maria refused to see her son again and withdrew his financial support.¹²⁶ Notwithstanding its personal cost, the Prince emerged from the incident relatively unscathed. His conduct, understanding and resolve were the subject of much praise.¹²⁷ Moreover, his commitment to Protestantism did much to refute allegations of the dynasty's inclination towards popery, as well as reinforcing his brother's authority over his family. Consequently, the advertisement of this unlikely victory was recommended:

“Give me leave to propose unto y(ou)r judgment, if it were not fit, that a full relation of all the passages concerninge this busines of the Duke of Gloucester, were drawn up: so as it might be preserved in memory and, if need be, com(m)unicated to the world. It would doubtless doe the King a great deale of Right, both in England & abroad; and tende mucche to the Duke of Glocesters honor.”¹²⁸

Accordingly, one of the King's letters to his brother was published, in which Charles reminded Henry of his father's parting charge to remain constant in his religion and threatened to renounce him should he falter.¹²⁹ Shortly after, *An Exact Narrative of the Attempts made upon the Duke of Gloucester* was printed for the “satisfaction of all true Protestants.”¹³⁰ The account praised the Prince in no uncertain terms, detailing how he was “set upon” by the Queen's servants but through his zeal and unwavering conviction endured all their efforts “most nobly and heroically.”¹³¹ Indeed, this episode was to prove formative to

¹²⁴ *Ibid.* p. 407.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.* p. 408.

¹²⁶ Letter from the Marquis of Ormonde to Hyde, 2nd December, 1654. Bod. Lib. Clarendon MS 49. f. 187v.

¹²⁷ See Letter from Richard Lovell to Hyde, 6th November, 1654. Bod. Lib. Clarendon MS 49. f. 125r; Letter from the Marquis of Ormond to the King, 27th November, 1654. Bod. Lib. MS Clarendon 49. f. 178r; Letter from George Radcliffe to Nicholas, 20th November, 1654. Bod. Lib. Clarendon MS 49. f. 265r.

¹²⁸ Letter from George Ratcliffe to Nicholas, 18th December 1654. B.L. Egerton MS 2534. f. 295r.

¹²⁹ Charles II, 1654. Sig. A2r.

¹³⁰ See Anon., *An Exact Narrative of the Attempts made upon the Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1655).

¹³¹ *Ibid.* Sig. A1r; Sig. A2r.

the development of Henry's image and his religious devotion became a central part of his *persona*. Following his death in 1660, elegies repeatedly returned to his bravery and "courage bold" in upholding his Protestantism.¹³² In one verse even the Catholic Church mourned this virtuous Prince, whom it had failed to win to its cause:

"Go ask the Church of Rome, she (sighing) saith,
Ah, all my *Batteries* could not shake his *Faith*."¹³³

This emphasis upon Henry's fervour was also expressed visually. The frontispiece to Thomas Manley's posthumous biography of the Prince and his sister, Mary, Princess of Orange (1661, See Figure 23), depicts him with one hand gesturing towards a skull and the other resting upon the Bible. The Prince acknowledges his own immortality but is also shown preparing for it, holding the instrument of his salvation, the Holy Scriptures. Thus a political scandal which had threatened royalist support was actually presented as a success. The early anxieties over Henry's religion had subsided and he was to become a paragon of princely piety. His ordeal had demonstrated his devotion unequivocally and attested to the Stuarts' commitment to the Protestant Church. The union of militancy and religious fervour in his cultural representation was powerful, for each attribute enhanced and augmented the other. He was presented as a devout warrior prince, ready to protect the beliefs and concerns which he shared with his subjects.

V

Towards the end of the seventeenth century the same attributes continued to be employed in princely representation. Thus the portrayal of William, Duke of Gloucester, son

¹³² Anon., *Dying Tears. Or, England's Joy Turned to Mourning* (London, 1660); See also Arthur Brett, *Threnodia* (London, 1660). p. 14 ; Anon., *The Queen's Lamentation* (London, 1660).

¹³³ Anon., *An Elegie upon the Universally-lamented Death of the Thrice Noble and Vertuous Prince, Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1660).

of the future Queen Anne, like those of his predecessors, was firmly situated within the conceit of the militant Protestant prince. It was an image which would become self-fulfilling, with the young Prince enthusiastically embracing the attributes of his constructed *persona*. Thus while one author extolled his virtues as “form’d by Nature, and design’d by Heaven, for no less than the HEROE”,¹³⁴ the Duke was already assuming military command of his own company of diminutive soldiers. At the age of four he directed that twenty-two local boys should attend him with paper caps and wooden swords.¹³⁵ Their number soon grew to ninety and the Prince’s companies were regularly exercised under his charge.¹³⁶ Significantly, William’s birth promised a Protestant Stuart succession and was perceived by many as a vindication of the Glorious Revolution.¹³⁷ A popular ditty, *The Protestants Satisfaction* (1689), proclaims:

“Protestants now your glory proclaim,
See what the Hand of Heaven has done.
Valiant Prince George of honour and Fame
Now does enjoy a Royal young son.
Who in time may sway the Scepter
And like the Prince pull Popery down.
Let Rome and her Faction be all in distraction
While we have an heir to the Royal Crown.”¹³⁸

Again it would appear that the Prince took these predictions to heart. His biographer informs us that “nothing could divert his mind from the idea of going to war against the Disturber of

¹³⁴ Fuller, 1696. p. 4.

¹³⁵ Lewis, 1789. p. 9.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.* p. 14.

¹³⁷ Bowers, 1996. p. 46.

¹³⁸ Anon., *The Protestants Satisfaction* (London, 1689).

the Reformed Church [Louis XIV] throughout the Christian world.”¹³⁹ His faith was crucial to William’s representation. While he survived, the Stuart Protestant line had a visible future and the British public had an acceptable alternative to the disputed Catholic heir. Indeed, it was in opposition to Prince James, the Old Pretender, that William was to be repeatedly portrayed.

Recent historical scholarship has done much to highlight the propagandistic struggle for the hearts and minds of the British people, between the exiled James II and his successor, William III. Both Paul Kleber Monod’s investigations into Jacobite popular support and Edward Corp’s work on the culture of the Jacobite court at St. Germain-en-Laye have shed new light on the ideologies, methods and effectiveness of Jacobite propaganda.¹⁴⁰ Tony Claydon’s study of the Williamite counter-attack has elucidated a previously neglected area of research.¹⁴¹ Nevertheless, in general, historians have focused closely on the rival rulers and have failed to analyse with any real depth the crucial roles played by royal heirs in these public campaigns. Representations of both James’ son, Prince James (1688-1766), and William’s nephew, William, Duke of Gloucester, were employed as valuable instruments of royal propaganda.

While Corp has provided a stimulating, yet brief, analysis of Prince James’ childhood representation,¹⁴² William’s portrayal has been wholly neglected. Indeed, his very existence has been marginalised in a number of books dealing with this period.¹⁴³ Yet this treatment belies his dynastic and political importance. Significantly and unlike his contentious uncle,

¹³⁹ Lewis, 1789. p. 85.

¹⁴⁰ See Paul Kleber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1988); Edward Corp, *The King Over the Water: Portraits of the Stuarts in Exile after 1689* (Edinburgh, 2001); and Edward Corp, *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France 1689-1718* (Cambridge, 2004).

¹⁴¹ See Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996).

¹⁴² Corp, 2001. pp. 33-45.

¹⁴³ Claydon fails to assess the propagandistic role of Prince William at all in *William III and the Godly Revolution*, while Craig Rose’s *England in the 1690s* (Oxford, 1999) and Geoffrey Holmes’ *The Making of a Great Power* (New York, 1993) devote no more than a few sentences to his death in 1700. Even in Edward Gregg’s biography of William’s mother, *Queen Anne* (New Haven and London, 2001), he is mentioned only infrequently and in passing.

William III, he had been born and raised in England and was untainted by association with the events of 1688. Representations of Prince William sought to endorse the new regime by conveying reassuring messages of the continuation of a Protestant and English Stuart dynasty. Thus, at times when King William's popularity was in decline or the nation's stability was threatened, the younger William's image could be employed in a shrewd exercise of damage limitation. Similarly, the predominance of Prince James' representation in Jacobite propaganda was, in many ways, a means of deflecting attention from his father's faults and fall from grace. Very few portraits were painted of James II in exile and not one was engraved at the time.¹⁴⁴ In contrast, Prince James was the subject of several portraits and engravings. The proliferation of his image served a number of purposes. Primarily, it was to propagate his likeness, so that as he grew up in France, his "subjects" in Britain remained familiar with his physical development. His portraiture also served to highlight his Stuart features and to dispel the slanders concerning his parentage which his father's enemies had employed so successfully against him.¹⁴⁵ Each side, therefore, adopted their infant heir as the rising star of their cause, downplaying the disappointments of the present by emphasizing those hopes for the future.

Nevertheless, examination of their portraiture, both painted and engraved, underlines not the differences in their portrayal but rather the similarities. A specific relationship - dialogue even - between the portraiture of these two Princes is perceptible, with William's, in particular, borrowing from and adapting that of his rival. Is this merely the result of artistic plagiarism or an intentional response to James' portraiture? As has been shown, conventions for the depiction of the young royal heir had been developed and fine-tuned over the past century and the portraiture of Princes James and William is firmly rooted within this

¹⁴⁴ Corp, 2001. p. 33.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* p. 14.

tradition. Despite their religious, political and ideological differences, depictions of both followed the tried-and-tested precedents of Stuart royal portraiture. Images of these childhood adversaries reveal a close, reactive relationship with each other. Their similarities were intended to provoke a direct comparison. Within this artistic exchange William was deliberately presented in opposition to his young rival, with the positive aspects of his education and prospective government visually underlined. William's propagandistic importance, therefore, should not be underestimated. His Protestantism and English upbringing were assets with which the Jacobites were hard pressed to compete.

Prince James was born in June 1688. His mother's successful delivery of a healthy child was both unexpected and controversial, after fifteen years of marriage, the loss of four children in infancy and several stillbirths.¹⁴⁶ The public celebrations staged to reconcile the British people to their new Catholic Prince have been discussed in Chapter One.¹⁴⁷ In addition to the persuasive powers of these extravagant festivities, the popular print was also used to proclaim James' royal prerogative. A number of engravings was enlisted in the campaign to assert his hereditary and divinely sanctioned right.¹⁴⁸ Bernard Lens II's mezzotint (1688, See Figure 24), designed and executed with royal permission, has similar aims. Analysis of its iconography, as well as its later manipulation and appropriation, reveals the artistic exchange between Jacobite and Williamite propaganda, while providing valuable insight into the conception and development of the Duke of Gloucester's representation. The baby Prince is portrayed in a domestic setting, lying in his cradle and rocked by his mother,

¹⁴⁶ John Evelyn's response is typical. His diary entry for the 10th of June reads: "A young prince borne, which will cause disputes." He continues: "About two o'clock we heard the tower ordnance discharg'd, and the bells ringing for the birth of a Prince of Wales. This was very surprizing, it having been universally given-out that her majesty did not looke til the next moneth." See De Beer (ed.), 2000. Vol. IV, 10th June, 1688. p. 586.

¹⁴⁷ See pp. 48-49.

¹⁴⁸ See for example, William Vincent's engraving of *The Prince of Wales* (1688). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; John Smith's mezzotint of *Prince James Francis Edward Stuart* (1688). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; and Jan Luyken's engraving of *The Birth of the Prince of Wales* (1688). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

Mary of Modena. The print brims with the imagery of nature and fertility – the embroidered floral decoration on the tablecloth, the vase filled with blooms and, of course, the Prince himself, who lies swaddled in a blanket of blossoms. A mythological creature - half woman/half foliage - possibly, Flora, goddess of fertility, is carved onto the end of his cradle. By employing this much-used convention of royal child portraiture, the young Prince is represented as the embodiment of his parents' fruitfulness and fertility. Amidst the rumours circulating about the circumstances of his birth and conception, this message assumes an even greater significance. James' status is reinforced by the feathered Prince of Wales insignia, carved into the top of his cradle, as well as the opulence of his surroundings with ornately carved cabinet, throne-like chair and swathes of fabric behind. Yet for all this, Lens' image is conspicuous among its contemporaries for its surprisingly intimate portrayal of royal domestic harmony and maternal care, reminiscent of the Dutch tradition of didactic family scenes. Here, in addition to underlining the legitimate hereditary prerogative and exalted position of the Prince, the calm attentiveness of his mother and his innocent and composed demeanour, provide a reassuring moral message about the royal dynasty.

Despite the torrent of royal propaganda celebrating the Prince's birth, the political climate continued unsettled. Fear of a popish succession was compounded by allegations of treachery. Indeed, rumours of James' supposititious birth were given such credence that on the 22nd of October 1688, James II called a meeting of an Extraordinary Council during which a number of witnesses to the birth swore to his legitimacy.¹⁴⁹ It did little to ameliorate the situation, however, and the King's enemies were quick to exploit the doubts raised by these rumours. Adapted from Lens' design, a rather crude print (1688, See Figure 25), attributed to Pieter Schenk, comprises part of the Williamite propaganda campaign to discredit the Prince and his parents. Here, the attributes which had signified his legitimacy

¹⁴⁹ See Privy Council Registers, James II. 4th April, 1687 - 16th December, 1688. TNA. PC2/71. pp. 759-776.

and status in the earlier engraving are absent. All the ephemera, alluding to fertility and fruitfulness, has disappeared and the Prince of Wales feathers carved into the crib are also gone. The engraving references two of the defamatory stories regarding James' parentage. Where previously the scene had been one of moral virtue and domestic harmony, now the once attentive royal mother is distracted from her rocking by her confessor's lascivious hand, poised to creep beneath her bodice. As well as modifying Lens' composition, Schenk has also borrowed from his earlier engraving after Jacob Toorenvliet of *Venal Love* (c.1675-1688, See Figure 26). Just below Mary's out-stretched fingers an apple lies on the table, denoting temptation. These overtones of lust and debauchery are reinforced by the accompanying Dutch verses, a section of which reads:

“Some priest they say crept nigh her Honour,
And sprinkled some good Holy Water upon her,
Which made her conceive of what had undone her.”¹⁵⁰

Meanwhile, the Queen's bloated charge lies unfed in his dishevelled covers - his bowl and spoon sit neglected. In one hand he holds a *molentje*, or toy windmill, referencing an alternative story in which the Prince is the son of a miller's wife, placed in the Queen's bed by the same confessor, Father Petre.¹⁵¹ In Dutch paintings of children the windmill also signifies an undesirable restlessness in the child who holds it.¹⁵² Thus the high moral values, expressed in the first print, have been subverted in its second state - the virtuous mother and child rendered depraved and obscene, his royal heritage ridiculed. Pieter Schenk, to whom this print is attributed, was also responsible for re-working at least one other official print of the Prince for defamatory purposes.¹⁵³ It is likely, therefore, that this case of plagiarism

¹⁵⁰ Woolf, 1988. p. 7.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.* p. 7.

¹⁵² Schama, 2004. p. 503.

¹⁵³ See Schenk's modified version of John Smith's mezzotint of Prince James, after Godfrey Kneller - *De Prins Van Wales* (1688). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

constituted a deliberate attempt to provoke comparison between the Schenk and Lens engravings. Indeed, the earlier composition appears to have enjoyed a reasonably wide distribution and cruder renderings of the same scene exist.¹⁵⁴ By adapting an officially sanctioned and widely disseminated image, its associations were clearer and its derogatory message was amplified. The royal parents' iconography was appropriated and subverted, their authority undermined.

Lens II's print, commemorating the Duke of Gloucester's birth (1689, See Figure 27), illustrates the close relationship between images of the rival heirs. With this mezzotint Lens clearly draws on his earlier design for Prince James. Once more the heir is depicted in his royal nursery, rocked in his cradle by a female attendant. However, the woman's modest attire, posture - with a little dog perched on her lap - and servile bowed head provide a striking contrast with the majestic and refined image of Queen Mary, suggesting that William is accompanied, not by his mother, but by a nurse. Indeed, it may be that Lens' choice of sitter was, in fact, a precautionary measure, taken in light of the defamatory treatment which Mary of Modena's resemblance had suffered and to prevent the same fate befalling his mother, Princess Anne's likeness. Again the symbols of fertility and nature abound - the flowers in their classical urn, the floral drapery and the landscape, viewed through a window in the distance. Instead of a toy windmill, as in the Schenk engraving, William clutches a little posy in his hand. Once more, moral messages are implicit in the engraving. The column behind the baby traditionally represents strength and fortitude, while the image of an animal subdued - the lapdog - is not uncommon in depictions of royal children, serving as a testament to the sitter's equanimity, as well as his ability to command others.¹⁵⁵ The pomp and luxury of Prince James' nursery have been moderated, while the landscape behind

¹⁵⁴ See anonymous versions of Lens' print in the collections of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh and the National Portrait Gallery, London.

¹⁵⁵ Howarth, 1997. p. 133.

appears typically English. Through William's child-like gesture, grasping enthusiastically for the tulip in his nurse's hand, he is identified as a young devotee of his Dutch uncle, William III, and as a future disciple of his policies. Indeed, the references to antiquity in the urn and column may well reflect the symbolic relationship in the arts between Protestantism and classicism.¹⁵⁶ Thus Lens' original composition has been manipulated not once but twice. In this, its final version, a new Protestant heir, William, has been substituted for Prince James. The ornate baroque decoration of the Prince of Wales' nursery has been replaced with simple classicism, while William is conspicuously located within an English setting and is identified symbolically with the principles of the King and of the Glorious Revolution. Again, it is probable that this development of meaning was intentional, that a direct comparison between the two heirs was being encouraged. The evolution of the image suggests that with William's portrayal, Lens referred not only to his original of James but also to the subversive Dutch copy - the introduction of a feathered headdress for the Prince and the replacement of the windmill with the posy in his hand bear out this relationship.¹⁵⁷ Thus, while each print could be viewed as self-contained, to those aware of the altered states, they told another story - of the change in royal regime and of the battle of the infant heirs. As has been shown, William III's supporters had already adapted official Jacobite images for seditious purposes.¹⁵⁸ In its final state, the image of William, Duke of Gloucester should be viewed as a development of this propagandistic tactic. Its associations were deliberately patent. By referring back to two popular images of Prince James, it highlighted the contrasts between the rival sides of the Stuart dynasty, underlining the negative connotations of the Catholic branch, while, in turn, emphasising the merits of the Protestant.

¹⁵⁶ Thomas, 1995. p. 227; Taylor, 2003. p. 504.

¹⁵⁷ See Figure 25 and p. 91.

¹⁵⁸ See pp. 90-92 and footnote 153.

In 1691 Nicolas de Largillière was commissioned to paint a new portrait of Prince James (See Figure 28). His portrait was the first to be commissioned by the exiled Stuarts, following the failure of King James' Irish campaign in 1690.¹⁵⁹ The Jacobite defeat was a severe blow to James II, both politically and personally. William III's victory had further secured the usurper's position on the British throne, while James was henceforth to be haunted by accusations of cowardice, following his desertion of his troops and flight to France.¹⁶⁰ This image may, therefore, indicate a conscious and prudent shift in emphasis from the King to the heir. Prince James' portrait sits comfortably within the tradition of courtly *bambino* portraits, originating in *Seicento* Italy and a well-established mode of depiction for British royal child portraits by the late seventeenth century.¹⁶¹ James sits naked, except for some drapery, on a tasselled cushion, staring out at the viewer. The composition underlines his hereditary and divine right to the throne, as well as his legitimacy. The cushion references that which rested underneath the king's feet in the official setting of the throne,¹⁶² while in the background a crown is embroidered into the surrounding drapes. His sweet countenance clearly demonstrates his Stuart features and his nudity implies that he has nothing to conceal - he is a figure of truth. James gestures to the little spaniel which sits beside him. Again the subdued creature serves as a testament to his authority and command but here also stands for fidelity to the Jacobite cause. It is likely that John Evelyn was responding to a copy or engraving of this canvas, when he commented: "I visited the Earl of Peterborough, who shewed me the picture of the Pr. of Wales, newly brought out of France, seeming in my opinion very much to resemble the Queene his mother, and of a most vivacious

¹⁵⁹ Corp, 2001. p. 34.

¹⁶⁰ McLynn, 1988. p. 15.

¹⁶¹ See for example *Charles II, when Prince of Wales*, attributed to Justus van Egmont (1630). National Portrait Gallery, London; Peter Lely's portrait of *Queen Anne as a Child* (c.1667). Royal Collection, London; and John Smith's mezzotint, after Godfrey Kneller's lost portrait, of *James, Prince of Wales* (1688). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

¹⁶² Gibson, 1997. p. 2.

countenance.”¹⁶³ Thus Largillière’s legitimising aims had proved successful. His image is an appealing entreaty to the loyalties of the Prince’s subjects. It presents James as the new face of Jacobitism and as the irreproachable heir to the British throne.

A little later Godfrey Kneller was commissioned to paint a portrait of the young Duke of Gloucester, which was subsequently engraved (c. 1692, See Figure 29). Oliver Millar has loosely dated the painting to 1691, when William was two years old.¹⁶⁴ However, judging by the sitter’s appearance and the painting’s evident relationship to Largillière’s portrait of James, a later date of 1692, or even 1693, would be more appropriate. Like James, William represented the future of his dynastic party and, in many ways, was a more appealing focus for the public than his uncle, William III. Although the King’s victory in Ireland had helped to consolidate his political authority, his regime was far from popular with his new subjects. His nationality, Calvinism, policies and personal conduct repeatedly laid him open to criticism.¹⁶⁵ Indeed, as Claydon has asserted: “The very Revolution which had brought William to power had been an affront to English sensibilities.”¹⁶⁶ Although young, his nephew had two fundamental advantages over his uncle - he was English and he was Anglican.¹⁶⁷ Thus, his image served to deflect negative feeling away from the King by reminding and reassuring the English people that the future of the Protestant Stuart dynasty reflected and represented their interests. Like his Catholic rival, William is depicted seated, dressed in drapery (although somewhat more decorously) and gesturing emphatically towards the fluffy little dog, which sits in obedience below him. Again the themes of authority and loyalty are evoked. The large curtain upon which William sits is embroidered with the initial ‘G’ below a

¹⁶³ De Beer (ed.), 2000. Vol. V, 20th March, 1692. p. 92. See for example, Gerard Edelinck after Largilliere, *His Royal Highness, James Prince of Wales* (1692). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; and P. van Schuppen after Largilliere, James Francis Edward, Prince of Wales (1692). Drambuie Collection, Edinburgh.

¹⁶⁴ Millar, 1963. p. 144.

¹⁶⁵ Rose, 1999. p. 39; Claydon, 1996. p. 122; Baxter, 2003. p.102.

¹⁶⁶ Claydon, 1996. p. 122.

¹⁶⁷For details of William’s religious instruction see Burnet, 1875. p. 608; Lewis, 1789. p. 27; pp. 85-86; p. 100.

coronet, contained within a wreath - again reminiscent of the embellished device behind James. Thus the principal motifs of Largillière's portrait have recurred in Kneller's. However, once more, William's depiction is set within a classicised background. A decorative frieze is revealed below the drapery, while behind the Prince a vista with classical arches, columns and a statue of Minerva, clutching shield and spear, recedes into the distance. Minerva's presence suggests that William has been cast in the guise of a young Perseus. Indeed, later paintings continued to employ this iconography. Another statue of the goddess is present in the Duke's portrait with his mother and a later composition shows him dressed in classical attire, beside an ornate table, the leg of which has been carved to resemble the undulating bare-breasted and snake-haired figure of Medusa.¹⁶⁸ In *London's Great Jubilee* (1689), a description of the displays and speeches during the Lord Mayor's Pageant, mention is made of a ship, named the *Perseus and Andromeda*. The author explains the pertinence of this choice, for Perseus "rescues Andromeda from the Sea monster; the moral is, the Church from the Deluge, that was ready to overflow it. How applicable this is to the present Revolutions of this Year, will need no comment to explain."¹⁶⁹ Classicism had been a favoured motif of his uncle's portraiture from a young age.¹⁷⁰ In maturity he had adopted the *persona* of Hercules as a metaphor for his fight "to preserve Christianity from the monstrous forces of evil represented by Louis XIV."¹⁷¹ It may well be then that, through these explicit references to antiquity, the Duke is also presented as an ancient hero and father of nations, who will preserve and protect Protestantism. Even in youth he is prepared for his role as Defender of the Faith.

¹⁶⁸ See *Queen Anne with her son, William, Duke of Gloucester* (1694), after Godfrey Kneller. National Portrait Gallery, London; *William, Duke of Gloucester*, after Godfrey Kneller (1694). Frederiksborg Castle, Hillerød, Denmark.

¹⁶⁹ Taubman, 1689. p. 10.

¹⁷⁰ See for example Gerrit van Honthorst's portrait of him as a three-year-old in classical costume - *William III, when Prince of Orange* (1654). Palace of Het Loo, Apeldoorn, The Netherlands; and Jan de Baen's portrait of him as a Roman general - *William III, when Prince of Orange* (c.1667). Royal Collection, London.

¹⁷¹ Baxter, 2003. p. 97.

The use of parallel motifs in these two portraits again indicates a calculated relationship. A number of copies of the Largillière were sent to Britain from France and both William III and Kneller were acquainted with images of the Prince of Wales, produced at Saint-Germain-en-Laye and smuggled into Britain.¹⁷² Once more, William's party were presented with the opportunity to modify Jacobite propaganda for their own ends. By calling upon the same devices and themes of power, status and loyalty, they intentionally provoked comparison with the image of the rival heir. William's portrait is an adaptation of the earlier one of James, re-branded for a Protestant prince and his public.

The young heirs continued to be presented in opposition to each other in a variety of cultural spheres. In December 1694 Mary II had died of smallpox. In contrast to her husband, Mary had been popular and her death was deeply felt across the kingdom.¹⁷³ The gap left by her death was to be filled by the young Prince William. William's sixth birthday was the first court festivity after the Queen's death.¹⁷⁴ The *Post Boy* newspaper reported that the event "was observed in this City by ringing of Bells, and other Demonstrations of Joy suitable to the occasion, and there was last night a fine ball at Windsor, upon the same subject."¹⁷⁵ During the entertainments a new ode by Purcell was performed - *Who can from Joy Refraine?* - which proclaimed the young heir "a prince of glorious race".¹⁷⁶ Just over a month before a party of Jacobites had gathered at the Dogg Tavern in Drury Lane to celebrate the birthday of the Prince of Wales. Having lit a bonfire, the revellers continued to carouse with trumpets and kettledrums and forced passers-by to drink the Prince's health, thereby

¹⁷² The Earl of Ailesbury recorded how King William had desired to see a print of Prince James in the collection of the Earl of Essex and commented on his family likeness. See W.E. Buckley (ed.), 1890. p. 283. In 1697 Kneller announced during a speech at Oxford University that: "his Fader and Moder have sat to me about thirty-six times a piece; and I know every line and bit in their Faces. Be got I could paint King James just now by memory. I say the child is so like both, that there is not a feature on his face but wat belongs to Fader or Moder." See Corp, 2004. p. 184.

¹⁷³ Rose, 1999. p. 43.

¹⁷⁴ Baldwin and Wilson, 1981. p. 597.

¹⁷⁵ *Post Boy and Historical Account*, Issue 33, 23rd - 25th July, 1695. p. 2.

¹⁷⁶ Baldwin and Wilson, 1981. p. 597.

provoking a riot.¹⁷⁷ Olive Baldwin and Thelma Wilson have convincingly argued that William's birthday celebrations provided a useful counter-attraction to the subsequent arrests and gossip surrounding the 'Drury Lane Rioters'.¹⁷⁸ Thus, William's society debut represented an attempt to offset the disturbing effects of Queen Mary's death and of Jacobite dissension. In the same year, William Fuller, formerly a servant to the exiled Stuarts, published a pamphlet alleging that Prince James was the son of an Irish gentlewoman, Mary Grey, who had subsequently been confined to a nunnery and murdered.¹⁷⁹ In the singular dedication to William, Duke of Gloucester, he accuses the pretended Prince of Wales and his Catholic brethren of seeking to rob William of his birthright, even before his conception.¹⁸⁰ Again, the Prince is celebrated as the suppressor of Papist conspiracies and a "Heretick Exclusion", as Britain's future Hercules.¹⁸¹

Over the following years William III continued to promote his nephew. On his next birthday, Gloucester was installed as a Knight of the Garter in a manner "greater than was ever known."¹⁸² The King granted him twenty thousand pounds from the civil list, with his own apartments and household at St. James and gave him command of a Dutch regiment of foot guards.¹⁸³ The significance with which he was generally regarded is evident in the 1699 House of Commons debates regarding his education. In December, two Tory MPs put forward a motion to remove from office William's Preceptor, the Bishop of Salisbury. Following a series of speeches on the matter, accusing him of insinuating that King William had gained power by conquest, the motion was quashed by forty votes.¹⁸⁴ Such was the fear

¹⁷⁷ Luttrell, 1857. Vol. III, Tuesday 11th June, 1695. p. 484.

¹⁷⁸ Baldwin and Wilson, 1981. p. 597.

¹⁷⁹ Fuller, 1696. p. 17.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.* p. 3.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.* p. 4.

¹⁸² Luttrell, 1857. Vol. IV, Thursday 23rd July, 1696. p. 88.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.* Vol. IV, Thursday 23rd December, 1697. p. 323; Thursday 6th January, 1698. p. 328; Saturday 30th July, 1698. p. 408.

¹⁸⁴ Luttrell, 1857. Vol IV, Thursday 14th December, 1699. p. 593.

that Prince William might be influenced by the King's enemies. As he matured, William became increasingly involved with public and Court life. In the same year, accompanied by his mother and father with the French ambassador, he attended the much publicised trial of the Earl of Warwick and Lord Mohun, brought up on charges of duelling and murder.¹⁸⁵ Shortly afterwards, the King appointed a horse guard of six gentlemen to attend him and ordered that foreign ambassadors should have audience with him.¹⁸⁶ Just before his twelfth birthday the Duke was officially placed under King William's protection and granted the late Queen's lodgings at Kensington.¹⁸⁷

Meanwhile, Prince James was also coming of age. In early 1699 Sir David Nairne noted that "the Prince began for the first time to dine with the King and Queen regularly [and] to have no more table for himself."¹⁸⁸ His position was further enhanced by his father's steady decline. By the end of the year Nairne remarks that King James was carried to dinner in a "rouling chaire".¹⁸⁹ His poor state of health was such that Lord Manchester, ambassador-extraordinary at the French Court, reported back to England that "King James was the fifth instant taken with an apoplectick fitt, and dead for some time; after which was seiz'd with the dead palsy on one side, and suppos'd could not live for many days."¹⁹⁰ In preparation for his imminent ascendancy, Prince James became increasingly involved in political affairs.¹⁹¹

It was amidst this rise in profile that another set of portraits of the rival Princes was executed. In 1699 Godfrey Kneller painted two conversation pieces of the young Prince William. The first depicts him dressed in a breast plate and ermine-lined cloak, draped over his shoulder *alla Romana*, with bands of fabric falling over his sleeve (See Figure 30). Again

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.* Vol. IV, Thursday 28th March, 1699. p. 499.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.* Vol. IV, Saturday 3rd June, 1699. p. 523.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.* Vol. IV, Saturday 6th July, 1700. p. 664.

¹⁸⁸ The Journal of Sir David Nairne. N.L.S. MS 14266. Sunday 22nd March, 1699. f. 148r.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.* Friday 13th December, 1699. f. 154v.

¹⁹⁰ Luttrell, 1857. Vol. V, Thursday 11th March, 1701. p. 264.

¹⁹¹ From March 1701, Nairne's entries record an increased number of consultations with the Prince.

classicism and, by implication, Protestantism, are key to his portrayal. The second version, now lost but subsequently engraved (See Figure 31), shows the Duke in the same pose - one hand on hip, the other slightly out at his side - but dressed in contemporary seventeenth-century attire with the badge and sash of the Garter clearly visible. Reproduced consistently over the next few decades, both in oils and in ink, these images were to become the most iconic representations of William. Similarly, around 1700, François de Troy was to create some of Prince James' best-known portraits. In one of these the Prince is also shown inside an oval, equipped with a breastplate, this time worn over a red jacket with gold brocade, his Garter sash arranged on top (c.1700, See Figure 32). James' pose is, in fact, a mirror-image copy of Kneller's second portrait of William. Eight different versions of de Troy's composition survive and several of these too were engraved.¹⁹² It is intriguing to note that within a year of each other both parties independently produced single figure compositions, the sole focus of which was the person of the heir, effectively signalling his coming-of-age and entrance into the political arena.

While the movement of art works from Saint-Germain to Britain has been well documented,¹⁹³ the artistic exchange in the opposite direction has received little attention. Spies and informers operated on both sides of the Channel and the opposing Courts were kept abreast of news of each other. As well as Jacobite sympathisers, artists like John Smith and the medallist, Norbert Roettiers, intermittently visited the Court at St. Germain and must have provided valuable information on royal patronage back in Britain.¹⁹⁴ The two most influential members of the Jacobite Court during this period were the Drummond brothers, John, Earl of Melfort and James, Earl of Perth. Melfort, in particular was a renowned artistic connoisseur

¹⁹² Corp, 2001. p. 40.

¹⁹³ See Edward Corp, 'The Portraits of the Stuarts and their Courtiers', in *A Court in Exile, The Stuarts in France 1689-1718* (Cambridge, 2004).

¹⁹⁴ John Smith visited the Jacobite court in 1698 to copy Largillière's double portrait of Prince James and his sister, Louise-Marie. See Sharp, 1996. p. 2; p. 55. Norbert Roettiers travelled to France in 1695 and successfully smuggled Jacobite medals into Britain between 1697 and 1700. See Corp, 2001. p. 186.

and both he and his brother had patronised Kneller before their exile.¹⁹⁵ After James II's death in 1701, Gerard Edelinck was engaged to engrave a posthumous portrait of the late King, based on Kneller's painting of 1684. The painting, of course, was not available so Edelinck worked from John Smith's original English mezzotint.¹⁹⁶ These episodes illustrate that there was an interest in Kneller and his contemporaries, who worked for the Williamite regime, and that their work provided an important stimulus to the creation of Jacobite propaganda. It may well be then that in this case the image of Prince James was derived from that of Prince William. As the Duke's position and prestige grew and as a new mature and self-assured image was created for him, it was natural for the rival party to issue a similarly confident portrait in response. Once again, the British public were reminded that there were two possible lines of succession and two potential heirs.

From his birth, pains were taken to present William, Duke of Gloucester, in opposition to his uncle, Prince James. As has been shown, Williamite propaganda was not averse to the re-appropriation of artistic precedents. By explicitly referencing earlier images of Prince James, William's depiction intentionally provoked comparison, emphasising the presence of another royal claimant. However, by presenting him within a classical context he was cast as an ancient hero and the successor to his uncle's legacy. The positive aspects of his future ascendancy were highlighted and the Catholicism of his rival was underlined. As de Troy's portraits demonstrate, the Jacobites were similarly disposed to manipulating artistic models. The commissioning and distribution of portraits on both sides responded to the position and political circumstances of the other heir. Thus, in order to appreciate and understand the iconography of each Prince, their images should not be viewed in isolation.

¹⁹⁵ See the inventory of Melfort's collection confiscated by the Crown in 1692 - *Calendar of Treasury Papers*. Vol IX, Part IV, 1689-92. p. 1692.

¹⁹⁶ Corp, 2001. p. 189.

William, who died unaware of his rival claimant and Catholic relatives,¹⁹⁷ had been educated to hold English and Protestant interests dear. His image articulated this. Both Princes became the luminaries of their respective causes and their images were employed to deflect negative attention away from their elders. Their relationship constitutes much more than a series of coincidental and superficial similarities. It is only logical that those responsible for each Prince's representation should wish to keep abreast of how his adversary was portrayed and to respond to those modes of depiction. Following the Glorious Revolution the British public were faced with a choice between two royal families and two rival young heirs. It is within this context that the public images of Princes James and William should be viewed. The significance of their iconographies should not be underestimated – for in these two children rested the conflicting hopes of a divided nation.

VI

An effective princely image responded to the interests and anxieties of subjects. In order to appeal to the British public, the Stuart prince had to be seen to represent them. As this chapter has shown, the security of Church and state were at the centre of popular concerns. Consequently, the Stuarts fashioned public images for their young heirs which addressed these fears. Princely portrayal focused on communicating reassuring messages about the future by presenting male progeny as masculine, militant and Protestant.¹⁹⁸ In many ways Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, established a successful precedent for his successors to follow. The martial Protestant *persona*, formed for him in infancy, was to have significant popular appeal. Indeed, it was encouraged, advanced and accentuated by the war party which

¹⁹⁷ Jenkin Lewis, the Prince's biographer and valet, recorded that: "He never was told anything of King James nor of the Pretended Prince of Wales, yet he once said he would be Prince of Wales; (for which he was checked)." See Lewis, 1789. p. 29.

¹⁹⁸ As discussed above, Prince James, the Old Pretender, is the exception to this – see pp. 87-102.

had rapidly grown around him - and therein lay the problem. With Henry's representation increasingly beyond the King's control, ideological tensions emerged and efforts had to be taken to curb the warrior prince. His public image had proven almost too potent. Yet, following Henry, Duke of Gloucester's reunion with his exiled family, it was to the guise of the Protestant warrior that the Stuarts once more returned. By so doing, the emasculation which his representation had suffered at the hands of their enemies and the anxiety experienced over his religion were effectively countered. Significantly, the Duke's image was also conceived with an emphasis upon his own obedience and loyalty to the King, his brother. Accordingly, potential ideological conflicts between the Prince and his sovereign were diminished. After the Glorious Revolution, William, Duke of Gloucester's representation also centred on the projection of martial aptitude and religious devotion. His image was employed to offset opposition and to promote loyalty to the new regime. Consistently presented in opposition to the Catholic heir, Prince James, his popularity was used to bolster his uncle's government, while promising the British public a more acceptable form of Stuart rule than that offered by the Jacobites. Thus, while each Prince's portrayal responded to specific political and religious circumstances, they were also heavily informed by the established model. These heirs were of immense dynastic and propagandistic importance and their premature deaths had serious political implications. Potentially destabilising, the Stuarts' management and commemoration of these losses was crucial to assuaging the ensuing anxieties.

Chapter 3

“Joy Turned to Mourning”: The Princely Death

I

“O put not your trust in Princes, nor in any Child of Man, for there is no help in them. For when the breath of man goeth forth, he shall turn again to his earth, and then all his thoughts perish.”¹

So preached William Fleetwood, Chaplain in Ordinary to King William III, following the demise of William, Duke of Gloucester, in 1700. After almost a century of investing hopes and aspirations in successive generations of Stuart progeny, only to see them eclipsed through death, this sentiment would surely have resonated with his audience. Yet, while the loss of an heir extinguished a series of propitious expectations, more importantly, it also, threatened the continuity of the dynasty and the security of the realm. A prince’s demise, therefore, was not only grieved by his family and household - his subjects also had an interest in his passing. How the Stuarts managed and marked these bereavements was critical to calming political and social apprehensions. The public performance of grief was an important coping mechanism. It helped survivors to register their loss and to come to terms with “the rift of separation”.² Throughout the seventeenth century the treatment of royal deaths was to alter and develop. Official responses did not necessarily correspond to the perceived importance of each loss and often there was a marked difference between the extent of official and popular acts of remembrance. Thus, for example, when Prince William died at

¹ From Psalm 146. See Fleetwood, 1700. p. 3.

² Cressy, 1997. p. 393.

the age of eleven, effectively signalling the end of the Protestant Stuart line, his obsequies were relatively reserved. In contrast, public interest in his death was intense and four hundred guards were appointed during the funeral to keep the assembled crowds at bay.³ This Chapter examines the different means by which the state, family, household and public observed and commemorated these tragic losses.

A variety of methods were employed for memorialising the royal dead. Some were more immediate and transitory, such as the assumption of mourning dress or the staging of funeral ceremonial, while others were gradual and enduring, such as the commissioning of monuments and posthumous portraits. What is striking throughout this period is the steady scaling down and increasing simplicity of princely death rites. The size and grandeur of funerals were curtailed; frequently orders for general mourning were not issued; tomb projects went unplanned or were left unfinished.⁴ It is testament to the regard and respect which these Princes engendered that the individual need to express a sense of loss persisted. Personal and private forms of commemoration were enacted and commissioned by members of their family and Courts, while the reduction and restraint of official commemoration may, in fact, have helped to stimulate popular interest. Under the Stuarts, a burgeoning commercial trade sprang into action, profiting from public demand for memorial goods. Elegies, epitaphs, songs, sermons, engravings, broadsides and curiosities all responded to the premature deaths of royal heirs. Significantly, they also perpetuated and accentuated the images and *personae* fashioned for these Princes. Thus the efficacy of their representation in life is exemplified by its adoption and amplification after death. Indeed, the portrayals contained in these pieces of commemorative ephemera would prove influential in the later development of their posthumous memories. The extent and variety of methods for memorialising these lost heirs,

³ Luttrell, 1857. Vol. IV, Thursday 9th August, 1700. p. 676.

⁴ See pp. 106-130.

therefore, reveal not only the political significance of their deaths but also the strong response to their loss as individuals.

II

The official response to a royal death was swift. In a period when the wheels of bureaucracy turned notoriously slowly, complex funeral arrangements were set in motion within a matter of days. Their execution demanded considerable organisation, involving the co-ordination of members of the royal household, the heralds, servants, and a variety of artists, craftsmen and labourers. The seventeenth century witnessed a shift in the management of royal funerals - from large-scale public events, like those of Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, and the early Stuarts, to smaller private interments, favoured after the Restoration. Around two thousand mourners participated in Henry's funeral cortege, four hundred more than had processed before the corpse of Elizabeth I.⁵ The separate studies of Jennifer Woodward and Gregory McNamara have shed considerable light on the political motives, expense, ceremonial, imagery and material display of his obsequies.⁶ Indeed, Woodward has argued that: "the scale and magnificence of the affair broke all precedents and constituted a great tribute to the Prince's memory."⁷ Nevertheless, it does not necessarily follow that the later Stuarts' preference for more restrained rites indicates a lesser concern for the reverence or remembrance of their deceased. A modern day interpretation of the terms "public" and "private" should not be applied to these events. As Paul Fritz has observed, the distinction was primarily heraldic and indicated the degree of ceremony employed, rather than any

⁵ Woodward, 1997. p. 149.

⁶ See Woodward, 1997. pp. 148-165; Gregory McNamara, "'Grief was as Clothes to their Backs': Prince Henry's Funeral viewed from the Wardrobe" in Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (Southampton, 2007).

⁷ Woodward, 1997. p. 148.

conscious attempts at secrecy.⁸ However, while Fritz's research has greatly enhanced understanding of later Stuart and Hanoverian royal funerals, he may be guilty of concentrating too closely on what was absent from them, rather than what remained.

Describing the private rites of Charles II, Fritz asserts that "the ceremony lacked all of the pomp, grandeur and spectacle" associated with earlier public ones.⁹ However, analysis of the first post-Restoration royal funeral, that of Henry, Duke of Gloucester, reveals that despite its reduced size, it was nonetheless a meticulously designed display of royal splendour, which would continue to influence the planning of regal exequies well into the eighteenth century.

On the 13th of September 1660, amid the celebrations surrounding the Restoration of his brother, Charles II, the Duke of Gloucester unexpectedly died. John Evelyn remarked upon this fateful timing: "In the midst of all the joy and jubilee, dies the Duke of Gloucester of the small-pox, which put all the court in mourning: died the 13th in prime of youth, a Prince of extraordinary hopes."¹⁰ Entrepreneurs were quick to reap commercial gain from his death and popular pamphlets like *Dying Tears or England's Joy Turned to Mourning* (1660) also highlighted the special poignancy of his loss at a time of such festivity and merry-making.¹¹ Henry has been largely neglected by historians but reactions to his demise reveal the admiration and respect in which he was held, both in Britain and on the Continent. In a letter to Elizabeth of Bohemia, informing her of her nephew's death, Sir Charles Cottrell reported:

⁸ Fritz, 1981. p. 61.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 70.

¹⁰ De Beer (ed.), 2000. Vol. III, 13th September, 1660. p. 257.

¹¹ Anon. *Dying Tears or England's Joy Turned to Mourning* (London, 1660). See also Anon. *Some Teares Dropt ore the Herse of the Incomparable Prince Henry Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1660); and Anon. *The Queens Lamentation* (London, 1660).

“wee are all here struck w(i)th such a generall sadnesse . . . that it is impossible to containe our grieffe within our selves but must make it infectious by bemoaning the publicke losse.”¹²

Meanwhile, Sir Henry de Vic, Charles II’s representative at the Court in Brussels, described the “generall affliction” which had affected “all sorts of men” there but especially the Marquis of Caracena, Governor of the Spanish Netherlands, “for the particular respecte which he bare unto him.”¹³ The French royal family, Cardinal Mazarin and Marshal de Turenne all sent personal letters of condolence to Charles II.¹⁴ In particular, the recently reinstated King felt the loss deeply and assumed purple mourning for his brother.¹⁵ This gesture was widely emulated, despite the fact that no orders were issued for general mourning.¹⁶ Samuel Pepys ordered his own black suit two days after Henry’s death and a week later observed that mourning dress was *a la mode* for London’s fashionable ladies.¹⁷ Writing on the 5th of October, de Vic reported that he was virtually a prisoner until his mourning clothes and those of his servants were finished.¹⁸ It is likely that the adoption of mourning garb served two related purposes. Subjects demonstrated not only their own sense of loss but also their loyalty to the newly restored regime. Even before the funeral itself then, the public display of grief had begun.

However, the Restoration celebrations continued. Anna Key has shown how the “rituals of monarchy” thrived under Charles II, arguing that he manipulated ceremonial to

¹² Letter from Cottrell to Elizabeth of Bohemia, 14th September, 1660. B.L. Add MS 24023. f. 34r.

¹³ Letter from De Vic to Sir Edward Nicholas, 1st October, 1660. B.L. Egerton MS 2537. p. 193.

¹⁴ See *State Papers France, Charles II*. 1660-61. TNA. SP 78/115, ff. 99r-117r.

¹⁵ For Charles’ reaction to his brother’s death see Letter from Richard Honeywood to Elizabeth of Bohemia, 21st September, 1660. B.L. Add MS 18744. f. 19r; Letter from Cottrell to Elizabeth of Bohemia, 14th September, 1660. B.L. Add MS 24023. f. 34r; and *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1659-61*. 24th September, 1660. p. 198. Samuel Pepys observed the King in purple mourning at Whitehall garden three days after the Duke’s death – see Latham and Matthews (eds), 1970. Vol. I, 16th September, 1660. p. 246.

¹⁶ See Results of searches made for precedents concerning mourning ordered for, and the burial places of, younger children of the Monarch, 1660-1700. TNA. PC 1/13/55.

¹⁷ Latham and Matthews (eds), 1970. Vol. I, 15th September, 1660. p. 245; 22nd September, 1660. p. 251.

¹⁸ De Vic to Sir Edward Nicholas, 5th October, 1660. B.L. Egerton MS 2537. p. 194.

underline the strength of his rule and to project a splendid image of his prerogative.¹⁹

Examination of the period following Henry's demise also reveals this preoccupation, with a calculated parity between the display of majesty and mourning. Indeed, less than a fortnight later, when the Prince de Ligne, Ambassador Extraordinary of Philip IV of Spain, arrived to congratulate Charles, he was presented with a difficult diplomatic situation. The Venetian Ambassador, Francesco Giavarina, described his embassy's procession through London:

"The prince de Ligne made his public entry yesterday, with a great suite, superb liveries and much pomp, amid extraordinary plaudits from the people who acclaimed him with shouts of joy."²⁰ Having planned a magnificent display for his first audience with the King, on hearing of the Duke's death, the Prince and his entourage offered to assume black but were excused.

The Embassy of the Prince de Ligne received by Charles II (1660, See Figure 33) records this unusual event. The Prince (shown kneeling before the King) and his entourage are depicted sumptuously attired in matching gold and scarlet, their hats plumed with feathers and their apparel trimmed with bows, frills and lace. Rising from his throne, beneath a canopy of state and amidst the rich tapestried walls of the Banqueting House, Charles is shown in sober black. In stark contrast to the radiant attire of the foreign envoys, his courtiers are also dressed in unadorned mourning. Despite this, Giavarina recorded how the spectacle had impressed, with the costly liveries outshining even those of the Prince's entry.²¹ After this initial meeting, the Prince followed the Court, attending a private audience with the King, accompanied by his train, all now attired in black.²² Notwithstanding the impact made by his first audience, the Prince departed "sorry for the fatal necessity that debars him from

¹⁹ See Anna Keay, *The Magnificent Monarch, Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (New York and London, 2008). p. 209.

²⁰ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1659-61*. 24th September, 1660. p. 198.

²¹ *Ibid.* 1st October, 1660. p. 201.

²² *Ibid.* 1st October, 1660. p. 201.

appearing to his greatest advantage of splendour.”²³ Henry’s death had restricted royal spectacle, compelling the King, his household and the diplomatic guests to contain their magnificence. The material display of majesty was replaced by that of grief. Yet the receptions and festivities had to carry on, asserting the right and legitimacy of the Restoration, as well as the authority and standing of the dynasty. These concerns and the careful balance between princely splendour and ceremonial restraint were to shape the planning and execution of Henry’s funeral.

The Privy Council were acquainted with the news of his death on the 14th of September. Upon receiving this intelligence they deliberated over the manner and time of his interment but were unable to reach a conclusion, deciding only that his body should be embalmed and removed to the unoccupied Somerset House.²⁴ The nature of these debates is unclear, yet the Venetian ambassador records that a public interment was initially considered by the Court before opting instead for a private one.²⁵ Analysis of the Wardrobe Accounts of the funeral reveals that despite this decision, splendour and display, reflective of and appropriate to Henry’s rank, were central to its execution. On the evening of the 21st of September, eight days after the Duke of Gloucester’s death, the funeral rites commenced. Between his removal to Somerset House and his final journey to Westminster Abbey a team of tradesmen, labourers and artisans worked diligently to orchestrate his grand dispatch.

Henry’s sudden death from smallpox and the risk of further infection meant that his embalming was carried out with great haste.²⁶ Yet even the records of this procedure reveal the luxury involved. Forty-four ells of ordinary holland, thirty-two ells of fine holland, forty-four ells of superfine holland, fifteen yards of white rich taffeta and twenty yards of rich

²³ *Manuscripts of Le Fleming of Rydal Hall*, 1890. p. 26.

²⁴ Privy Council Registers, Charles II. TNA. PC 2/54, p. 162. *Royal Funerals 1618-1738*. College of Arms. Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 65.

²⁵ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1659-61*. 1st October, 1660. p. 201.

²⁶ *Royal Funerals 1618-1738*. College of Arms. Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 65.

crimson grained taffeta (an extremely costly fabric, dyed so as to achieve a brilliant red), were employed about the business before he was coffined.²⁷ In all 185 yards of cloth were used.²⁸ Henry's body then lay in state in the Privy Chamber of Somerset House, attended by his servants.²⁹ The sight must have been at once ominous and impressive. The rooms at the Palace were hung with black cloth and the floor covered with dark baize, a hard-wearing woollen material.³⁰ The coffin was placed on a hearse beneath a fringed pall of thick black velvet and covered with a smaller piece, upon which rested a black velvet cushion, bearing a Genoa velvet crimson cap and ducal crown.³¹ The pall was decorated with eight escutcheons of the Duke's arms, made of black Florentine Satin and painted with fine gold.³² Throughout the Wardrobe Accounts specific reference is made to the type, quality and origin of the textiles used, revealing the intended impact of such opulent display. In contrast, the provisions for the funeral of William, Duke of Gloucester, some forty years later, have little of that fastidiousness, suggesting that, by the time of his demise, the practices and conventions of a private royal funeral were well established.³³ With Henry's obsequies arrangements were meticulously monitored and detailed. Here the liberal use of rich costly fabrics constituted a striking statement of royal magnificence amidst the background of sorrow and loss.

While few outside the Court would have been privy to this scene, the Duke's posthumous travels were more open affairs. Unfortunately there is no mention of how he was

²⁷ The Accompt of the Right honourable Edward Earle of Sandwich, Master of his Ma(jes)ties Great Wardrobe. For the Funeralls of the Duke of Gloucester, The Princess of Aurange, The Duke of Cambridge and the Queen of Bohemia. TNA. LC 2/7. p. 1. An ell is equal to forty-five inches.

²⁸ Just over ninety-one yards of fabric were used to embalm Henry, Prince of Wales, in 1612 – see McNamara, 2007. p. 273.

²⁹ Sandford, 1707. p. 605.

³⁰ Accompt of the Right honourable Edward Earle of Sandwich. TNA. LC 2/7. p. 3; Royal Funerals 1618-1738. College of Arms. Naylor (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 65.

³¹ *Ibid.* pp. 1-3; *Ibid.* p. 65.

³² *Ibid.* p. 1; *Ibid.* p. 65; Sandford, 1707. p. 605.

³³ Provisions for the Funeral of His Highness the Duke of Gloucester. TNA. LC 2/14/1.

transported from his place of death at Whitehall Palace to Somerset House. However, the Accounts do contain a noteworthy entry “for covering the Glasse Coache twice over with black Velvett and the second time with purple cloth.”³⁴ Glass coaches (those with glazed windows), as opposed to curtain coaches, were still extremely rare and expensive during this period.³⁵ The Accounts refer to four coaches in total, but only the glass one is singled out for this special attention. While the other coaches were draped only in royal purple, it was also wrapped in mourning black. During the funeral, the Prince’s body was conveyed in his own barge, covered in six and a half yards of black cloth, while the other barges were left unadorned.³⁶ Correspondingly, it is likely that the glass coach, also swathed in black, carried Henry’s coffin along the Strand to Somerset House.

His funeral began at six in the evening, when five barges conveyed the corpse and its attendants along the Thames to the Parliament Stairs.³⁷ The decision to process by water rather than land, however, should not be interpreted as an attempt at secrecy or concealment. In Restoration London the Thames was still “an essential artery”, a major thoroughfare and the heart of the capital’s commerce and trade.³⁸ Indeed, many important royal and civic events, such as the triumphal entry in 1662 of Charles’ Queen, Catherine of Braganza, and the annual Lord Mayor’s Day Procession were conducted along the river. Thus the funeral route was an oft-used ceremonial circuit, open and easily observed by the public. In fact, some two hours after its commencement, Samuel Pepys came across the convoy on his way from Whitehall to the Hoop Tavern: “Back by water about 8 a-clock and upon the water saw [the] corps of the Duke of Gloucester brought down Somersett-house stairs to go by water to

³⁴ *Accompt of the Right honourable Edward Earle of Sandwich*. TNA. LC 2/7. p. 5.

³⁵ Thrupp, 1877. p. 45.

³⁶ *Accompt of the Right honourable Edward Earle of Sandwich*. TNA. LC 2/7. p. 3.

³⁷ Sandford, 1707. p. 605; *Royal Funerals 1618-1738*. College of Arms. Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 65.

³⁸ Wood, 1995. p. 553.

Westminster.³⁹ Thus the populace was presented with the dramatic sight of five richly decorated state barges, one draped in black, navigating up the river by torchlight. Indeed, the fact that the funeral was an evening rather than a day-time affair should not be interpreted as any retreat from the public gaze. Certainly, vast crowds still gathered to view William III's funeral procession in 1702, although it was conducted much later at night.⁴⁰

While the coffin and its thirty attendants travelled by water, it would appear that the mourners of higher status travelled by road. As discussed earlier, four coaches were recorded in the funeral accounts.⁴¹ The dressing of two of these carriages is worth particular consideration. George Lee, a woollen draper, was paid for just over 130 yards of purple cloth to cover the coaches and to make housings for the twelve horses which drew them.⁴² Each coach was then decorated with purple grained fringe, silk strings, tags and large tassels. Inside Genoa damask curtains were hung, with purple ribbons and rings, while purple serge seats were installed.⁴³ The horse housings and heads were also adorned with purple silk tassels.⁴⁴ It would seem most likely that the chief-mourner, Henry's brother, James, Duke of York, and his assistants, the Dukes of Buckingham, Richmond and Albemarle, were conveyed in these elaborate carriages to the House of Lords where the funeral company met before the ceremony at the Abbey.⁴⁵ Thus two separate groups were simultaneously making their way to Westminster – the body and its attendants, in the form of an impressive water procession and the chief mourners in their richly adorned purple coaches. Both companies presented a striking spectacle to the public.

³⁹ Latham and Matthews (eds), 1970. Vol. I, 21st September, 1660. p. 249.

⁴⁰ Fritz, 1982. p. 296; Fritz, 1981. p. 71. William's obsequies took place at eleven at night.

⁴¹ See p. 112.

⁴² *Accompt of the Right honourable Edward Earle of Sandwich*. TNA. LC 2/7. p. 3.

⁴³ *Ibid.* pp. 4-6.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* p. 4.

⁴⁵ *Manuscripts of Le Fleming of Rydal Hall*, 1890. p. 27.

Once the body and mourners had arrived, the display continued. At nine o'clock eighteen gentlemen of the Privy Chamber carried the coffin on its bier from Parliament Stairs to the Abbey. A further twelve supported the canopy over it.⁴⁶ The canopy itself, born ten feet in the air by black staves, was made from over sixty yards of thick black velvet with valences at each end and silk fringing.⁴⁷ The Knight Marshalls processed in front of the corpse, armed with staffs to clear the way, followed by a large train of servants, heralds, nobles and royal officials. The Duke of York walked behind the coffin, his train carried by Lord Widdrington, followed by the Duke's three supporters, fourteen earls, the royal guard and "divers others".⁴⁸ As the descriptions of the Prince de Ligne's embassy demonstrate, the size and attire of a retinue were one means of projecting grandeur. While the number of mourners which accompanied the Duke's coffin fell well below that which had escorted Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, to his burial, the procession was still considerable, probably mounting into the hundreds. The Funeral Accounts also show that material display through clothing was an important consideration. Entries were made for the mourning liveries of twelve footmen, three coachmen, three postilions, two old footmen and one groom of the pad.⁴⁹ These items, which would have continued to be worn at Court after the funeral, again show that the expression of splendour was central to the funeral's organisation. Each footman was equipped with black trunks, doublet, short coat, stockings, gloves, hat and a velvet cap. Each suit was trimmed with black ribbon, silk, lace and silver or gold galloon braid.⁵⁰ The records concerning the musicians present at the funeral are even more striking. As the procession made its way towards the Church, seventeen trumpeters, one kettle drummer, four ordinary

⁴⁶Royal Funerals 1618-1738. College of Arms. Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 66; Sandford, 1707. p. 605.

⁴⁷Accompt of the Right honourable Edward Earle of Sandwich. TNA. LC 2/7. p. 2; p. 7.

⁴⁸Royal Funerals 1618-1738. College of Arms. Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 66.

⁴⁹Accompt of the Right honourable Edward Earle of Sandwich. TNA. pp. 7-16.

⁵⁰*Ibid.* pp. 8-10.

drummers and a fifer also paraded.⁵¹ Of course the mourning dirge itself would have provided a means of attracting public attention, indicating that issues of secrecy and seclusion were immaterial to the arrangement of this occasion. They also lent a martial bent to the proceedings, appropriate to the funeral of a former soldier. However, the players' uniforms were also clearly designed to impress. Each trumpeter was fitted with a black velvet coat with hanging sleeves, worn over black suits, lined with taffeta and trimmed with black ribbon, buttons and silk loops.⁵² George Pinckney, an embroiderer, was employed to embellish the coats "with his Ma(jes)ties crowne and Knotts thereon before and behind with fine Venice gold, purlles and spangles."⁵³ From each trumpet hung a black damask bannerol with ribbons, tassels and "jolly boys".⁵⁴ The drums were muffled with black baize and two large bannerols were suspended from the kettle drum.⁵⁵ Indeed, the extensive train of attendants in their long black cloaks and richly decorated liveries would have offered an arresting sight. Reaching the Abbey door the mourners met a guard of soldiers, bearing torches and forming a passage through which the train proceeded.⁵⁶ The rites concluded at midnight with Henry's interment in the same vault as his great-grandmother, Mary, Queen of Scots, his uncle, Prince Henry Frederick and two of his younger siblings.⁵⁷ Thus from Henry's lying-in-state to his arrival at Westminster Abbey every attention was made to conduct his funeral in a manner appropriate to his status. Royal display was clearly an important concern. Despite its reduced scale, the level of finery and magnificence was calculated to impress, while the public were presented with several opportunities to view the rich proceedings. Organised in less than a week and

⁵¹ *Ibid.* pp. 16-21.

⁵² *Ibid.* pp. 17-18.

⁵³ *Ibid.* p. 18.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* p. 18.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* p. 19; p. 21.

⁵⁶ Sandford, 1707. p. 605.

⁵⁷ Royal Funerals 1618-1738. College of Arms. Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 68; *Manuscripts of Le Fleming of Rydal Hall*, 1890. p. 27. At the time of Henry's burial, the bodies of Mary, Queen of Scots; Henry, Prince of Wales; Prince Charles, son of Charles I; and Princess Anne, daughter of Charles I, were already entombed in the vault.

with twenty-six named artisans and labourers involved (doubtless many more besides), it was a considerable feat of management and co-ordination. The overall impression was one of understated opulence, a compelling exhibition of royal power.

Why then was it decided that Henry should be honoured with a private rather than a public funeral? Paul Fritz has viewed the reduction and simplification of royal interments as part of a general trend.⁵⁸ However, it may be more helpful to view the form of Henry's rites as a result of particular political circumstances. Firstly, the timing of the Duke's death was unfortunate to say the least. Charles II had only regained his throne a matter of months earlier and crucially, had not yet been crowned. His coronation and magnificent progress to Westminster Abbey would take place just over six months later.⁵⁹ Opulence and excess typified these proceedings. Sir Edward Walker, Garter, wrote of "the richnesse & beauty of the Habitts both of his Ma(jestie), the Nobility, & all others, with their Horses and furniture, being so great, as no age hath seene the like."⁶⁰ With his customary gusto, Pepys declared: "I may now shut my eyes against any other objects, or for the future trouble myself to see things of state and shewe, as being sure never to see the like again in this world."⁶¹ It is unlikely that the King would have countenanced a great state occasion, like a public funeral, before his own splendid inauguration. Above all, the coronation, the symbolic investiture of divinely-ordained authority, could not be allowed to be tainted or overshadowed.

Pageantry, ceremony and display were all to be exploited by the Restoration Court. Luxury and opulence were to become characteristic of Charles II's reign, in deliberate contrast to the austerity of the former regime.⁶² In general, the Commonwealth had refrained from extravagance with one major exception. In 1658, the Protector, Oliver Cromwell, had

⁵⁸ Fritz, 1981. p. 61; p. 79. See also Gittings, 1984. p. 216.

⁵⁹ Keeble, 2002. p. 43.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* p. 45.

⁶¹ Latham and Matthews (eds), 1970. Vol. II, 23rd April, 1661. p. 88.

⁶² Keeble, 2002. p. 43.

been given a magnificent state funeral at a cost of £60, 000.⁶³ *The Pourtraiture of His royal Highness, Oliver late Lord Protector* (1659) details the “very great state” and “magnificent manner” in which it had been effected.⁶⁴ The frontispiece to the biography (1659, See Figure 34) depicts Cromwell’s effigy “under a rich cloth of estate being vested with Royal Robes, a Scepter in one hand, a Globe in the Other, and a Crown on the head; a little distant beneath lyes his Armour, and round about are fixed the Banners, Banroles and Standards, with other Ensigns of honor, and the whole Room being spacious, is adorned in a Princely manner.”⁶⁵ Thus as Clare Gittings has observed: “There was nothing to distinguish the Protector’s image from that of an actual sovereign. Having resisted the offer of coronation during his lifetime, Oliver Cromwell was crowned at death.”⁶⁶ In response to this appropriation and subversion of the symbols and conventions of royal spectacle and ceremony, it may well be that the Stuarts made a conscious decision to distance themselves from the grand heraldic display of death. Henry’s carefully devised funeral - the first royal interment following the Restoration - was, therefore, a compromise between public exhibition and private ceremonial, where heraldic pageantry was curtailed but splendour remained. Thus, once more, Henry had become a subject for the fashioning of a distinct Stuart cultural identity, one which would influence the execution of royal death rites for decades to come.

In all, the Wardrobe Accounts show that the Duke’s funeral cost in excess of £2300.⁶⁷ The outlay for the two grandest public state funerals of the Restoration period, those of George Monck, Duke of Albemarle, in 1670 and Edward Montagu, Earl of Sandwich, in 1672, was estimated at around £5000 each.⁶⁸ Compared to the vast sums spent on early Stuart

⁶³ Gittings, 1984. p. 229.

⁶⁴ H.D., 1659. pp. 68-69.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* p. 63.

⁶⁶ Gittings, 1984. p. 230.

⁶⁷ *Accompt of the Right honourable Edward Earle of Sandwich.* TNA. LC 2/7. p. 23.

⁶⁸ *Preparations to be made for the Funerall of the Earle of Sandwich &c at his Ma(jes)ties Charge.* B.L. Add MS 12514. f. 242 r.

and Cromwellian state funerals these figures are decidedly thrifty and indicate a similar shift away from the imposing spectacle of death.⁶⁹ The significance of Henry's funeral and of its brand of understated display becomes more apparent on examination of its use as a precedent for later royal interments. For example, after the death of Charles II in 1685, a full heraldic (and therefore public) funeral was proposed by the College of Arms, based on the funeral of James I.⁷⁰ After close consultation with his successor, James II, their scheme was rejected and instead, he requested that they come back the following day with the precedents for the funeral of the Duke of Gloucester.⁷¹ It is, indeed, interesting that James, who had been chief mourner at Henry's dispatch, thought the affair a suitable model for that of a monarch. However, the heralds' reluctance to comply is plain when they returned without the appropriate records and, after questioning, pleaded ignorance of the occasion.⁷² In response they were sharply rebuked and ordered to conduct a more thorough search:

“His Ma(jes)tie expecting from them an account of all matters relating to Honnour and Ceremonies, directed that from that time they should be very punctual in recording such things, and that they should search the several offices through which any matters of hono(u)r and Ceremony passed, to enable them more exactly to perform the same.”⁷³

Significantly, Charles II's obsequies established the level of ceremony for the funerals of the later Stuart and Hanoverian sovereigns.⁷⁴ Thus, for over a century, the Duke's death rites were to influence royal funerals directly. Following Henry's death, and with the exception of Mary II, no royal Stuart buried in Britain was to receive a public funeral. His obsequies set a

⁶⁹ The cost of Anne of Denmark's funeral (1619) has been estimated at around £30,000. James I's interment (1625) has been reckoned at £50,000. See Woodward, 1997. p. 170; p. 198.

⁷⁰ Royal Funerals 1618-1738. College of Arms. Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 121.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* pp. 123-124. Fritz, 1981. p. 70.

⁷² Royal Funerals 1618-1738. College of Arms. Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 125.

⁷³ *Ibid.* p. 125.

⁷⁴ Fritz, 1981. p. 71.

precedent and continued to be referred to as an exemplar as late as the last decades of the eighteenth century.⁷⁵

The shift towards private royal interments inevitably resulted in the downscaling of funeral corteges and the containment of pomp. However, the privacy or restraint of these occasions should not be overstated. The post-Restoration funeral still offered opportunities for public contact and rich display. Thus, following William, Duke of Gloucester's death in 1700, his body was laid out in his lodgings at Whitehall which were hung with black cloth, the floor covered with baize and illuminated by eight black candelabra bearing large silver candlesticks.⁷⁶ Over several days the room was decorated with "3 dozen of Taffata Escocheons of His Highnes's Arms . . . intermixt with small stars of the Order of the Garter and eight larger Satten Escocheons placed upon the Pall."⁷⁷ Two days before the funeral this impressive scene was "permitted to be publicly seen by all sorts of persons."⁷⁸ Thus access and spectacle were still important considerations. Above all, private royal death rites were executed in a style deemed appropriate to the status and memory of the deceased. What is clear, however, is that as the mourning pageantry was set aside, increasingly royal obsequies left a weaker impression on the public consciousness. The engravings, woodcuts, drawings and eye-witness descriptions, both published and in manuscript form, which had so often accompanied state funerals, disappeared.⁷⁹ The move away from the royal heraldic funeral

⁷⁵ See Memorandum relating to the Deaths of Princes of the Royal Family from 1660 to the Present time 1772. TNA. PC 1/13/47; Results of searches made for precedents concerning mourning ordered for, and the burial places of, younger children of the Monarch, 1660-1700. TNA. PC 1/13/55.

⁷⁶ Royal Funerals 1618-1738. College of Arms. Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 188.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* p. 188.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* p. 189.

⁷⁹ See for example, Romeyn de Hooghe's engraving of *Queen Mary II's Funeral Procession* (1695). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; An anonymous engraving of *The Hearse of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex* (1646). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; Inigo Jones' design for the *Catafalque of James I* (1625). Worcester College, Oxford; The anonymous published account of *The Funerals of the High and Mighty Prince Henry, Prince of Wales* (London, 1612); and John Chamberlain's description of the funeral of Anne of Denmark in Norman McClure (ed.), *The Letters of John Chamberlain* (Philadelphia, 1939). 14th May, 1619. Vol.II, pp. 237.

was reflective of a gradual withdrawal from grand gestures of official commemoration under the Stuarts. Accordingly, other channels were increasingly adopted for the public performance of grief.

III

It is remarkable that in an age when funerary sculpture flourished, no permanent monuments were erected to these Princes. Indeed, not one Stuart sovereign, ruling after 1603 and interred in England, was to be commemorated with a tomb.⁸⁰ However, this omission does not necessarily indicate a shift in attitude to royal monuments. Plans were drawn up for memorials to Charles I, Mary II, William III and Queen Anne.⁸¹ Similarly, after Henry, Duke of Gloucester's death, the Venetian Ambassador, Giavarina, reported that preparations were being made to unite Henry in a single vault, with his deceased father and sister, King Charles and Princess Elizabeth.⁸² These proposals too failed to come to fruition. The scheme may well have been resurrected in 1678, however, when Christopher Wren was commissioned to design a mausoleum for Charles I. The mausoleum was never built but the plans also show four burial vaults for other members of the late King's family.⁸³ Thus while intentions and proposals repeatedly foundered, it would appear that, in planning at least, the Stuarts were no less preoccupied with monumental commemorative concerns than their forebears had been.

Following the death of Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, the Venetian Ambassador, Antonio Foscarini, recorded that "a rich tomb of marble and porphyry is being prepared, and

⁸⁰ Monuments were erected to James II in the Church of St. Louis at St.-Germain-en-Laye and in the chapel of the Scots College in Paris.

⁸¹ See Christopher Wren's designs for a *Mausoleum for Charles I* (1678). All Souls College, Oxford; Grinling Gibbons' drawing for a proposed *Monument to Mary II* (1695). All Souls College, Oxford; His plans for a *Monument to William III and Mary II* (1702). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; and James Gibbs' design for a *Triumphal Column to Queen Anne* (1713-20). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

⁸² *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series)* 1659-61. 1st October, 1660. p. 201.

⁸³ Beddard, 1984. p. 42. If this assumption is correct then the vaults were intended for King Charles I and his oldest deceased children - Princess Elizabeth; Henry, Duke of Gloucester; and Mary, Princess of Orange.

many statues; it will take a long time and cost much.”⁸⁴ Again these plans were never realised. Instead, Henry’s body was interred at Westminster Abbey in the vault beneath the memorial to his grandmother, Mary, Queen of Scots. Historical scholarship has tended to ascribe this absence either to James’ emotional distress following his son’s death,⁸⁵ or conversely, to an inexplicable neglect of the Prince’s memory.⁸⁶ Jennifer Woodward has argued that the magnificence of Henry’s exequies, as well as the post-funeral display of his effigy at the Abbey, precluded the need for a tomb monument.⁸⁷ Yet, the wealth of references to tomb architecture - both visual and literary - in commemorative pamphlets, published after his death indicates, on the contrary, that there was a consensus that a permanent memorial was required.⁸⁸ For example, the frontispiece to John Taylor’s *Great Britaine, all in Blacke* (1612, See Figure 35) shows an arched plaque sitting upon a pediment, flanked by two black columns. The first column bears an initial H, while the second is inscribed P, both topped with embellished pyramidal structures. In *Mausoleum* (1613, See Figure 36), William Drummond of Hawthornden’s altar poem, rendered in the form of a pyramid capped with an imperial crown, the author ruminated on the material most suitable for such a monument:

“Of Jet
Or Porpherie,
Or that white stone
PAROS affoordes alone.”⁸⁹

⁸⁴ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1610-13*. 29th December, 1612. p. 469.

⁸⁵ Howarth, 1997. pp. 171-172.

⁸⁶ Parry, 1981. p. 87.

⁸⁷ Woodward, 1997. p. 163. See also Howarth, 1997. p. 177.

⁸⁸ See, for example, John Webster’s *A Monumental Columne, erected to the living Memory of the ever-glorious Henry, late Prince of Wales* (London, 1613); William Drummond’s *Mausoleum, or The Choisest Flowres of the Epitaphs, written on the Death of the never-too-much-lamented Prince Henrie* (Edinburgh, 1613); and Domenicus Badius’ *Monumentum Consecratum Honori & memoriae Serenissimi Britanniarum Principis Henrici Frederici* (Leiden, 1612).

⁸⁹ Drummond, 1613. p. 3. The last line of the quotation refers to Parian marble, a semi-translucent, flawless fine stone from Greece.

By the end of the verse, all worldly materials have been rejected as unworthy and instead, a crystal tomb has been erected from the tears of the Muses. Published a year after Henry's death, this verse may, in fact, constitute a direct response to the neglected monument project.

The absence of a tomb for Prince Henry becomes even more striking when placed within the context of James I's programme of royal tomb erection. Following his accession to the English throne, James had commissioned a monument for his predecessor, Elizabeth I. Despite orders that they were to be buried as cheaply as possible, tombs were also commissioned for his two infant daughters, Sophia and Mary (1606 and 1607, See Figure 37). Nigel Llewellyn has argued that Stuart royalty refrained from tomb erection because of the increasing size and magnificence of courtiers' tombs.⁹⁰ He asserts that the dearth of a monument was better than risking a tomb which might be outdone and outshone by those of their subjects.⁹¹ The design and proportions of the singular memorials to these two children, however, would appear to contradict this theory. Both monuments were executed in painted alabaster by Maximilian Colt. Sophia, who died aged just three days, lies swaddled in her cradle, draped in black mourning cloth with gold embellishment. Her sister, Mary, who died aged two, is likewise portrayed in black mourning, a diminutive figure lying upon a tassled cushion. Below her, four *putti* sit weeping at each corner of her tomb. Defining the purpose of these monuments, which sit rather incongruously amongst the grand memorials of Westminster Abbey, is problematic. While grief may well have contributed to their creation, to the contemporary Stuart onlooker, these monuments prioritised dynastic considerations over parental affection. Placed as they are, almost flush against the back wall of the north aisle of Henry VII's Chapel, bystanders would have been faced only with a side view of Princess Mary's tomb and the back of Sophia's crib. Indeed, it would have been difficult to

⁹⁰ Llewellyn, 2000. p. 313.

⁹¹ *Ibid.* p. 313.

catch sight of the artistry which had rendered the pudgy cheeks and cherubic lips of the baby princess. Instead the viewer was presented with the royal Stuart arms, emblazoned onto the head of each tomb. Thus in some small way the monuments to Mary and Sophia, the first Stuarts born south of the border, comprised part of an on-going campaign to establish the new line at England's ancient royal basilica.⁹² Of course, at the heart of this drive was the rehabilitation and veneration of James' mother, Mary Queen of Scots. On the 11th of October, 1612, less than a month before Henry's death, Mary's body had been moved from Peterborough Cathedral and re-interred at Westminster beneath her splendid new tomb, executed by Cornelius Cure. Why then, just months after James I had completed his programme of Stuart funereal monuments, did he neglect to extend this honour to his heir?

It seems unlikely that the crown's finances prohibited it. Following his death Henry's income and most of his estates were transferred to his father, who benefited from an estimated increase of between £20, 000 and £50, 000 per annum.⁹³ The cost of a tomb was insignificant in comparison. Approximately £2000 was spent on Mary, Queen of Scots' tomb, while Elizabeth I's had totalled £765.⁹⁴ If then the motives behind the peculiar absence of Henry Frederick's tomb were not practical, perhaps, they were political. Certainly, there is considerable evidence to show that his parents, James and Anne, were greatly affected by his death. Analysis of contemporary eye-witness accounts of their behaviour reveals a strange shift from rather theatrical demonstrations of grief to conscious attempts to distance themselves from the loss. Even before his demise their conduct appears singular. In his final days, when it became clear that the Prince was beyond help, both absented themselves from his sick bed. James, in a state of nervous exhaustion, removed himself to his country retreat, Theobalds, and took to his bed. A contemporary account described him as a man "whose

⁹² Howarth, 1997. p. 170.

⁹³ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1611-18.* 3rd December, 1612. p. 161; 18th December, 1612. p. 162.

⁹⁴ Woodward, 1997. p. 137.

sorrow noe tounge can expresse not willing nor being able to stay . . . more like a dead than a living man, full of most wonderful heaviness.”⁹⁵ Anne, too, retreated into self-imposed confinement at Somerset House - over a month later she was still indisposed, sitting in a dark room, hung with black.⁹⁶ Both refrained from any contact with each other “for fear to refresh the sense of the wound.”⁹⁷ This physical withdrawal continued, with James delaying and minimising opportunities for official condolence. On the 17th of November 1612 the Privy Council of Scotland decided to send a small party south to “minister up to his Heynes such conforte and consolation as their waik judgments can afford . . . to carye as it wer the mouthis of the people to his Majestie.”⁹⁸ Their sympathetic gesture was unappreciated, however. A week later the King wrote to the Archbishop of Glasgow demanding that the party desist:

“For, in place of consolation, your condolement can bring nothing unto us but a refrication and a renewing of our too deeplie imprinted sorrow, besides that we do not holde it comelie that our Counsell . . . should as if Scotland were a free est(ate) sende an ambassade of condolement unto us.”⁹⁹

Even those permitted to offer their condolences had to endure a considerable delay before they were permitted audience. James finally received foreign ambassadors on the 8th of January - over two months after Henry’s death.¹⁰⁰ Foscarini described the visible signs of distress and audible sighs of the King, who even in the most important discussions would break down and call out “Henry is dead. Henry is dead.”¹⁰¹ Thus the reactions of the royal parents ranged from the public performance of mourning to a conscious retreat from it. These

⁹⁵ Account of the Death of Prince Henry. B.L. Cotton MS Titus C VII. f. 65r.

⁹⁶ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1610-13.* 23rd November, 1612. p. 449; *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1611-18.* 17th December, 1612. p. 162.

⁹⁷ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1611-18.* 10th November, 1612. p. 155.

⁹⁸ *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, 1610-13.* Vol. IX, p. 490.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 745.

¹⁰⁰ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1610-13.* 18th January, 1613. p. 478.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.* 18th January, 1613. p. 478; 5th January, 1613. p. 472.

accounts may not only convey the feelings of the King and Queen toward their own personal loss, but also toward the very real political loss with which they had been afflicted.

As previously discussed, in the years before Elizabeth I's death the succession of an alien royal house to the English throne was by no means certain and much of the new dynasty's appeal had stemmed from their successful production of an heir and the hopes of a prolific and stable royal line.¹⁰² Following James' accession, his own public image was buoyed by the popularity of Prince Henry, whose presence gave him a powerful source of political leverage.¹⁰³ With the luminary of the Stuart line lost and its future now resting in the person of Prince Charles, an apparently fragile and inexperienced twelve-year-old, James' self-belief must have been severely shaken. All around him, men of Court and Church were interpreting Henry's death as an act of divine judgment and as a sign of more misfortune to come. In an impassioned letter, written shortly after, Sir John Holles, a member of Prince Henry's household, wrote:

“Oh no words can express our loss, nor can ey(e) of man pierce to the end of our miseries, it is true the violl of the sins was, & is full, & cryed to heaven for vengeance . . . lust, pryde, gluttonie, hypocrisy, neglect, & contempt of all laws divyn and human, unthankfullness for his blessings, & our great deliverance the fift of November, hath brought upon us this lamentable sixt of (Novem)ber & will a 7th unless a new hartie repentance expiate & dissolve this thicke cloude of sins.”¹⁰⁴

In *Sorrow for the Sinnes of the Time*, a sermon preached three weeks after Henry's death by Daniel Price, a chaplain in his service, his demise was compared to the ten plagues inflicted by God upon the Egyptians: “the least of our bosome sinnes is fire in the hand and a serpent

¹⁰² See p. 45; p. 38.

¹⁰³ See p. 43; pp. 69-70; p. 77.

¹⁰⁴ Letter from Holles to Sir Robert Mansfield, 14th November, 1612. B.L. Add MS 32464. ff. 55v-56r.

in the hart, a canker, a spider, an evill spirit, and the fruit hereof is death.”¹⁰⁵ These frenzied responses to the Prince’s passing illustrate the dismay, anxiety and panic which many of his circle experienced and propagated. As the fall-out continued, further events threatened to damage the Court’s calm and order, as well as the King’s prerogative.

While alive, Henry had been known for his secrecy: on his deathbed he ordered that his private papers be destroyed.¹⁰⁶ Despite this, it emerged that he had instigated a clandestine correspondence with Prince Maurice of Orange, who, it appeared, had turned Henry against his proposed marriage with the Catholic House of Savoy.¹⁰⁷ Even more shocking were the rumours that he had planned to accompany his sister, Elizabeth, to Germany, following her marriage, presumably with the intention of selecting his own Protestant wife.¹⁰⁸ The implications of such wilful disobedience of his father’s wishes and rejection of his foreign policy would surely not have been overlooked by the King and his courtiers. Matters were to worsen when, Mr. Bayly, the Prince’s chaplain, began to preach publicly that, shortly before his death, Henry had related to him his fear of a Popish threat, lamenting that “religion lay a bleeding.”¹⁰⁹ John Chamberlain described how this dissidence spread: “Divers other preachers have been busy in the same kind . . . they take the alarm, and begin to speak freely.”¹¹⁰ The furore was such that, in response, the King declared his commitment to the Protestant faith before the Privy Council.¹¹¹ Measures were also taken to protect the new heir, Prince Charles, who was placed in the charge of “two sober divines” who were ordered never to leave his side.¹¹² In this climate of scandal and revelation, some courtiers began to seek favour with the King by decrying the memory of his elder son, contending that he had

¹⁰⁵ Price, 1613. p. 18.

¹⁰⁶ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1610-13.* 30th November, 1612. p. 453.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.* p. 453.

¹⁰⁸ Nichols, 1828. Vol. 2, p. 489; McClure (ed.), 1939. 12th November, 1612. Vol. I, p. 390.

¹⁰⁹ McClure (ed.), 1939. 19th November, 1612. Vol. I, p. 392.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* 19th November, 1612. Vol. I, p. 392.

¹¹¹ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1611-18.* 19th November, 1612. p. 156.

¹¹² *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1611-18.* 12th December, 1612. p. 160.

planned to “snatche the sceptre out of his fathers fist: with this opium they rock the parent asleep, to drowse out the sorrow for his lost child.”¹¹³ Thus the aftermath of Henry’s death was unsettled and divisive. While living, his relationship with James had been uneasy and, although father and son had been reconciled in their last days together, the revelations which emerged posthumously must have influenced and tainted his father’s attitude towards him.¹¹⁴ The unsettled atmosphere at Court may well have persuaded the King that this unfortunate episode was one best forgotten rather than memorialised.

Henry’s death came as a blow to James on at least one more significant level – it challenged his well-established ideological identity. For a monarch who located his power as much in the royal line which proceeded from him as that which had preceded him, and who domesticated his political rhetoric by employing a language of fatherly authority,¹¹⁵ the loss of his son and heir was a severe political blow. In *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* (1598) James had equated his responsibilities towards, and command over, his subjects with paternal care: “As the Fathers wrath and correction upon any of his children, that offendeth, ought to be by a fatherly chastisement seasoned with pittie, as long as there is any hope of amendement in them: So ought the King towards any of his lieges that offends in that measure.”¹¹⁶ Erin Murphy has argued that James drew upon his “literal paternity as part of his kingly duty, and consequently a sign of his kingly right.”¹¹⁷ The *Basilicon Doron* effectively promoted this rhetoric, both contending that it was a sovereign’s obligation to sire progeny and proclaiming James’ own children as a sign of God’s blessing.¹¹⁸ Thus the loss of a mature heir, deprived of his inheritance by the Almighty, seriously undermined the King’s

¹¹³ Letter from Holles to Lord Gray, 27th February, 1613. B.L. Add MS 32464. f. 63r.

¹¹⁴ A letter from Richard Sackville, third earl of Dorset, to Sir Thomas Edmondess, relating the news of Henry’s death, reports: “Only this is certen that P and R were reconciled a day or two before the Kinges now last going to Roiston.” P and R denote respectively Princeps and Rex. 9th November, 1612. B.L. Stowe MS 173. p. 224.

¹¹⁵ Goldberg, 1986. pp. 3-5.

¹¹⁶ James VI and I, 1598. Sig. B5r.

¹¹⁷ Murphy, 2011. p. 52.

¹¹⁸ James VI and I, 1969. pp. 90-92.

own self-styled *persona* and authority. John Chamberlain records that to comfort him his courtiers observed that Henry was the seventh prince since the Conquest who had “been taken from us at man’s estate”.¹¹⁹ The need for such reassurances would imply that, indeed, James felt personally threatened by the loss. His son’s reported insubordination would surely have rocked his self-image even further. With his fatherly authority undermined, so too was his kingly rule. In light of these challenges to James’ position and standing, it became crucial that he reassert his authority. He started with his own family, by reaffirming his paternal command over his remaining son. Having discovered Henry’s rebellious schemes, he ordered that the new heir should live within a stricter compass than his brother:

“The King has decided that Prince Charles shall leave St. James Palace and settle in the Royal Palace; that for some time he is not to have a household; nor is there any talk of making him Prince of Wales; the Prince has accordingly moved into the Palace at Westminster, to an apartment near to the King’s. He is seldom to be seen.”¹²⁰

He also dismissed from service those whom he believed to have been instrumental in his elder son’s waywardness:

“Rochester hath planted his kinsman Sr Robert Carr [Robert Kerr, first earl of Ancram] gentleman of the bedchamber, & supplanted Sir David Murray, for whom though the Prince interceded earnestly, yet the King refused, alledging he was a puritan, seducing his late master to that schism.”¹²¹

Thus in the months after Henry’s death, James attempted to claw back his lost ground and to limit its detrimental effects, imposing his fatherly command on a new heir and thereby re-articulating his own monarchical authority and self-identity.

¹¹⁹ McClure (ed.), 1939. 12th November, 1612. Vol. I, p. 390.

¹²⁰ *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series), 1610-13*. 30th November, 1612. p. 453.

¹²¹ Letter from Holles to Sir Thomas Digby. 29th June, 1613. B.L. Add MS 32464. f. 67r.

Perhaps then, the absence of Prince Henry's tomb may be viewed as a form of damage limitation. The loss of his heir in maturity was deeply unsettling for James. Henry's death threatened both the continuity of the Stuart line and the stability of the nation. In its wake, panic, insubordination and discord spread through certain Court factions, while revelations came to the fore which showed Henry's intentions to defy his father's wishes and to challenge the King's authority. It is perhaps ironic that in *Basilicon Doron* James advised his son: "Honour your parents for the lengthening of your owne daies (as God in his lawe promiseth)."¹²² Certainly, news of his son's secret machinations would have done little to encourage James to pursue a monument project. Politically, the loss of his heir undermined both the King's claims of divinely-sanctioned rule, as well as his own cultivated *persona* of the nourishing father and, unlike his mother's reputation, his son's public standing needed no rehabilitation. During Henry's funeral the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, preached from the eighty-second psalm: "I have said ye are Gods and yee are children of the most High: but yee shall die as a man and yee Princes shall fall like others."¹²³ To illustrate his point he directed the mourners to gaze at the funeral effigy and coffin, "inviting their eyes to the present dolefull spectacle of their late ever renowned Prince, who not long ago was as fresh, brave and gallant as the best of them."¹²⁴ This episode may help to explain why a memorial was never executed. Here, the effigy was employed to provide visual confirmation of the equalising power of death. A tomb might have served the same purpose. The aftermath of Henry's death had deeply affected James, both personally and politically. It may well be that prudence and self-preservation advised against the erection of a tomb. Perhaps, for James, a memorial would have constituted a permanent monument to his own fallibility.

¹²² James VI and I, 1969. p. 116.

¹²³ Nichols, 1828. Vol. 2, p. 502.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.* p. 502.

When James died in 1625, he too was buried with no monument or marker. In fact, curiously, after 1612 the only royal monument in Westminster to reach completion under the Stuarts was Christopher Wren's marble urn, commissioned in 1678, for the recently recovered remains of the supposed Princes in the Tower, Edward V and Richard, Duke of York. It is, indeed, odd that these honours were only afforded to the prematurely deceased princes of an earlier dynasty. While the various failures of the Stuart monument projects can be attributed to a range of factors - personal, social, political and economic - altering with, and unique to, each unsuccessful scheme, the lack of an official physical site of mourning was a significant omission.

IV

It would be misguided to interpret the restraint or absence of official forms of commemoration as evidence of familial antipathy towards the deaths of royal heirs. Parents, siblings and relatives were deeply affected by these losses and chose to memorialise the deceased in a variety of ways. Following the demise in 1677 of Charles, Duke of Cambridge, who died aged just over one month, James, Duke of York, wrote to his nephew, Prince William of Orange: "I wish you may never have the like cause of trouble nor know what it is to lose a son."¹²⁵ While William was never to experience the death of a son of his own, he was still reportedly devastated by news of the loss of his nephew and heir, William, Duke of Gloucester, confining himself to his bedchamber for two days.¹²⁶ Writing to Princess Anne, he avowed: "It is so great a loss for me and all England that my heart is pierced with affliction."¹²⁷ The Duke's parents too were grief-stricken and continued to commemorate their loss for years to come. For example, Anne ordered that the anniversary of his death

¹²⁵ Letter from James, Duke of York to the Prince of Orange, 3rd January, 1678. TNA. SP 8/3/26.

¹²⁶ Luttrell, 1857. Vol IV, 13th August, 1700. p. 676.

¹²⁷ Gregg, 2001. p. 121.

should be marked annually as a day of mourning within her household, while a jewelled gold locket, containing strands of the Duke's hair, now in the collections of Holyrood House, was presumably commissioned by one of his parents.¹²⁸ William's mother and father also propagated his memory pictorially. An inventory of paintings taken after Anne's accession (c.1705-1710), records nine portraits of the young Prince, eight of which were on view.¹²⁹ Their positioning is particularly informative. At St James', three portraits of William were displayed in Anne's state bedchamber, her bedchamber and the closet attached to her bedchamber.¹³⁰ At Windsor, an oval portrait of the Duke after Kneller, was also hung in the Queen's bedchamber, while Prince George's bedchamber at Kensington was adorned with a picture of "The Queen & Duke of Gloucest(er) at ½ length ov(er) the Chim(ney)."¹³¹ The display of these portraits, in the more private rooms of the royal apartments, indicates that William's death had, and continued to have, a deep personal impact on his parents.

Indeed, portraits were frequently employed as a means of maintaining links between living and deceased family members. After Charles II's death, another inventory was taken, recording a portrait of his long dead brother, "The Duke of Gloucester when he was a child", in the King's presence chamber at Whitehall.¹³² Moreover, paintings of the three-year-old James, Duke of Cambridge (another of the Duke of York's ill-fated sons), were displayed in his father's apartments at Whitehall and Culford Hall and, following his accession, at St. James' and Windsor.¹³³ In a different way, James I's failure to erect a monument to his elder son did not preclude him from commemorating the loss. As has been shown, the immediate

¹²⁸ Luttrell, 1857. Vol. IV, 13th August, 1700. p. 676.

¹²⁹ See A List of Her Majesties Pictures in Kensi(n)gton, Hampton Court and Windsor Castle. B.L. Add MS 20013.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.* f. 34r.

¹³¹ *Ibid.* f. 33r; f. 6r.

¹³² Keay, 2008. p. 207; Inventory of His Majesty's Goods 1688. B.L. Harleian MS 1890. f. 72r.

¹³³ Millar, 1963. p. 130.

aftermath of Henry's death was unsettled and disruptive.¹³⁴ In the years following, his deceased son continued to haunt James. His presence remained in the public consciousness in the form of anniversary sermons, dedicatory poems and posthumous prints, as well as in the relocation and inheritance of his public image by the new heir, Prince Charles.¹³⁵ If then, James' authority was rocked by the loss of his heir and its unsettling repercussions, Paul Van Somer's portrait, executed in 1615 (See Figure 38), may well comprise part of the campaign to reassert his royal power. Traditionally viewed as a rather conventional image of regal accomplishment, learning and authority, further analysis suggests, rather, that this portrait comprises a direct response to the Prince's demise.

James is depicted, full-length, dressed from head to toe in sombre black, a mode of attire quite at odds with his customary portrayal. Renowned for his love of gems and rich fabrics, other portraits of the King are conspicuous for their detailed depiction of pearl and jewel encrusted breeches, doublets and cloaks, as well as for their sumptuous fabrics, fine lace and gold detailing.¹³⁶ Indeed, such was James' delight in rich apparel that on his return to London following the death of Queen Anne in 1619, Chamberlain reports that he rather inappropriately wore: "A suit of watchet (light blue) satten laid with silver lace, with a blew and white feather."¹³⁷ The motives behind James' uncharacteristic choice of garb may

¹³⁴ See pp. 125-27.

¹³⁵ See, for example, Robert Wilkinson's *A Paire of Sermons Successively Preacht to a Paire of Peerles succeeding Princes. The Former as an Ante-Funeral to the late Prince Henry, Anno Dom. 1612. October 25. The first day of his last and fatal sicknesse. The Latter Preacht this present yeere 1614. Januar. 16. To the now living Prince Charles, as a preserver of his life, and life to his soule* (London, 1614); Richard Brathwaite's *Upon the Illustrate Prince Henry, the Authors Long Meditated Tears in The Poet's Willow* (London, 1614); and Simon de Passe's version of the engraving, *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* (1616). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London. For further discussion of Charles' inheritance of Henry's *persona* see Michael Ulliyot, *Venerable Reader, Vulnerable Exemplar: Prince Henry and the Genres of Exemplarity*. PhD Thesis, University of Toronto (Toronto, 2005); and Kevin Sharpe, "'So Hard a Text'? Images of Charles I, 1612-1700" in *The Historical Journal*. Vol. 43, No. 2 (2000).

¹³⁶ See for example, John De Critz The Elder's portrait of *James VI and I* (c.1606). Dulwich Picture Gallery, London; and Paul Van Somer's portrait, *James I* (c.1619). Royal Collection, London.

¹³⁷ McClure (ed.), 1939. 5th June, 1619. Vol. II, p. 242. Strict black mourning was observed after Henry's death. Gregory McNamara's research into Prince Henry's funeral viewed from the Wardrobe of the Robes has shown the dramatic effect which the adoption of black mourning had on the appearance of the usually vibrantly adorned nobility, servants and spaces of the Court – see McNamara, 2004. p. 264.

become apparent upon closer examination of the most intriguing element of the portrait – the discarded suit of Greenwich armour which lies at his feet. The armour depicted, decorated with *fleur de lys*, thistles and roses, is almost certainly that executed under Jacob Halder and presented to Prince Henry by Sir Henry Lee (c.1608, See Figure 39). The presence of an attribute so closely associated with the late Prince offers a very different interpretation of the painting from that of a conventional representation of royal magnificence. Instead, James assumes the image of a bereaved and mourning father, whose loss is highlighted by the fallen and discarded armour at his feet. The motif is reminiscent of the tomb of Sir Francis de Vere (c.1609, See Figure 40), attributed to Maximilian Colt, at Westminster Abbey.¹³⁸ Here, the deceased lies in civilian clothes beneath a bier laden with the instruments of his soldierly profession - his armour. As such, Sir Francis' "natural body" - that subject to decomposition and decay - is represented in the lower level, while his armour acts as a substitute for the conventional tomb effigy which represented the "political body" of its subject; that is, an image of the tomb's inhabitant portrayed as he was in life, with the symbols of his office.¹³⁹ Perhaps then, Henry's armour in Van Somer's portrait performs a similar role, evoking the social presence of Henry's "political body", despite his untimely demise.

In the face of this loss James' pictorial presence is emphatic - it implies that, although the son is lost, the King remains. It is interesting to note that, whereas the original suit of armour bears the initials H.P. (Henricus Princeps), Van Somer has depicted it bearing the initials I.R. (Iacobus Rex). These details suggest that here, in light of the fall-out from his son's death, James has re-inscribed his relationship with Henry. The portrait's implication is that the son is made in the image of the father and vice versa.¹⁴⁰ The eminence and distinction

¹³⁸ De Vere's tomb was, itself, heavily influenced by Engelbrecht II of Nassau's monument (c.1531-34, artist unknown) at the Grote Kerk, Breda, The Netherlands.

¹³⁹ For a more conventional double-effigy tomb, see Maximilian Colt's monument to Robert Cecil, first Earl of Salisbury (c.1612-18), at Hatfield Parish Church, Hatfield, Hertfordshire.

¹⁴⁰ For another example of this notion applied to James and Henry see p. 77.

of the late Prince is, therefore, merely a reflection of that of the King. James' left hand rests beside the English regalia: sceptre, orb and crown, which sit on a red Ottoman-styled tablecloth, embroidered with gold. Thus his sovereign authority is underlined by the symbols of his office, attributes absent from official large-scale English royal portraiture since Elizabeth I's coronation portrait.¹⁴¹ This inclusion may well have been influenced by James' speech to the Houses of Parliament in 1614, when he employed the accoutrements of his office to illustrate his own princely virtues:

“My integritye is like the whiteness of my roabes, my purity like the mettall of golde of my crowine my firmeness and clearness like the p(re)cious stones I wear, and my affections naturall like the redness of my heart.”¹⁴²

The fabric which hangs behind him, a canopy of state, further emphasises his regal status.¹⁴³ Thus Van Somer's portrait responds to Henry's potentially damaging and destabilising loss with a gesture of constancy, power and continuity.

Around James' neck he wears the blue ribbon of the Order of the Garter, holding the George in his right hand. Again this develops the association with Henry, who had endeavoured to revive the old Elizabethan values of chivalry at his court. These chivalric overtones and the connection with the Prince are again evident in the portrait's display. During the reign of Charles I it was recorded as hanging in the Bear Gallery of Whitehall Palace.¹⁴⁴ From this room royal and noble spectators could view the military exercises in the adjoining tiltyard.¹⁴⁵ Henry, himself, had first publicly borne arms in 1606, running at the ring during the visit of his uncle, Christian IV of Denmark.¹⁴⁶ Three years later, aged thirteen,

¹⁴¹ See the anonymous copy, *Queen Elizabeth I* (c.1600). National Portrait Gallery, London.

¹⁴² Flowers of Grace: or the Speache of our Sovereign Lord King James, 5th April 1614. At the session of Parliament then begunne. B.L. Cotton MS Titus C VII. f. 121r.

¹⁴³ With thanks to Prof. David Howarth for drawing my attention to this.

¹⁴⁴ Millar, 1963. p. 80; Millar, 1960. pp. 3-4.

¹⁴⁵ Stow, 1971 (repr.1603). p. 102.

¹⁴⁶ Young, 1987. p. 38.

he appeared once more, challenging his father to tilt at the ring at Whitehall.¹⁴⁷ Sir Charles Cornwallis, Henry's treasurer and biographer, noted that he regularly practised at the tilt, while Robert Peake's portrait of the Prince (1610, See Figure 41) shows him presented before the tiltyard wall, mounted and adorned for the tournament.¹⁴⁸ Although the martial festivities preceding his investiture as Prince of Wales, *Prince Henry's Barriers*, were waged indoors at the Banqueting Hall, the celebratory jousts held after his creation in June 1610, were performed in the tiltyard at Whitehall.¹⁴⁹ Analysis of Abraham Van Der Doort's inventory of the paintings hanging in the Bear Gallery during the late 1630s also reveals a thematic programme of display. Paintings of warrior princes were particularly favoured, with portraits of Henry II and Henry IV of France, the Emperor Charles V and the Princes Maurice and Frederick Henry of Orange.¹⁵⁰ Thus James' portrait was displayed in a space particularly connected with Henry and his *persona*, where the significance of his armour was most likely to be understood and appreciated. As one of the principal means of approach to and from the Palace, it could also be readily viewed by a considerable audience.¹⁵¹

This reading of the portrait is not without problems. Oliver Millar's dating of the portrait to 1618, has been widely accepted.¹⁵² Accordingly Roy Strong has proposed that the painting's appearance connects with the reorientation of the arts at court, effected by the commencement of negotiations for a Spanish match for Prince Charles,¹⁵³ while Kevin Sharpe has expanded upon this suggestion, concluding that the regalia's presence signals the attractions of an Anglo-Spanish royal marriage and that the discarded armour symbolises the

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.* p. 38.

¹⁴⁸ Cornwallis, 1641. p. 16.

¹⁴⁹ Young, 1987. p. 207.

¹⁵⁰ Millar, 1960. pp. 3-4.

¹⁵¹ Stow, 1971. p. 102.

¹⁵² Millar, 1963. p. 80.

¹⁵³ Strong, 1969. p. 179.

blessings of peace which such a union might bring.¹⁵⁴ However, close examination of the *cartellino* at the bottom of the canvas reveals that the last digit of the date has been obscured and bears a far greater resemblance to a 5 than to an 8.¹⁵⁵ Millar's attribution is partially based on the date inscribed upon another version of the portrait, formerly in the possession of the Earl of Craven at Hampstead Marshall. However, this is a much cruder painting and is probably a later copy after the original.¹⁵⁶ The difficulty is that the artist, Van Somer, is not definitively recorded in Britain until December, 1616.¹⁵⁷ In his *Anecdotes of Painting* (1782), however, Horace Walpole, who also read the date as 1615, informs the reader: "In what year Van Somer came to England we do not know, certainly as early as 1606, between which and 1620 he did several pictures."¹⁵⁸ Could Van Somer's portrait of King James, therefore, provide evidence of his earlier presence at the English Court? What is known of Van Somer pre-1616 is that he lived an almost nomadic existence, working in Amsterdam, Leiden, The Hague and Brussels before settling in London.¹⁵⁹ What is more, a portrait of Edmund Sheffield, first earl of Mulgrave, attributed to Van Somer, and with a similar composition, including a suit of discarded armour lying on the floor, is inscribed ANNO 1614.¹⁶⁰ It is, therefore, likely that he visited England during this time. The fact that he was able to secure work with important Court patrons almost from the outset of his permanent arrival in 1616 would imply that he had already established a reputation for himself.¹⁶¹

Why then, over two years after Henry's death did James commission this portrait?

¹⁵⁴ Sharpe, 2010. p. 61.

¹⁵⁵ This reading has been verified by Desmond Shawe-Taylor, Surveyor of the Queen's Pictures.

¹⁵⁶ When this portrait was sold at Sotheby's *British Paintings and Watercolours Sale* in 1996 it was described as "circle of Van Somer". The inscription also differs from the original, with the addition of "FIDEI DEFENSOR" at the end.

¹⁵⁷ Millar, 1963. p80.

¹⁵⁸ Walpole, 1879 (repr. 1782). Vol. II, p. 112.

¹⁵⁹ Millar, 1963. p. 80.

¹⁶⁰ The current whereabouts of this portrait is unknown; it was formerly in the Ehrich Collection, New York. See the Paul Van Somer artist boxes at the Witt Library, Courtauld Institute of Art, London.

¹⁶¹ Portraits of Anne of Denmark and the Lord Chamberlain, William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, by Van Somer are inscribed 1617, showing that he was working for the Court elite from shortly after his arrival. It seems unlikely that such eminent clients would patronise an artist unless his reputation was already well established.

As previously noted, Henry's popular presence continued unabated. In 1613 and 1614, Daniel Price published sermons to mark the first and second anniversaries of Henry's death.¹⁶² Sir Walter Raleigh's *History of the World* was posthumously dedicated to him in 1614 and the following year Henry Peacham penned *Prince Henry Revived*, a poem written on the birth of Prince Henry Frederick of the Palatine, the son of Henry's younger sister, Princess Elizabeth and, significantly, James' first grandchild.¹⁶³ At the same time, James was experiencing acute political and financial problems. In April 1614, after a gap of four years, he re-called Parliament because, in short, he was in desperate need of funds. His speech to mark the opening of, what would become, the Addled Parliament was divided into three parts, covering the soul, the person and the exchequer. Commenting publicly on Henry's death for the first time, in the section concerning his person, the King spoke of the succession:

“Saying that God to his secret judgment had taken away Prince Henry, which he understood to mean that God was punishing his faults and sins; or it might well be that He was chastising those of his people because many times God punishes kings for the sins of his subjects.”¹⁶⁴

He went on to attribute his dire straits, in part, to the Prince's death and the expense of his sister's nuptials: “It is not unknown to you by the death of my sonne, the marriage being put of(f); I was constrained to my sonne-in-law & his trayne six monthes.”¹⁶⁵ Indeed, the Prince's death had, more importantly, deprived James of the lucrative dowry (£210,000) promised by the House of Savoy on the marriage of Henry to the Infanta Maria.¹⁶⁶ Unfortunately, however, James' appeals were fruitless and the House of Commons with near unanimity

¹⁶²See Daniel Price, *Prince Henry his First Anniversary* (Oxford 1613) and *Prince Henry his Second Anniversary* (Oxford, 1614).

¹⁶³ See Walter Raleigh, *The History of the World* (London, 1614); Henry Peacham, *Prince Henrie revived Or A poeme vpon the birth, and in honor of the hopefull yong Prince Henrie Frederick* (London, 1615).

¹⁶⁴ Quoted from a transcript, *Account of Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, Count Gondomar, Spanish Ambassador to London* (TNA. SP 15/40. f. 56) in Jansson (ed.), 1988. p. 8.

¹⁶⁵ Flowers of Grace. B.L. Cotton MS Titus C VII. f. 122r.

¹⁶⁶ Thrush, 2003. p. 27.

resolutely declined to grant him any money until he renounced his right to levy impositions (customs duties imposed without Parliamentary consent).¹⁶⁷ Believing that their motives were nothing more than hostility to his prerogative and royal person, James dissolved the Parliament on the 7th of June.¹⁶⁸ The period after Henry's demise then, was one of uncertainty and conflict for the King. What is more, from late 1615 the fall-out from the Overbury scandal was to add to his woes, seriously damaging the reputation of James and his Court.¹⁶⁹ He became increasingly worried that he had lost the love of the people.¹⁷⁰ It is possible that he viewed the loss of his son as the defining moment from which his subsequent troubles stemmed. The repeated challenges to his royal authority would surely have impacted upon his confidence. Thus Van Somer's portrait may be read as a self-affirming statement, where James reasserts his majesty and prerogative, despite the events of previous years and declares his constancy and resilience. Queen Anne had been depicted in mourning for her son in 1613 (See Figure 42) and Princess Elizabeth was painted in her wedding dress, with black arm band, jet brooch and miniature locket around the same time (1613, See Figure 43).¹⁷¹ James' portrait should be viewed as a complement to this pair, where the presence of the Prince lingers on in the accoutrements of the sitter.

Henry's armour and its associations continued to appeal to James and his family. Around 1616 a portrait, also attributed to Van Somer, was painted of Prince Charles, clad in the same suit (See Figure 44), probably to commemorate his own installation as Prince of Wales. By this means, the younger, weaker son was shown literally assuming the military

¹⁶⁷ Russell, 1992. p. 5.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.* p. 18.

¹⁶⁹ Bellany, 2002. p73.

¹⁷⁰ Russell, 1992. p. 8.

¹⁷¹ In Anne's portrait, the Queen is depicted wearing a jet miniature locket, presumably with Henry's likeness inside. This same miniature reappears in several later portraits, again illustrating the persistence of Henry's memory through painted accessories. See, for example, Marcus Gheeraert's portrait, *Anne of Denmark* (1614). Royal Collection, London; and Paul Van Somer's portrait, *Anne of Denmark* (c.1617). Royal Collection, London.

mantle of his popular, elder brother. This painting also demonstrates that, as in James' portrait, artists were not averse to adapting or re-fashioning armour for the canvas. Charles is depicted wearing knee-length articulated tassets (separate plates hanging from the breastplate, designed to protect the upper legs), whereas in the original suit the skirted tassets fall just below the thigh. The HP monogram on the suit has also been cleverly concealed by the ribbon of his lesser George. The significance of James' appearance in his portrait and the presence of Henry's armour is born out by consideration of subsequent copies of the canvas. This image of James was to become his official presentation and half-length and full-length variants exist in the Royal Collection, at Drumlanrig Castle, Falkland Palace and Haddo House. Adam de Cologne re-worked the original composition and added a more mature head in two portraits at Newbattle Abbey College and Hatfield House (1623, See Figure 45). Yet in all these versions not only has the suit of armour been removed, but James' apparel has been embellished. No longer portrayed in severe black, in each his doublet has been adorned with rich gold and in the versions by Adam de Cologne striking red socks have been added. Why were these changes deemed necessary? By the time these copies were painted and removed from the context of Whitehall Palace, the original message was no longer relevant. Few would have understood it outside the royal Court. What the changes do show is that the armour's presence and James' attire were considered unusual and incompatible with a conventional portrait of the monarch.

Some years later, Van Somer's image was resurrected on canvas once more. During the reign of Charles I, Anthony Van Dyck was commissioned to furnish the Cross Gallery of Somerset House with a series of Stuart family portraits.¹⁷² In his painting of James I (c.1635-6, See Figure 46), as in the earlier copies, he removed the armour from the composition, adjusting the position of the regalia and placing a column behind the King. However, a few

¹⁷² Barnes. et al, 2004. p. 538.

years later, when Van Dyck was commissioned to execute a posthumous portrait of Prince Henry for the same gallery (c.1637-8, See Figure 47), he chose to model his composition on a miniature by Isaac Oliver and intriguingly, to portray the sitter attired in the same Greenwich suit. Thus the armour was finally restored to its rightful owner. Clearly, over twenty years after his death, the armour's association with Henry and its emblematic significance was still understood.

Thus in this portrait, as in Van Somer's later paintings of James and his consort, Queen Anne, symbolism is paramount.¹⁷³ While on one level, the painting communicated a statement of majesty and power, to those aware of its imagery, it presented not only a father who mourned the loss of his son but also a monarch who had weathered the storm and emerged still standing. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, for James it constituted a self-affirming declaration of his own divinely-ordained authority and resilience.

For his surviving family, the death of an heir was a personal and political loss not easily forgotten. Despite the reduction of state-sponsored forms of remembrance, the individual compulsion to mark and mourn these bereavements clearly endured.

V

Household members, servants and supporters also commemorated the deaths of Stuart heirs. Posthumous portraits were frequently commissioned. For example, a letter from Thomas Murray to Dudley Carleton, written a few months after the death of Prince Henry Frederick, records the conveyance of a posthumous portrait to Sir Henry Savile, the provost of Eton College.¹⁷⁴ Edward Alleyn, the theatrical entrepreneur and founder of Dulwich

¹⁷³ See David Howarth's discussion of the portraits of *James I* (c.1619) and *Anne of Denmark* (1617-18) in *Images of Rule*, 1997. pp. 125-131.

¹⁷⁴ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1611-18*. 22nd February, 1613. p. 171. See Savile's entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Vol. 49, pp. 109-118.

College, whose company was under the Prince's patronage, probably commissioned another portrait, after William Hole's engraving of *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* (1612, See Figure 48), which remains part of the Dulwich Picture Gallery collections.¹⁷⁵ Posthumous portraits of Henry, Duke of Gloucester, exist at Bolton Abbey, Euston Hall and Knole, while two years after his death, the cross-bow Guild of St. George in Bruges commissioned a portrait after Boeckhorst's earlier composition (See Figure 12), complete with heavily embellished frame.¹⁷⁶ Other *objets d'art* were also employed to memorialise the deceased. A silver and gold heart-shaped locket (1660, See Figure 49), inscribed "H D of Gloster" and recently purchased by the National Trust for Ham House, has a provenance from the Earls of Dysart.¹⁷⁷ Decorated with a fine relief portrait of the Prince, it probably contained a lock of his hair and may have belonged to Elizabeth Murray, Countess of Dysart, or her second husband, John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale. Both had close ties to the royalist Court in exile, while Maitland participated in Henry's funeral.¹⁷⁸ Such acts of commemoration often expressed genuine personal grief, however, motives were not always so pure. Displays of remembrance might also serve to lament the loss of position or opportunity which these deaths had brought about. In response to the demise of his master, Henry Frederick, Sir John Holles bemoaned: "he is gone, & with him those superfluous additions of my better fortunes."¹⁷⁹ Accordingly, others sought to ingratiate themselves with the surviving members of the bereaved royal family. Thus the scholar and theologian, James Maxwell, dedicated *The Laudable Life and Deplorable Death of Our Late Peerelesse Prince Henry* (1612) to Prince

¹⁷⁵ Murray, 1980. p. 302. See William Hole's engraving *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* (1612). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; Anon., after Isaac Oliver, *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* (c.1613). Dulwich Picture Gallery, London.

¹⁷⁶ See Anon., after Johann Boeckhorst, *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (c.1660). Bolton Abbey, Skipton, North Yorkshire; Peter Lely, *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1660). Euston Hall, Thetford, Norfolk; P. Thyssens, *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1660). Knole, Sevenoaks, Kent; Johann Boeckhorst, *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1662). Groeningen Museum, Bruges.

¹⁷⁷ *Antiques and Fine Art Sale Auction Catalogue*. Holloway's, Banbury, 22nd February, 2011. Lot 10, p. 1.

¹⁷⁸ See their entries in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Vol. 36, pp. 218-225 and Vol. 39, pp. 892-3; *Royal Funerals 1618-1738*. College of Arms. Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals). p. 68.

¹⁷⁹ Letter from Holles to Francis Cook, 15th November, 1612. B.L. Add MS 32464. f. 57r.

Charles and Princess Elizabeth: “Infants of Albion, of greatest hope, all happiness.”¹⁸⁰ This more self-seeking aspect may well be apparent in a complex commemorative scheme commissioned by the renowned antiquarian and courtier, Sir Robert Cotton.

While James I’s failure to erect a monument to his late son’s memory has provoked comment from modern day historians, it would appear to have sparked surprisingly little reaction from his contemporaries. In *A Discourse of the Most Illustrious Prince, Henry late Prince of Wales*, written in 1626 and published in 1641, Sir Charles Cornwallis regretted the absence of a memorial, declaring: “I wish it were in my power to raise such a monument unto his fame, as might eternise it unto all posterities.”¹⁸¹ Scarce few others openly expressed the same sentiments. It may well be, however, that Prince Henry was, indeed, to receive a monument in the years following his death – in a provincial parish church in Huntingdonshire. In his essay, *Sir Robert Cotton and the Commemoration of Famous Men*, David Howarth details how Cotton had erected a series of family tombs in the Church of All Saints in Conington. Among these memorials are two royal cenotaphs, dedicated to princes of the house of Canmore, David Earl of Huntingdon and Henry of Scotland.¹⁸²

It was through Prince David, Earl of Huntingdon and Lord of Conington (1152-1219), that Cotton and his ancestors, the Bruces of Conington, claimed descent from the Scottish royal line and significantly, kinship with the King.¹⁸³ A manuscript in the collections of the British Library illustrates just how important this association was to Cotton. Written in his own hand and dated 1603, the *Pedigree of the Descent of Conington Manor, Huntingdonshire* traces the ownership of Cotton’s family estate back to David I, King of Scots, through his grandson, Prince David. With the marriage of Isabella of Mar to Robert Brus (hereafter,

¹⁸⁰ Maxwell, 1612. Sig. A2r.

¹⁸¹ Cornwallis, 1641. p. 29.

¹⁸² Howarth, 1997. p. 45. Henry is generally known as Henry, Earl of Northumberland. I shall refer to him as Prince Henry, according to the cenotaph’s inscription: “Prince Henry of Scotland, Lord of Conington.”

¹⁸³ *Ibid.* p. 45.

Bruce), the pedigree splits to reveal the parallel descents of the royal line of Scotland and the Bruces of Conington, concluding with “Jacobus Rex Britanniae” at one branch and at the other: “Thomas Cotton seased of the mannor of Conington by this descent who(se) Heir is possessed of the same at this day 1603.”¹⁸⁴ The Prince David Monument, which Howarth dates approximately to 1613, should be viewed as part of a campaign to proclaim this illustrious lineage, confirming Cotton’s eligibility for the honour and title of baronet, which he had purchased in 1611, and commemorating his links with the new royal dynasty. A little later, Cotton commissioned a cenotaph to David’s father, Prince Henry of Scotland (c.1615, See Figure 50). His reasons for doing so are rather more problematic. It is this memorial which may represent a veiled response to the death of the latter day Prince Henry.

Prince Henry of Scotland (c.1115-52) was the oldest son and heir of David I, King of Scots. Like his name-sake, Henry Frederick, he was a Scottish-born prince who had come to inherit English lands and titles, through his mother, Maud of Northumbria. While James I’s heir had been named in honour of Henry VIII, David’s son too, had been christened in deference to an English monarch, King Henry I. Reputed for his great bravery and military prowess, he also died in maturity before inheriting the throne, to the great sorrow of his subjects. In *Historia rerum Anglicarum*, the twelfth century English chronicler, William of Newburgh, described his demise and character in terms which would have been equally applicable to Henry Frederick. He “departed by an early death from human things, to the great grief of English as well as of Scots . . . He was a most noble youth, and - what is hard to find in a man walking the broad ways of the world – conspicuous both for courtesy of manners, and for their sincerity.”¹⁸⁵ A heavily annotated manuscript copy of Newburgh’s text

¹⁸⁴ Pedigree of the Descent of Conington Manor, Huntingdonshire. B.L. Add MS 4712. f. 2r.

¹⁸⁵ Anderson, 1908. p. 229.

from Cotton's library still survives.¹⁸⁶ Thus Sir Robert was well aware of the historical parallels between the two princes. Indeed, Prince Henry's renown was not to be diminished by time and he was still considered important enough to feature in John Speed's *The History of Great Britaine*, published in 1611. Referencing the historical chronicles of the Scot, Hector Boece, his valour and magnanimity were singled out for praise.¹⁸⁷ Cotton was closely associated with Speed's text, loaning the author manuscripts, records and coins, as well as reading proofs. Kevin Sharpe has argued that some of the passages may even have been penned by Sir Robert.¹⁸⁸ It is highly probable, therefore, that Cotton was fully conscious of the similarities between these two Scottish princes and that with Henry of Scotland's cenotaph he sought to manipulate them as part of a calculated campaign for his own advancement.

Indeed, it is possible that yet another historical parallel was being invoked. Some years later, Cotton was also heavily involved in the preparation of John Weever's *Ancient Funerall Monuments* (1631).¹⁸⁹ Here, Weever described a cenotaph as "an empty funeral monument or Tomb erected for the honour of the dead, wherein neither the corps, nor reliques of any defunct, are deposited, in imitation of which our hearses here in England are set up in Churches."¹⁹⁰ He continued to relate a classical example: "Octavia the sister of Augustus, buried her son young Marcellus, that should have been heir in the empire, with six hundred Cenotaphs or Hearses."¹⁹¹ Interestingly, Marcellus, who too, had died before receiving his rightful inheritance, was a figure with whom Henry Frederick was compared

¹⁸⁶ See William of Newburgh, *Historia rerum Anglicarum*. B.L. Cotton MS Vespasian B VI. ff. 111v-182 r. This manuscript was probably owned by John Joscelyn and acquired by Cotton shortly after his death in 1603.

¹⁸⁷ Speed, 1611. pp. 446 -8.

¹⁸⁸ Sharpe, 1979. p. 38.

¹⁸⁹ See *The Epistle to the Reader* in John Weever, *Ancient Funerall Monuments within the united monarchie of Great Britaine, Ireland, and the islands adiacent* (London, 1631) which includes a funeral elegy to Sir Robert.

¹⁹⁰ Weever, 1631. p. 32.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.* p. 32.

after his death.¹⁹² For example, in *ANEPICED. Or funeral song* (1613) George Chapman mused:

“If yong Marcellus had to grace his fall,
Six hundred Horses at his Funerall;
Sylla six thousand; let Prince Henry have
Six millions bring him to his greedy grave.”¹⁹³

Perhaps then, the Prince Henry cenotaph was also an oblique reference to this classical precedent, of which Cotton would certainly have been aware and for which the monument’s classicised appearance would have been particularly appropriate.

Cotton was well positioned to exploit these parallels, both practically and intellectually. He was highly versed in employing the lessons of the past to explain and aid the predicaments of the present. Under royal command he had written papers detailing historical precedent concerning, amongst other subjects, *The Manner and Means how the Kings of England have supported and improved their States; Touching the question of Precedency between England and Spain* and *That the Sovereigns Person is required in Parliament in all Consultations and Conclusions*.¹⁹⁴ Indeed, Sir Robert’s propensity for espousing historical models could gall his contemporaries. John Chamberlain described him as a man, who had ever “some old precedent in store”.¹⁹⁵ Thus Cotton was a scholar steeped in history, for whom historical analogies held a special attraction. Indeed, around 1610 he was also engaged by Henry Frederick to write a tract advocating the pursuit of peace, rather than war, with Spain.¹⁹⁶ Cotton further attempted to ingratiate himself by researching the privileges and prerogatives of the Prince of Wales, sending his notes to Thomas Chaloner,

¹⁹² See Henry Peacham, *The Period of Mourning* (London, 1613). Sig. D1r.

¹⁹³ Chapman, 1613. p. 35.

¹⁹⁴ See *Cottoni Posthuma: Divers Choice Pieces of that Renowned Antiquary, Sir Robert Cotton, Knight and Baronet* (London, 1679).

¹⁹⁵ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series) 1611-18*. 13th July, 1615. p. 295.

¹⁹⁶ Howarth, 1997. p. 46.

Governor of Henry's household.¹⁹⁷ He insinuated himself with many members of the Prince's circle, a group of men also interested in antiquity and the arts,¹⁹⁸ and, following Henry's death, it is almost certain that Sir Robert acquired books from his library.¹⁹⁹ Perhaps most importantly, he participated in the Prince's funeral – one of ten baronets who followed the corpse in its hearse, each holding a bannerol.²⁰⁰ Although Cotton's ambitions for advancement through Prince Henry came to an abrupt end with his untimely death, he continued to seek favour with his erudite father, King James.

The monument itself, although in a sorry state of repair, displays a refined understanding of the classical architectural idiom and harmonious proportion unusual for its early date. It consists of a wall-mounted tablet framed by two fluted Corinthian columns, bearing a prominent architrave and frieze, upon which rests a heavy cornice. Similar to an aedicule, its depth and solidity render it something of a curiosity when compared to the majority of seventeenth-century mural monuments which tended to be shallower. The cornice supports Henry of Scotland's coat of arms, with lion rampant and double tressure, impaling chequy.²⁰¹ Although originally poly-chromatic, the monument was white-washed in the mid-eighteenth century.²⁰² Smaller and more contained than the rather eccentric Earl David cenotaph, it is paired with a similarly conceived (although not identical) monument to Sir Robert's great-grandfather, Thomas Cotton, which is suspended on the opposite aisle wall. Based on its employment of harmonious proportions and similarity to the architectural framework employed in his design for the tomb of Lady Francis Cotton (1608, See Figure

¹⁹⁷ Croft, 1992. p. 182.

¹⁹⁸ Sharpe, 1979. p. 120.

¹⁹⁹ Tite, 1994. p. 2.

²⁰⁰ Chapman, 1613. p. 51.

²⁰¹ Cotton Pedigree, 1754-55, compiled by Nicholas Brett of Spring-Grove, Chaplain to Sir Robert Cotton, fifth Baronet. B.L. Add MS 53781.

²⁰² *Ibid.* At the end of the eighteenth century *Cotton Pedigree*, Nicholas Brett details the appearance of the family tombs at All Saints. He complains that: "the colours on this & the other old monuments are now lost, some blockhead of a Workman having whitewashed them out but a few years ago." B.L. Add MS 53781.

51), Howarth has tentatively attributed the monument to Inigo Jones.²⁰³ Although far simpler in conception than the project for Lady Cotton's monument, its restraint may be explained by Jones' experiences with the execution of his earlier scheme (begun 1610, see Figure 51). In its finished form, the Italianate elegance of Jones' drawing has been rendered awkward and cramped by its provincial stone-mason, with an abundance of decorative strap-work. If indeed, Jones is the master behind the Conington monument, he may have favoured a cautious approach in order to prevent the corruption of this later design.²⁰⁴ Sir Rowland Cotton, the patron of the Lady Cotton tomb, was no relation to Sir Robert but was also attached to the Court of Prince Henry, where Jones occupied the post of Surveyor.²⁰⁵ Thus Sir Robert may have been acquainted with the scheme. He was most certainly well known to Jones, to whom he lent manuscripts and portfolios.²⁰⁶ As a member of the Prince's household, Jones had also participated in Henry's funeral.²⁰⁷ Could then, Prince Henry's cenotaph be the result of collaboration between two members of Prince Henry's circle, Cotton and Jones, who wished, in some part, to rectify the absence of a tomb? Sir Robert certainly had the means and the motive. However, this interpretation perhaps places too little emphasis on his more self-interested incentives. If the cenotaph does represent a memorial to the two princes, it was probably conceived primarily to further his own family's interests, rather than to quell any desire for Henry's permanent commemoration.

If the provisional date of 1615 is accepted then the memorial was erected at a time when Cotton's position and influence was on the ascent. His association with the Howards,

²⁰³ Howarth, 1997. p. 53. It is interesting to note that the cenotaph to Prince Henry represents a more sophisticated understanding of the classical grammar of architecture, with correctly conceived entablature, column capitals and bases - superior to that of the Lady Cotton Monument. This innovation may have been the result of Jones' experiences during his Italian tour of 1613-14.

²⁰⁴ Even so, the sculptor has applied strap-work on the altar front, out of keeping with the cenotaph's classical appearance.

²⁰⁵ Harris and Higgott, 1989. p. 42.

²⁰⁶ Howarth, 1997. p. 53.

²⁰⁷ Chapman, 1613. p. 44.

earls of Suffolk, Northampton and Arundel, and their alliance through marriage with the new royal favourite, Robert Carr, earl of Somerset, provided Cotton with opportunities for advancement. In 1614, he became one of the principal agents working towards a Spanish match between Prince Charles and the Infanta.²⁰⁸ He had the ear of James I, was esteemed by the Spanish ambassador as the King's representative and was attempting to broker positions in government for his own associates.²⁰⁹ Had his negotiations been successful, if not high office, then at least greater royal influence and trust, would have followed. As it turned out, in late 1615, discussions were terminated, Cotton was examined and arrested and his gradual fall from grace was set in motion.²¹⁰ It seems most likely, therefore, that the Prince Henry Monument was commissioned during his brief rise and that through it Cotton hoped to augment his position and favour with the King.

It is strange indeed that Cotton chose to erect a cenotaph to Prince Henry of Scotland, after he had already erected a cenotaph to the latter's son, Prince David. It was through David's daughter, Isobel, that the Bruces and thus the Cottons claimed kinship with King James. This second cenotaph, therefore, seems superfluous - unless its dedicatee had somehow become topical. As has been shown, in the years after his death, Henry Frederick's image was still very much present in the popular consciousness.²¹¹ What is more, according to Timothy Wilks, Robert Peake's equestrian portrait of the Prince (1610, See Figure 41) was briefly under Cotton's ownership around this time.²¹² Cotton inherited the portrait from his patron, the earl of Northampton, and it may even have been displayed at Conington.²¹³ If this was indeed the case, Henry's death and commemoration would surely have been pressing on

²⁰⁸ Sharpe, 1979. p. 131.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.* p. 132. *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1611-18.* 24th August, 1615. p. 305.

²¹⁰ Sharpe, 1979. p. 133.

²¹¹ See footnote 135 and p. 137. See also Chapter 5.

²¹² Wilks, 2007. p. 177.

²¹³ *Ibid.* p. 177. See also Evelyn Shirley, "An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard K.G. Earl of Northampton, taken on his death in 1614, together with a transcript of his will" in *Archaeologia*, XLII (1869). p. 372.

Cotton's mind. By exploiting the parallels between Prince Henry of Scotland and Henry, Prince of Wales, Sir Robert could subtly commemorate the latter, thereby remedying the absence of an official memorial. More importantly, by erecting this monument, he hoped to emphasise further his family's links – both by blood and experience - with the Stuart dynasty. All Saints, was in effect to become a shrine to the glory of the Cotton line. Their intention was recognised over a century later by Nicholas Brett. He comments that the Prince David monument was “designed to point out the Antient Alliances of the Bruce Cotton Family” while as a group of monuments, he wrote: “tis highly probable he made these also to preserve the Memory of his Ancestors.”²¹⁴ In effect, by comparing his own forbear, Henry of Scotland, with the late Prince, his own lineage was elevated higher still. Furthermore, if this supposition is correct, the learned scholar, James I, would have been one of only a few in a position to understand its significance and consequently, the compliment it paid to him. For if the cenotaph compared Henry Frederick to Henry of Scotland it also, by implication, compared King James to his own distant ancestor, David I, one of Scotland's most successful and progressive monarchs, a ruler described by William of Newburgh as:

“a great and glorious man in the world, and of no less glory in Christ . . . He was a man religious and pious; a man of much prudence and moderation in the administration of temporal things, and none the less of great devotion towards God.”²¹⁵

Such praise would, no doubt, have appealed to James' own self-image and vanity.

Thus acts of remembrance and commemoration, effected by members of princely Courts and circles, served a variety of purposes. Certainly, anguish and a sense of personal loss played their parts but, for men and women whose standing and influence depended upon

²¹⁴ Cotton Pedigree, 1754-55, compiled by Nicholas Brett of Spring-Grove, Chaplain to Sir Robert Cotton, fifth Baronet. B.L. Add MS 53781.

²¹⁵ Anderson, 1908. p. 229.

royal preference, the exhibition of grief could be an important means of securing further favour.

VI

The effects of royal deaths were felt well beyond the confines of the Court. In addition to the families, households and supporters of these Princes, the British public were affected by and memorialised their loss. As Sir John Holles noted, in one of his many letters touching on Henry Frederick's death: "I nothing doute but that you mourn in the country, as well as we heer in the Court."²¹⁶ However, with public access to, and participation in, official commemoration schemes becoming increasingly restricted, other forms of remembrance were produced to satisfy popular interest. A wealth of commemorative ephemera was issued in response to the premature deaths of Stuart heirs. Even the one-month-old Charles, Duke of Cambridge, was to be the subject of a black-bordered, printed elegy, which lamented:

"To tell, in fine, how all our Mirth did die,
And with the ROYAL BABE do's buried lye."²¹⁷

Entrepreneurs were quick to seek profit. Just three days after William, Duke of Gloucester's death an advertisement was featured in the *London Post* – it is worth quoting at length:

"A choice collection of poetry being designed for the Press; entitled the Muses Meditations; occasioned by the death of His late Highness, the Duke of Gloucester: All such Gentlemen of both Universities, and elsewhere, that are poetically inclined, are desired to send what miscellaneous poems they please on Death, Judgment, Heaven, Resurrection,

²¹⁶ Letter from Holles to Francis Cook, 15th November, 1612. B.L. Add MS 32464. f. 56v.

²¹⁷ Anon., *An Elegy on the Death of the Duke of Cambridge, which happened on the 12th of December 1677* (London, 1677). p. 1.

Christ's Passion, Sin and the Contemplative Subjects; to Benjamin Harris Bookseller at the Golden Boar's Head . . . where care shall be taken to have them speedily published."²¹⁸

The announcement was repeated three days later.²¹⁹ The resulting collection, re-titled, *Suspirium Musarum, The Sighs of the Muses* (1700), is a hotchpotch of dedicatory verses, Pindaric odes and elegies in English and Latin. Some specifically commemorate William's passing, while others muse over the general themes of death, loss and sacrifice - one poem, rather inappropriately, even mourns the demise of the Earl of Roscommon.²²⁰ Visual representations also exhibit this slapdash approach, so that, on occasion, prints bore little resemblance to the events or figures portrayed. For example, *A Cordial Elegie and Epitaph upon the Much Lamented Death of that Incomparable Prince Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1660), published by George Horton, bears a crude woodcut on its front page (See Figure 52), supposedly depicting the deceased Prince, laid out upon a draped trestle table underneath a pall, decorated with heraldic escutcheons. Ironically, the image first appeared on a broadside produced to commemorate the funeral of the Parliamentarian general, Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex.²²¹ The incongruity of using a representation of one of the figureheads of the Parliamentary cause to portray a prince of the newly restored Stuart dynasty appears to have been disregarded. Thus for Harris, Horton and doubtless others besides, a swift response to the new demands of the market was crucial: quality and integrity were not the central concerns.

²¹⁸ *London Post with Intelligence Foreign and Domestic*, 2nd August, 1700. Issue 182, p. 2.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.* 5th August 1700, Issue 183, p.1.

²²⁰ Harris (ed.), 1700. p. 19.

²²¹ See Anon., *A Perfect Relation of the Memorable Funeral of the Right Honourable, Robert, Earle of Essex* (London, 1646).

Publishers were not the only operators to exploit swiftly the public interest in a royal death, however.²²² As early as the 3rd of August 1700, just four days after William's death, the *Flying Post* reported that:

“Mr. Goldsmith in the Old Jury, who made the effigies of the late Queen Mary, which is so much admired, went on Tuesday last to Windsor, and by permission took off a Mold from his Highness the Duke of Gloucester, in order to the making of his Effigies, which will be done to the Life in his Ducal Robes.”²²³

The accounts and descriptions of William's funeral make no reference to the use of an effigy. This wax figure was produced for commercial, rather than ceremonial purposes.

Consequently, a few weeks later, it was advertised that the effigy, “with extraordinary exactness and curiosity”, could be viewed at Mr. Goldsmith's museum at Green Court.²²⁴

Some eight years following, after the death of his father, Prince George, William's effigy was re-displayed as part of a rather macabre arrangement. For one shilling, visitors could view:

“The effigies of his Royal Highness George Prince of Denmark, made in wax, and seated at a banquet near the effigies of Her Present Majesty, and his highness the Duke of Gloucester. All happily performed in a very near imitation of the life. By Mrs Goldsmith.”²²⁵

Thus the deaths of these Princes captured public attention and traders were quick to respond - with a variety of wares. Text, image and curiosity were employed to satisfy the immediate and intense demand. Yet, despite the relatively brief period in which these goods were produced, the representations and reactions contained within commemorative ephemera were to play a central role in the formation and development of posthumous images. The *personae*

²²² For an account of the burgeoning commemorative trade of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Paul S. Fritz, “The Trade in Death: The Royal Funerals in England, 1685-1830” in *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (Spring, 1982).

²²³ *Flying Post*. 1st August, 1700. Issue 817, p. 2.

²²⁴ *Postman and the Historical Account*. 20th August, 1700. Issue 792, p. 2.

²²⁵ *English Post with News Foreign and Domestick*. 15th December, 1708. Issue 1281, p. 2.

fashioned for these Princes immediately after their deaths would continue to influence their portrayal for generations to come.

How then were they represented? Certainly, a heavy sense of loss characterised their portrayal. An elegy from *Suspirium Musarum*, entitled *Britannia Lugens*, articulates the real uncertainty and anxiety which William, Duke of Gloucester's death had caused. Britannia, herself, asks:

“Who shall support the Grandeur of my Throne,
When to the Skies my Reigning Monarch's Gone,
Since Glo'ster's Fall'n, who was to wear my Crown?
What foreign Arm shall then my sceptre wield;
Or lead my drooping Britans to the Field?”²²⁶

She continues, predicting that, upon William III's death, French forces will invade, murdering, pillaging and destroying in their wake, and “Ruin shall my Realms embrace.”²²⁷ Few posthumous images expressed loss more emphatically than William Hole's engraving of *The Effigy and Hearse of Henry, Prince of Wales* (1612, See Figure 53). The visual contrast between this depiction of the Prince and Hole's earlier engraving, *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* (1612, See Figure 48) is striking. The vital, vigorous and athletic figure of the Pike portrait has been replaced by an inert and lifeless effigy, laid out upon a coffin. All the bravado and bombast of the former depiction have been supplanted by mourning and grief.²²⁸ George Chapman's accompanying verse, embraces this contrast, balancing the confident bluster of Henry's representation in life with the stark, disappointing reality of the present:

“Whom all the vast frame of the fixed earth

²²⁶ Harris (ed.), 1700. p. 5.

²²⁷ *Ibid.* p. 6.

²²⁸ For further discussion of this image see pp. 223-4.

Shrunk under; now a weak hearse stands beneath.”²²⁹

In the wake of these lost hopes and aspirations, projections of what might have been were augmented and accentuated. Accordingly, the military interests and aptitude which these Princes had exhibited in life were exaggerated and inflated. Henry Frederick was mourned as a Prince, born of Pallas,²³⁰ whose death had denied Britain a martial conqueror:

“For men thought his star

Had markt him for a great and glorious war.”²³¹

Henry, Duke of Gloucester’s brief military career was recast as a heroic campaign, while he, in turn, was presented as a victorious warrior, whose prowess was such that his astonished enemies were rendered motionless with awe.²³² Posthumous printed images of the Duke reflected this martial emphasis, frequently depicting him in armour with a commander’s military baton.²³³ Even William, Duke of Gloucester, was transformed into Albion’s miniature “Champion”,²³⁴ who would have exceeded the military successes of his uncle, William III:

“Had God-like Glou’ster lived to ride

By Victorious William’s side:

He a greater wonder far,

Nephew to the God of War,

²²⁹ Chapman, 1612. Sig. A5r.

²³⁰ Peacham, 1613. Sig. D1r. See also John Taylor, *Great Britaine all in Blacke for the Incomparable Losse of Henry, Our Late Worthy Prince* (London, 1612).

²³¹ Webster, 1613. Sig. B1r. See also John Davies, *The Muses Tears for the Losse of their Hope; Heroick and ne’ere-too-much praised Henry, Prince of Wales* (London, 1613); and Richard Niccols, *The Three Sisters: Teares shed at the Late Solemne Funeralls of the Royall Deceased Henry, Prince of Wales* (Oxford, 1613).

²³² Crouch, 1660. pp. 2-4. See also Martin Lluelyn, *An Elegie on the Death of the Most Illustrious Prince, Henry Duke of Gloucester* (Oxford, 1660).

²³³ See, for example, Anon., *Henry, Duke of Gloucester, on Horseback* (c.1660). Sutherland Collection, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; Anon., *Prince Henry Late Duke of Gloucester* (1660). Sutherland Collection, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; Anon., *Henry Duke of Gloucester &c* (1660). Sutherland Collection, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

²³⁴ Anon., *Thraenodium Britannicum* (London, 1700). p. 7; W.B., 1700. p. 1.

Had far Great wonders done.”²³⁵

Likewise, the Protestantism inherent in representations of these Princes was emphasised and perpetuated in death. Henry, Prince of Wales, was variously upheld as a Protestant “Saviour or Redeemer”,²³⁶ who would have fought against the forces of Catholicism and “throwne down the walles of Rome.”²³⁷ Similarly, Henry, Duke of Gloucester, was hailed as a Christian Prince of “Godly zeal.”²³⁸ Despite his youth, William, Duke of Gloucester, was also praised for the piety which shone from his “tender mind.”²³⁹ An engraving, previously and incorrectly identified as James, the pretended Prince of Wales (1700, See Figure 54), again illustrates this posthumous process of distilling, refining and augmenting princely representations. Here, William, Duke of Gloucester, stands in his customary surroundings, within a classicised architectural setting with a landscape in the distance. He wears roman military attire.²⁴⁰ The familiar Protestant and martial overtones are again present. In one hand he holds a scalloped bowl and in the other a wand with a bubble hovering on its end. This oft-used Dutch *vanitas* emblem was particularly associated with childhood and symbolic both of its beauty and abrupt end.²⁴¹ This image, therefore, succinctly expresses the demise of the Prince and of the popular ideals for which he stood. Its sentiment is one of acceptance and inevitability - for such beauty, such hope and promise was not meant to last. Thus by

²³⁵ W.B., 1700. p. 9. See also Thomas Yalden, *The Temple of Fame* (London, 1700).

²³⁶ Wither, 1612. Sig. E1v.

²³⁷ Allyn, 1613. Sig. A4r. See also Richard Niccols, *The Three Sisters: Teares shed at the Late Solemne Funeralls of the Royall Deceased Henry, Prince of Wales* (Oxford, 1613); and George Chapman, *An Epiced(e) or Funerall Song: On the Most Disastrous Death, of the High Borne Prince of Men, Henry Prince of Wales* (London, 1613).

²³⁸ Anon., *The Queen's Lamentation* (London, 1660). p. 1. See also Anon., *A Cordial Elegie and Epitaph upon the Much Lamented Death of that Incomparable Prince Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1660); Thomas Howard, *An Elegy on the Death of the Most Illustrious Prince Henry Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1660); Martin Lluelyn, *An Elegie on the Death of the Most Illustrious Prince, Henry Duke of Gloucester* (Oxford, 1660); and p. 85.

²³⁹ Fowler, 1700. p. 6. See also Benjamin Harris (ed.) *Susprium Musarum, The Sighs of the Muses* (London, 1700).

²⁴⁰ For similar printed depictions see John Smith after Godfrey Kneller, *His Highness The Duke of Gloucester* (c.1692). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; John Smith after Godfrey Kneller, *His Highness The Duke of Gloucester* (c.1694). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; Pieter Schenk after Godfrey Kneller, *William, Duke of Gloucester* (c.1694). National Portrait Gallery, London.

²⁴¹ Schama, 2004. p. 512.

propagating and accentuating the aspects of their representation which had proven so appealing in life, the loss of these Princes was further amplified and intensified. Their images became increasingly idealised with a strong nostalgic focus on mythical histories and imaginary futures. Commemorative odes and elegies offered glimpses of an alternative reality which was more palatable and reassuring than that which now confronted the public. Thus the beginning of an abiding process was set in motion, where their representations came to stand for both great promise and, conversely, for acute disappointment and regret.

VII

The Stuarts' increasing preference for reduced and simplified death rites should not be construed as a sign of antipathy towards these losses and their commemoration. As has been demonstrated, despite the increasing moderation of official acts of remembrance, the need to grieve, honour and memorialise persisted. The demise of Stuart heirs was deeply felt and sincerely mourned. Although royal funerals were gradually scaled-down, elements of splendour and display remained; although monuments were not erected, frequently intentions were recorded and plans were drafted. State commemoration, and its increasing restraint, was influenced by a range of personal, social, political and economic factors which varied with each death. Yet the need to memorialise the deceased visually and materially persisted. Family, household, supporters and the public independently commemorated these Princes in a variety of ways. Programmes of pictorial display, posthumous and mourning portraits, cenotaphs, jewelled relics, mourning dress, printed pamphlets and engravings all played a part in marking and managing these losses. It is testament to the success of Stuart princely representation that the popularity and allure of these youths while living continued after death. Indeed, the strength of response provoked by their passing undoubtedly contributed to their enduring memory. The political effects of these bereavements were significant. Yet

amidst the grief and anxiety their implications were amplified. The promise and potential of these heirs was emphasised and their representations became focussed on nostalgic projections of a false dawn. However, amidst these reflections on vanished hopes and disappointments, the Stuart dynasty was forced to re-group and to look forward. In order to assuage political and social anxieties the royal house had to present a strong image of continuity, stability and endurance, while preparing new heirs for their future roles and presenting them to their subjects. Emerging from the shadows of their predecessors, forging an effective princely representation for those who remained often proved problematic.

Chapter 4

“A New Race of Princes”: The Dynasty Recovers

I

Jonathon Goldberg has argued that, under the early Stuarts, the family became an ideological construct, a metaphor for the state.¹ The domestication of political images continued with succeeding generations of the dynasty.² If then, familial rhetoric came to represent a projection of the nation and its political system, images of the royal family, itself, could also be employed to articulate messages about the realm and its state of affairs. Following a royal death, these visual intimations were of great import. Representations of the remaining family members, united together, constituted reassuring assertions not only of the continuity and resilience of the line but also of the stability of the kingdom. Thus, after the death of Mary II in 1694, an anonymous engraving was printed, depicting the surviving royals assembled in a rather cosy domestic arrangement (c.1694, See Figure 55). It was a calculated gesture designed to express the House's endurance. Sitting upon an ornate upholstered armchair (a homely stand-in for his throne), William III is placed beside his heir, Princess Anne, who also sits, attired in a mantua gown with apron, her hair dressed in a *fontange*. Each rests an elbow on the table between them which also bears the crown and sceptre upon a tasselled cushion. By so doing, the security of the immediate succession is

¹ See Jonathon Goldberg, “Fatherly Authority: The Politics of Stuart Family Images” in Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan and Nancy J. Vickers (eds.), *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago and London, 1986).

² See Toni Bowers, *The Politics of Motherhood: British Writing and Culture, 1680-1760* (Cambridge, 1996). pp. 35-65.

underlined. To William's right stands Anne's husband, Prince George, resting against his cane, while Anne motions with her fan towards their son, William, Duke of Gloucester - the future of the Stuart line. The dramatic drapery and imposing columns behind are at odds with this tight-knit domestic group, reaffirming that this is no ordinary family.³ Mounted upon the central column, immediately above the crown, is a classicised portrait in profile of the recently deceased Queen Mary. Thus, despite her death, Mary's presence persists and her position within the royal family remains. Taken as a whole, this image is a statement of constancy and progression. It presents its protagonists as a close, unified group - a message of particular significance taking into account the strained relationship between William and Anne.⁴ Finally, it proclaims that despite the destabilising effects of death, as the dynasty endures, so too does the nation.

This emphasis upon a dynasty united in the face of divisions between the living and the dead was often repeated.⁵ It is a concept further exemplified by the modification and development of another image. First published in 1624, Willem van de Passe's *The Family of James I* (See Figure 56) was designed to proclaim the benefits of the King's peaceful rule.⁶ James sits enthroned, with his children and grandchildren gathered around him. His heir, Prince Charles, is depicted in the foreground to his father's right, his hand resting upon the Bible with the King's *Workes* positioned just behind. He is heir not only to the crown but also

³ This arrangement is surely derived from Van Dyck's portrait of *Charles I and Henrietta Maria with their two eldest children, Prince Charles and Princess Mary* (1632, See Figure 61).

⁴ See p. 53.

⁵ See for example, Robert Pricke's engraving of *The True Portraiture (sic) of King Charles the First, His Queene, & Royal Progeny* (1660). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; Gerrit Mountin's engraving of *The Progenie of the Most Renowned Prince James King of Great Britaine France and Ireland* (c.1634). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; Anon., *The Pourtraictures of the Royall Progenie of King Charles the I. &c.* (c.1662). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

⁶ This engraving has previously been dated to 1622. The presence of Elizabeth of Bohemia's son, Ludovick, who was not born until 1624, points to a new, later date. Antony Griffiths has argued that there must have been an earlier state of this print since the tail of a dog is visible behind Ludovick, indicating that his figure was a later addition - see Griffiths, 1998. p. 67. However, close examination of the engraving reveals that what Griffiths interpreted as a tail is, in fact, the tassel of a cushion, upon which the infant prince is sitting. This is clear in later states of the print, which also depict the little Princess Henriette Marie upon a tasselled cushion.

to the royal word.⁷ James' daughter, Elizabeth, and her husband, Frederick, stand on the left with their large brood of offspring. Thus both branches of the family are represented upholding James' legacy – prudent policy and fruitfulness. Of particular interest, however, are the remaining members of the royal family. Although they had predeceased the engraving, Queen Anne, Prince Henry Frederick and the Princesses Sophia and Mary are all depicted. Each bears a skull, their heads propped against their hands in a gesture which commonly denoted death, while the little daughters also hold palms, a symbol of victory over mortality.⁸ The accompanying text draws out this notion:

“Death their life revives,

 Their Soules in Heav'n, On Earth their Fame still lives.”

Once more then, the royal house was presented as a single unified entity composed of all its members, both living and deceased. Interestingly, however, those children who had died in infancy before James' accession to the English throne, Margaret and Robert, have not been portrayed. The print's message is therefore not concerned merely with family but with dynasty. Here are the Stuarts of Great Britain, a new English royal line set to continue and flourish. In its next state (c.1627, See Figure 57), re-issued after the death of James I, Charles has gained a crown and a wife, while Elizabeth's children have multiplied. Both James and his grandson, Edward, now hold skulls.⁹ Commenting on James' continued central presence as head of the line, Goldberg has observed: “Replaced as monarch, he has not been deposed; he remains as a memorial image, dead and yet eternally alive . . . The dead father remains as the father of his family and of the kingdom.”¹⁰ And so it is with his deceased children and descendants. Each is preserved as they were, unforgotten and forever a part of the royal line.

⁷ Goldberg, 1986. p. 12.

⁸ Hall, 2001. p. 231.

⁹ This is a mistake on the part of the engraver. Edward (1624-84) was still alive. His younger brother, Ludovick, however, had died in infancy.

¹⁰ Goldberg, 1986. p. 12.

This statement of endurance and continuity was re-employed in a final adaptation of the print. Around 1660 van de Passe's engraving was updated (See Figure 58). Here a more mature Charles I and Henrietta Maria stand before their own grown-up progeny. A small skull lies at Charles' feet, while the Queen and her daughters wear mourning hoods. The newly restored Charles II stands between his parents, crowned and in his robes of state. Once more the dead mingle with the living, as the caption beside Prince Henry explains: "Henery [sic] Duke of Gloucester deceast." In this final state then, two branches, three generations and three Kings of the Stuart line are represented. Despite death - despite even rebellion - the dynasty lives on. The image constitutes a grand declaration of strength, continuity and resilience. Its message, frequently re-iterated, was an important one - in the face of political change, the Stuarts would adapt and endure.

As well as presenting a united front in response to the political and social anxieties prompted by princely deaths, the Stuarts also had to shift focus onto those next in line. Caught up in the grief and apprehension following the premature demise of royal heirs, it was often difficult for their successors to forge an effective and distinct public image. The remainder of this Chapter will analyse and assess how the dynasty moved forward, examining the prolonged effects of the loss of Stuart Princes. Both the nostalgia surrounding them and the persistent fixation with a male line of succession influenced representations of surviving royals. The depiction of heirs, who did not easily conform to the conventional model of princely portrayal, had to be carefully negotiated.

II

Commenting on the representational problems faced by Henry Frederick's younger brother and successor as Prince of Wales, Kevin Sharpe has observed: "From the beginning,

the image of Charles was, to a large extent, outside his control, inherited and ambiguous.”¹¹

Indeed, amidst the anguish and disappointment surrounding Henry’s death, Charles was expected by many to fill the void, assuming his brother’s principles and *persona*.

Accordingly, Robert Allyn’s *Funeral Elegies* (1613) compared the young Prince to a firebird reborn:

“ADmired Phoenix, springing up apace,
From th’ashes of another Phoenix bones.”¹²

Hopes that Charles would prove to be his brother’s spiritual heir persisted. Michael Ulliot has shown how, after his brother’s death, authors encouraged Charles, to read “the book of Henry” and to learn from and follow his lead.¹³ Ulliot discusses the dedication to Prince Charles of Sir Robert Dallington’s *Aphorismes Civill and Militarie* (1613). Dallington’s dedicatory epistle advises that: “All eyes are upon you. Those your sweete graces of nature and ingenuous dispositions to goodnes, makes men looke upon your worthy Brother in your princely selfe; holding you the true inheritor of his vertues.”¹⁴ As well as taking up Henry’s martial prowess, Charles was expected to exhibit a similar Protestant fervour. Following Charles’ return from his failed expedition to secure a Spanish match, Abraham Darcie dedicated *The Originall of Idolatries* (1624) to him, as a guide to discerning the true Church and distinguishing it from “the foule and odious deformities of her OPPOSITE.”¹⁵

Visually too, Charles was cast in the form of his brother. As has been discussed, in 1616 he was depicted by Van Somer wearing Henry’s armour.¹⁶ In the same year Frances Delaram executed an engraving, portraying Charles poised on a rearing charger, holding a

¹¹ Sharpe, 2000. p. 385.

¹² Allyn, 1613. Sig. B3v. See also George Wither’s *Prince Henries Obseqies* (London, 1612) which uses the same analogy. Sig. B2r.

¹³ Ulliot, 2005. p. 141.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 142.

¹⁵ Darcie, 1624. Sig. A2v.

¹⁶ See pp. 138-9.

military baton with a battle raging in the background (1616, See Figure 59). The accompanying inscription reads:

“Great hopeful Charles, who solely dost inherit,
(Thy Father’s Goodness) Thy famous brother’s spirit.”

The irony, of course, is that this image of Charles, which lacks Henry’s favoured chivalric subtext, exceeds the militant assertions of any of his elder brother’s visual representations. Charles is depicted as a commander on the front line, rather than as a hero, reviving the ancient ideals of valour and gallantry. The subtleties of Henry’s iconography have been lost in translation. The inscription demonstrates another complication in the Prince’s representation – he was also expected to inherit his father’s ideals. Thus Charles was heir to two sets of, if not opposed, then at least, contrasting ideologies. What emerged was an ill-defined and obscured image. Indeed, by the time of his accession, Sharpe has argued that “it was not at all clear whether Charles stood for war or peace, Protestantism or accommodation with Catholicism.”¹⁷ Royal images were not formed in isolation but shaped by the memories, expectations and desires of both the monarchy and its subjects.¹⁸ The ambiguities and inconsistencies which affected Charles’ *persona* were, to some extent, the result of this dialogue. Ultimately, the failure to reconcile or adapt these demands and to fashion a strong, distinct representation in his early years produced only confusion and uncertainty.

If it was problematic for a young Protestant prince to emerge from the shadow of a deceased heir, then it was considerably more difficult for those successors who had neither their age, faith or sex to recommend them. Analysis of Mary II’s representation, in the years before her accession, reveals the challenges and limitations which affected the portrayal of

¹⁷ Sharpe, 2000. p. 386.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 384.

those next in line, for whom the traditional modes of princely representation were considered inappropriate.

Following the Restoration of Charles II in 1660, the security and continuity of the Stuart royal line became once more a matter of public concern. As the years passed and Charles' marriage to Catherine of Braganza remained childless, hopes increasingly rested upon the offspring of his brother, James, Duke of York. James was prolific in his reproductive duties, fathering eight children by his first wife, Anne Hyde, and a further four before 1688 by his second wife, Mary of Modena. Of these, five were sons, all of whom (along with five of their sisters) died before leaving the nursery.¹⁹ Thus from her birth in April 1662 and for much of her life, James' eldest daughter, Princess Mary, represented the future of the Stuart dynasty. How then did her portrayal before her eventual accession to the throne in 1688 reflect this? Lois Schwoerer's article, *Images of Queen Mary II, 1689-95*, skilfully traces the development of Mary's public image during her reign; yet it fails to account at all for her depiction in the preceding years.²⁰ Mary's regal representation was not, however, fashioned in isolation but built upon a diverse and complex iconography which had already been evolving and maturing for over two decades. Schwoerer has stated that after the death of Elizabeth I in 1603: "The question of female rule did not resurface until the late seventeenth century at the time of the Glorious Revolution."²¹ On the contrary, it was an issue with which the Stuarts and their subjects were faced throughout the 1660s and '70s with the repeated deaths in the young male line. Mary's portrayal as Princess reveals rather that it was a matter which they were reluctant to address. Her status as heir was secondary; she was depicted first and foremost as royal daughter, bride and consort.

¹⁹ Sandford, 1707. p. 547.

²⁰ Schwoerer, 1989. pp. 717-748.

²¹ Schwoerer, 1989. p. 721.

Lady Mary of York's reception into this world was by no means celebratory. Her older brother Charles, Duke of Cambridge, had died the previous year and although the scandalous circumstances of his birth eased the disappointment of his loss, the Duchess of York's failure to produce another son was regrettable.²² On hearing the news Samuel Pepys reported: "I find nobody pleased".²³ Nevertheless, with the birth in 1663 of her younger brother, James, and, following that, another Charles in 1666, the male line of succession seemed secure. It was deeply disturbing then, when in May 1667, Charles died, only to be followed less than a month later by his older sibling, James. A letter of condolence addressed to Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon (grandfather of the deceased princes), from James Butler, Duke of Ormond, expresses the real sense of alarm and disquiet instigated by their deaths:

"All the preparation I had or could make up to myself to receive assurance of the death of the Dukes sone and of the great danger of the other, could not defend mee from being as sensibly struck with it when it came as anything in this world could touch mee and surely those only whoe want consideration of our good affections to the publick are insensible of so universall a losse."²⁴

Viewed within this context, the earliest portrait of Mary, depicted with her mother, father and younger sister, Anne, should be seen as a reassuring gesture, designed to promote the Duke and Duchess of York's fertility and to assuage the anxiety arising from these losses. Peter Lely's family group (1667, See Figure 60) has provoked minor, speculative comment from art historians. Detailed analysis of its date, content and context, however, reveals an image with an important message. Sir Oliver Millar has suggested that the painting was begun by

²² Charles, Duke of Cambridge, was conceived before the Restoration, after James, Duke of York's secret nuptials with Anne Hyde. James' clandestine marriage to a commoner, subsequent denial and then acknowledgment, raised questions over the legitimacy of the Prince.

²³ Latham and Matthews (eds.), 1973. Vol. III, 1st May, 1662. p. 75.

²⁴ Letter from Ormonde to Clarendon, 11th June, 1667. Bod. Lib. MS Carte 48. f. 461r.

Lely c.1668-70 and was finished by Benedetto Gennari around 1680.²⁵ It may be possible to provide a more precise date.

As has already been noted, up until 1667 the royal nursery housed four of the York children: the Princes James and Charles, as well as the Princesses Mary and Anne. Just months after the Princes' deaths, the girls were to be joined in mid-September 1667 by another brother, Edgar. Amidst the trauma of the loss of her sons the Duchess of York's pregnancy had come under increased scrutiny:

“The ill news of the great loss of the Duke of Kendall and the danger of the Duke of Cambridge is very afflicting. I beseech God in mercy to spare him and to keepe the Dutchess from any ill accident by the occasion of the trouble his Highness is under, I doe not only wishe hir now a sonn but that she may bring many to the happye increase of the Royall family.”²⁶

Edgar's propitious birth prompted a sigh of relief from the Stuarts, as well as their subjects. Pepys observed: “The whole court is mighty joyfull at the Duchesse of York's being brought to bed this day or yesterday of a son – which will settle men's minds mightily.”²⁷ It is highly probable that if any of these precious male heirs had been alive when the canvas was commissioned they would also have been included in the composition. It seems likely then, that it was started between late June and mid-September of 1667.²⁸ The painting was commissioned, therefore, at a time when the Yorks' family unit had experienced considerable loss but at the same time, with the pregnancy of the Duchess, harboured hopes of a new addition.²⁹ The composition, itself, is based upon Lely's earlier double-portraits of the Duke

²⁵ Millar, 1963. p. 127.

²⁶ Letter from Lady Orrery to Lady Clarendon, 11th June 1667. Bod. Lib. MS Clarendon 129. f. 102r.

²⁷ Latham and Matthews (eds.), 1973. Vol. VIII, 14th September, 1667. p. 436.

²⁸ James, Duke of Cambridge, died on the 20th of June 1667. Edgar, Duke of Cambridge, was born on the 14th of September, 1667. He died, aged three, on the 8th of June 1671.

²⁹ Although portraits of visibly pregnant women had enjoyed some popularity at the beginning of the seventeenth century, by the later Stuart period, this type of likeness was no longer fashionable. This may explain

and Duchess of York and his exquisite companion portraits of the pair, commissioned by Anne Hyde's father, the Earl of Clarendon.³⁰ The figures of the young Princesses were, therefore, included in a design which had become synonymous with the Yorks and their marriage.³¹ Presented as the fruits of their parents' union, their inclusion served to validate the royal match, underlining the fact that, despite the family's recent bereavements, James and Anne had successfully produced progeny and would continue to do so.

One striking feature of the portrait is the division of the sexes. James sits, military baton in hand, resting his arm on a globe, while a setting spaniel also sits inquisitively in attendance. He is represented in his guise of Lord High Admiral, as a military man of the world who commands obedience. Meanwhile, Anne and her daughters form a separate group. She is portrayed as a mother first and foremost, and from this her status derives. The young Mary holds a garland in her hands, a symbol of innocence.³² Positioned beside a vibrant red curtain, the feminine is here linked to the interior, domestic world. Between James and his wife and daughters is a particularly intriguing feature. What would appear to be a small oak sapling is depicted growing from a nearby wall. The presence of the oak, a favourite symbol of the Stuarts, as well as the dramatic, clouded sky, from which the sun has begun to emerge, reinforces the overall message of the image. Here is a dynasty which continues to grow and whose eminence cannot be contained. This conception of the royal family may have been borrowed from Anthony Van Dyck's painting of *Charles I, Henrietta Maria and their Eldest*

why Anne does not appear gravid. Technical examination of the under-painting may also shed light on the possibility that Anne's belly was retouched after 1680.

³⁰ There are versions of the double portrait, executed at some point in the 1660s, at the National Portrait Gallery, London and Euston Hall, Norfolk. The single portraits (c.1661) are in the collections of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery in Edinburgh.

³¹ The postures, positioning and dress of the Princesses are derived from Peter Lely's earlier portrait of *The Carnarvon Family* (c.1658-60). Whereabouts unknown, sold at Christies, London on the 6th of December, 2011, Lot 8007.

³² Taylor, 2003. p. 502. Floral wreaths were a commonly employed symbol of innocence – see, for example, Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia*, originally published in 1593 and translated into English by George Richardson in 1779 (Richardson, 1979. Vol. I, p. 84). It is also possible that Mary's garland references the use of burial coronets or garlands for children, see, for example, *Dead Child Carried to Heaven by Angels* (c.1630s), attributed to Peter Paul Rubens at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

Children (1632, See Figure 61). There is certainly a shared artistic vocabulary, for example, in the prominence of sky, landscape and distant buildings, the employment of drapery and the separation of the sitters into gendered groups. It is also interesting to note the similarity in pose and position between Mary and the two-year-old Prince Charles (the future Charles II). It would appear then that tradition and continuity were integral to the conception of this picture, evoking the previous reproductive achievements of the Duke's Stuart ancestors. This theme of stability and permanence is also developed by the depiction of Windsor Castle in the distance. As the oldest royal seat in Britain, its presence underlines the continued strength of the royal family. Thus, like the engraved family portraits discussed earlier,³³ Lely's composition represents a family which remains resilient, despite its recent tragedies, and which continues to hope for the birth of a longed-for prince.

Lely never completed the composition and the painting was shelved for over a decade before Benedetto Gennari finished it. It may well be that, following Prince Edgar's birth, the painting's message was no longer considered relevant – the anxiety caused by the deaths of the Yorks' earlier sons had been tempered. Why then, and when, was Gennari later charged with its completion? His own records detailing his career in London note: "Finished one portrait by Lely, portrait of the first wife of the Duke of Yorck (sic) with her two little daughters, namely the Princesses Maria and Anna."³⁴ Millar has plausibly dated this completion to around 1680.³⁵ The fact that it was Gennari, rather than Lely, himself, who finished the portrait suggests that by the time the project was resumed the original artist, who died on 30th November 1680, was already deceased. Indeed, it is possible that his death was responsible for bringing the unfinished canvas to light. If then, the painting was finished between late 1680 and early 1681, Gennari's commission occurred at a time when James'

³³ See pp. 158-161.

³⁴ Millar, 1963. p. 127.

³⁵ *Ibid.* p. 127.

status as royal heir was in jeopardy. In 1679, on account of his Catholicism, the Duke of York had been forced into political exile, staying first in Brussels and subsequently in Edinburgh.³⁶ Between then and April 1681 repeated attempts had been made by James' detractors to exclude him legally from the succession.³⁷ Indeed, during the Oxford Parliament in March 1681, it appeared that Charles II was willing to forfeit his brother's rights. The King offered the Commons a scheme of limitations upon James' power, proposing to make arrangements for a regency under William of Orange and Princess Mary, following Charles' death.³⁸ This plan was rejected, however, and by the end of the month another Exclusion Bill was presented, before the King finally dissolved parliament.³⁹ It may well be that the resumption of Lely's composition was informed by these events.⁴⁰ In a period when James' position - indeed the future of the legitimate Stuart line - seemed precarious, a painting which stressed the traditions and continuity of royal power and which depicted him alongside his two Protestant daughters may have been especially appealing.

Thus, in many ways, Mary's first portrayal on canvas set a precedent for her later representation. Her presence promised the continuation of the line; yet her part in its future was rendered as secondary. The Stuart preoccupation with providing a male heir meant that, in terms of her public image and dynastic position, she was repeatedly sidelined.

III

³⁶ Miller, 1989. p. 91; p. 101.

³⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 92-3.

³⁸ Mullet, 1994. p. 33.

³⁹ Miller, 1989. p. 104.

⁴⁰ A 1688 inventory records three unfinished portraits of James II by Lely in the royal collections, as well as others of Charles II, Catherine of Braganza and Princess Anne. See Millar, 1963. pp. 119-120. The fact that these paintings were still uncompleted almost a decade after Lely's death indicates that special circumstances prompted Gennari's completion of *The Duke and Duchess of York with their Daughters, Princess Mary and Princess Anne*.

As Mary matured, her representation developed. Yet references to her birthright and standing remained obscure. Arguably one of the most formative events in the development of Mary's early public image was the death in 1671 of her mother, Anne Hyde, Duchess of York. The Duke of York's conversion to Catholicism, as well as the absence of a young male heir - Edgar died within months of his mother - obliged her uncle, Charles II, to act. Mary and her sister, Anne, were declared children of state and their education in the true faith of the Church of England was committed to the supervision of Henry Compton, Bishop of London.⁴¹ From now on, as second-in-line to the throne, Mary's continued adherence to Protestantism was an extremely important political asset - one which was exploited throughout her iconography. She was represented as a model of Protestant virtue. Accordingly, when in 1677 Pierre de Lainé dedicated to her *The Princely Way to the French Tongue*, he prized her piety above all her other innumerable qualities. He asserted:

“You are MADAM, truly Pious, Devout and Charitable. You both love and frequent Gods Temple; believe and reverence his Sacred Oracles; and are kind and good to Your Spiritual Guides and those that wait at his Altar: These are the High Qualifications which give You as good a Right to a Celestial Crown, as Your Blood, Your birth and Fortune, with all Your other excellent Qualities do justly intitle You to any Throne.”⁴²

Significant steps were taken to dissociate Mary from her uncle's infamously debauched Court which she rarely attended, brought up instead in relative isolation at Richmond Palace.⁴³ Indeed, even her court debut, when she appeared in the title role of John Crowne's *Calisto* (1675), pointedly emphasised her purity and chastity. In a rather confused re-working of the original Calisto myth, Jupiter fails to seduce and rape the nymph whose virtue is impervious to his appeals:

⁴¹ Waller, 2002. p. 60.

⁴² de Lainé, 1677. Sig. A4r.

⁴³ Waller, 2002. p. 59.

“She flies the very shadow of a Man:
She thinks it does her Vertue stain,
If she but sleep where one has lain.”⁴⁴

Thus at a time when some complained that the ideal of the graceful, chaste and pious courtly woman was no longer either valued or evident,⁴⁵ Mary was being consciously cast as its epitome. Indeed, it may be no coincidence that one of the renowned paragons of female virtue, the former Maid of Honour, Margaret Blagge, was recalled to court to play the part of Diana - much to her chagrin.⁴⁶ By presenting the Princess alongside a woman whose religious and sexual virtue was undeniable, her own possession of those qualities was further underlined.

Pictorial representations of Mary followed in this vein. Around 1672, when she was ten years old, Peter Lely painted her as Diana (See Figure 62). She is depicted during the chase, accompanied by a greyhound and dressed in loose classicised clothing, her hair adorned with the crescent moon and strands of pearls. She gazes out, confidently addressing the viewer as if they are her intended target of attack. Her left arm and hand tense as she grips her bow, while her right hand loosely positions the arrow. Mary's assumption of Diana's *persona* underlined her own chastity and nobility. By portraying her as the virgin huntress, whose jealous protection of her own sexual virtue was absolute, she was endowed with the same quality. The image of the pure and pious princess continued to appeal. A portrait by Lely, representing Mary in the guise of another virgin goddess, Minerva (c.1677, See Figure 63), was painted shortly after Mary's betrothal to the self-appointed protector of the Protestant faith, Prince William of Orange. Mary demurely addresses the viewer, a spear in her left hand and her shield propped in the other. Her loose hair falls down her shoulder in a

⁴⁴ Crowne, 1675. p. 5.

⁴⁵ Wynne, 2001. p. 36.

⁴⁶ Wynne, 2001. p. 43.

gesture which reiterates her virginity.⁴⁷ Similar in composition to Lely's earlier portrait of Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland, as Minerva (c.1665, See Figure 64), Villiers' dynamic and rather knowing depiction is in direct contrast to Mary's composed serenity. Traditionally, in addition to her bellicose associations, Minerva was also connected with wisdom and patronage of the arts.⁴⁸ These attributes were perfectly appropriate for Mary to whom Bathsua Makin had dedicated *An Essay to Revive the Ancient Education of Gentlewomen, in Religion, Manners, Arts & Tongues* (1673) and to whom the playwright, Edward Cooke, dedicated *Love's Triumph, or, The Royal Union* (1678). In addition, Minerva could also signify the victory of virtue over vice,⁴⁹ a subject already very much part of Mary's public image. However, the context of the painting, executed amidst the celebrations for Mary's marriage, encourages a further reading. It may well be that the choice of Minerva, goddess of war, was deemed particularly suitable for the bride of a man frequently represented as a modern-day Mars. For example, in John Oldham's poem written to mark the royal match, the author asserted that Nassau was:

“A Name, which Mars himself, would with ambition bear,
Prouder in that than to be call'd the God of War.”⁵⁰

Traditionally, the painting is said to have been presented to Mary's court chaplain, Dr. Fleming.⁵¹ It is, therefore, not unlikely that Mary has been cast as the female counterpart to her husband, as a Minerva Britannica. While Prince William had assumed responsibility for the protection of Protestantism in the Low Countries, Mary, in turn, has been represented as England's defender of the faith. Thus, even from a young age, Mary's public image displayed

⁴⁷ For a brief discussion of women's hair and its associations with bridal virginity at the early modern English court, see Graziani, 1972. pp. 258-259.

⁴⁸ MacLeod and Marciari Alexander, 2001. p. 171.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* p. 171.

⁵⁰ Oldham, 1677. p. 3.

⁵¹ Auction catalogue: *Important Paintings by Old Masters*. Christies, New York, 11th January 1979, lot 235. p. 178.

the virtue and religious devotion which would later become synonymous with her representation. It was a mode of depiction which, over time, proved extremely successful.

Mary's iconography also reveals the priorities and, in turn, limitations involved when portraying a female heir. Alongside these images of chastity and piety, in the period surrounding Mary's betrothal, her representation increasingly stressed her fertility and potential fruitfulness. After four years of marriage, the failure of the Duke of York's second wife, Mary of Modena, to produce a male heir meant that the Princess' future reproductive responsibilities became ever more important. When in 1677 at the age of fifteen, Mary's marriage to William of Orange was announced, the focus of the future Stuart line shifted. After years of unfulfilled hopes, Oldham's verse prayed that Mary might prove as fertile as her grandmother, Henrietta Maria:

“May you be fruitful in as numerous Store
Of Princely Births as she who your great Father bore.”⁵²

What is more, within this union, unlike her father's, lay the promise of a Protestant heir. A manuscript poem, dedicated to the Secretary of State, Sir Joseph Williamson, expresses the real importance attached to the match, comparing the events of the wedding day to the deliverance of Protestantism from the Gunpowder Plot:

“And so the 4th day of November now
Doth in desert & fame the 5th out-do;
That sav'd the Princes from the fatall blow,
This will new princes on our land bestow;
That to the true Religion help did lend,
This will display it unto nature's end.”⁵³

⁵² Oldham, 1677. p. 4.

This emphasis upon Mary's fertility was mirrored in her visual representation. An early portrait of the Princess, probably painted around 1674 when she was twelve (See Figure 65), sets the tone for her later portrayals. She sits in an Arcadian landscape, her loose dress falling to reveal the flesh of her shoulders and draped so as just to conceal her left breast, while in her right hand she holds some blossoms. The prominence of Mary's *décolleté* and the floral imagery served to underline her fecundity and future productive role. As Mary's betrothal loomed, painted and engraved depictions of her developed this theme. Lower necklines, increasingly casual states of *déshabillé* and an abundance of flowers combined to create some pointed and surprisingly sensual portraits. In two related images by Lely, now at Syon Park and Portland Art Museum (c.1677, See Figures 66 and 67), Mary is depicted as an alluring bride ready to assume her conjugal duties. Her pale skin and elegant limbs are highlighted by her gestures and relaxed dress, while the smooth curve of her partially exposed breasts is revealed by clothing which seems poised to slip at any moment. In both, Mary's new status as Princess of Orange is hinted at by the presence of Orange blossoms which also signify fertility and marriage.⁵⁴ This association is further underlined in the Portland portrait by the vibrant orange gown which the Princess wears - its scalloped sleeves and her undressed hair endowing the composition with a pastoral air. The positioning of her left hand may also serve to highlight her new status, with her ring finger accentuated and cast in shadow. Thus both images portray Mary, in rather deliberate terms, as a bright blossom ready to be plucked and, more importantly, as the fertile source of a new royal line.

With Mary's betrothal public interest in the Princess increased and it was her image as a fruitful bride which prevailed. Both of Lely's portraits were reproduced in print in Britain

⁵³ Verses To the Right Hono(ur)able Sr Joseph Williamson, principall Secretary of State, on the Marriage of His Highnesse the Prince of Orange w(i)th the Lady Mary by A.B. TNA. SP 29/398/13.

⁵⁴ Heilmeyer, 2006. p. 88.

and the Netherlands.⁵⁵ One more image (See Figure 68), conceived in the same vein, is worthy of analysis. Published by Richard Tompson in the late 1670s, its meaning is patent. Mary is depicted in a state of casual undress with the plump rise of her right breast once again exposed by the lie of her drapery. In her right hand she grasps a small basket of flowers, while in her left she holds some of the buds. The significance of the strategic positioning of these symbols of fecundity over Mary's reproductive organs could hardly be more blatant. This device is also present in a portrait of her stepmother, Mary of Modena (see Figure 69). Painted by Lely in 1679, the elder Mary sits in a similarly low-cut, relaxed mode of attire with a small bowl of flowers balanced on her lap, holding what would appear to be some pimpernels to her breast. Behind the Duchess, some classical statuary is visible – a female figure flanked by a prominent scallop shell, another traditional symbol of fertility.⁵⁶ Both images therefore communicate the expectations and pressures placed upon royal wives - pressures which grew increasingly acute during the later Stuart period. They also highlight the extent to which Mary's public image during this time conformed to the traditional female type, representing her as the bestower of a future heir rather than as an heir in her own right.

One final example amply illustrates this point. Peter Lely's sumptuous painting of the Princess (1677, See Figure 70), most likely commissioned by her father, is undoubtedly the most regal and commanding of Mary's early portraits. She sits upright, addressing the viewer with a self-assured gaze, once more attired in orange (which indicates her recent betrothal) set off against her black wrap. She sits on an elaborate throne-like chair, her right arm resting on its support. Behind her a cherub bears an urn filled with flowers, while a heavy drape of

⁵⁵ See mezzotints after the Portland portrait, by Abraham Blooteling, executed c.1668; by Isaac Becket, executed in the early 1680s; and two versions by Pieter Schenk, probably executed in the late 1670s (Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London). Interestingly, in the Schenk prints, which were principally intended for a Dutch audience, Mary's gown has been rendered more decorous and conceals her cleavage. See also an anonymous mezzotint published by Edward Cooper in the 1680s after the Syon portrait (Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London).

⁵⁶ Hall, 2001. p. 318; McLeod and Marciari Alexander, 2001. p. 171. This motif is also present in Lely's marriage portrait of Anne Hyde (c. 1661). Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh.

rich embroidered velvet falls to reveal a landscape in the distance and a column, a symbol of strength. Thus, while the usual signs of Mary's marriage and fertility are present, there are also indications of her eminent status and regal standing. However, in its subsequent reproductions, of which there are several, this acknowledgment of Mary's birth-right has been diminished. In the National Portrait Gallery's copy (c.1678, See Figure 71) the opulence and grandeur of the original have been subdued. Mary no longer sits upon an opulent gilt seat but upon a stone plinth; the urn has been replaced by a vase, while the column has been moved and is now indistinct from its background. Behind Mary, instead of the velvet drapery and landscape, is a classical frieze, decorated with *putti*, carrying a great cornucopia. The replacement of the earlier attributes with symbols of abundance and plenty again places the emphasis upon Mary's fecundity rather than her rank. While this modified composition was copied widely, the original proved less appealing.⁵⁷ It would appear then, that Mary's position as heir was consciously played down. Her principal roles were prescribed as wife and mother - hope was invested in the fruits of her body. The irony is, of course, that Mary would never produce the long-awaited male heir - complications after her miscarriage in early 1678 probably rendered her sterile.⁵⁸ Instead, during her reign as queen, and following her sudden death, she was praised as the protector of her subjects:

“A *Mother*, not in the narrower and more minute, but in the larger and most noble Sense, not of a *single Family* only, but of *Nations*.”⁵⁹

IV

⁵⁷ Another painted version of this type, with Mary dressed in silver and blue, was sold at Sotheby's on 9th April, 1977. Engraved versions published by Carel Allard and Richard Tompson also follow this type (Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London). I have not come across any copies which follow the original composition.

⁵⁸ Waller, 2002. p. 105.

⁵⁹ Howe, 1695. p. 3; Schwoerer, 1989. p. 736.

As with the majority of early modern women, Mary's political significance and public status were markedly enhanced with her entrance into married life. Given her dynastic position as second-in-line to the throne after her father, the disposal of the young Princess's hand had become an important and much debated issue, both at home and abroad. In 1674 a memorandum had been presented to the Lords and Commons, advocating that Mary be given in marriage to William, Prince of Orange. It argued that by so doing, the security of the succession would be protected:

“All future disputes about the crown will be quieted, as were those bloody controversies between York and Lancaster by the prudent marriage of Henry VII.”⁶⁰ Meanwhile, approaches concerning a match with the Dauphin of France were also being made.⁶¹ It was not until late 1677, however, that negotiations progressed decisively, with the Prince of Orange's visit to the English Court. It would appear that William had been considering his future and that of the Stadholdership for several months, drawing up a will in June of that year and declaring the Elector of Brandenburg's son his heir, should he die without issue.⁶² Few were under any misapprehension about the motives behind his journey, as the diplomat, Roger Meredith, wrote to Secretary Williamson:

“All expect something extraordinary of this meeting of the two Courts. And we gather both fro(m) the great number & quality of the Persons that waite upon his Highness, that he designs a Match.”⁶³

The marriage arrangements, conducted by the Prince, King Charles and the Duke of York, were declared at a public Council meeting, during which the Duke spoke frankly of his desire

⁶⁰ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), 1673-5*. January 1674. p. 132.

⁶¹ Haley, 1958. p. 616.

⁶² State Papers Holland, Charles II. June – December, 1677. TNA. SP 84/205. p. 22.

⁶³ *Ibid.* p. 142.

for and consent to the union.⁶⁴ Preparations were immediately begun for a grand ceremony, set for the 14th of November.⁶⁵ Within days, however, the plans had changed. With little warning the wedding was brought forward to the 4th of November, conducted privately and with small company – a turn of events which took the Court by surprise:

“Many of the Nobility, Gentry & Principall Courtiers were furnishing themselves with rich cloths ag(ains)t that time and other preparations were making according, yet the Dutch Post arriving on Saturd(ay) night brought, it seems, letters of such contents, that his Ma(jes)tie thought fit to alter his resolution in reference to the time of the said marriage & on Sunday evening declared in Councill that it should be celebrated that very night & it was celebrated accordingly . . . this was done so privately that the Dutch Ambass(ado)rs themselves knew nothing thereof till it was over.”⁶⁶

While, the private nature of the ceremony has been attributed to William’s insistence that an elaborate display with its ensuing crowds and closeness would precipitate one of his coughing fits,⁶⁷ this account indicates that political considerations also impacted upon the execution of the marital celebrations.

Indeed, while several reports of rejoicing across both Britain and the Netherlands survive, there is also considerable evidence to show that many were unhappy with the match.⁶⁸ The resulting public displeasure reveals the limitations of both the Stuart and Orange propaganda machines. In England, the connection with the Yorks impacted negatively upon William’s popularity and rumours spread that he was a Catholic.⁶⁹ On the anniversary of

⁶⁴ Letter from Henry Frederick Thynne, Clerk of the Privy Council, to his Brother, 23rd October, 1677. B.L. Add MS 32095. f. 44r.

⁶⁵ Letter from Anon. to William Wharton, 28th November, 1677. Bod. Lib. MS Carte 79. f. 140r.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* f. 140v.

⁶⁷ Van Der Kiste, 2003. p. 47.

⁶⁸ For descriptions of public festivities see *The London Gazette No.1245*, 25th October, 1677. p. 2; *No. 1248*, 1st November, 1677. p. 2; *No. 1249*, 5th November, 1677. p. 2; *No. 1257*, 6th December, 1677. p. 1. See also *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series)*, 1673-5, 26th October, 1677. p. 422; 27th October, 1677. p. 427; 6th November, 1677. p. 445; 12th November, 1677. p. 452.

⁶⁹ Haley, 1958. p. 648.

Queen Elizabeth's accession, shortly after the marriage, an effigy of the pope was burned with a string of oranges round its neck and an inscription: "What the great Duke of Alva could not do will be done by the skirts of a woman."⁷⁰ Meanwhile, in the Low Countries, suspicion of the new Princess of Orange and of the Stuart royal family was widespread. An anonymous report on the reception of the marriage by the Dutch asserts that many of the people were "highly displeas'd", fearing that such an association indicated William's absolutist leanings and Papist inclinations.⁷¹ A Netherlandish tract, written around 1677, went even further, casting aspersions on both Mary's faith and character:

"The Prince of Orange need not be a sovereign [sic] nor to marry a Papist Princess to the disturbance and devastation of the whole land, if he hath a mind to marry let him marry a pious princess but not a worldly one, & who being born out of an ungodly family (it) may be feared that she shall bring her judgments over to us in Holland."⁷²

Thus despite the care which had been taken to distance Mary from her father's religion, as well as her uncle's dissolute court, for many she had been tainted by association. In light of these public misgivings, a new propaganda campaign was required, which would underline the blessings of such a match and present both protagonists as the purveyors of its bounty.

While the privacy of the wedding ceremony itself had precluded the opportunity for spectacle and display, beyond the confines of the English Court the authorities celebrated in lavish style.⁷³ In Edinburgh, the Duke of Lauderdale, Lord President of the Privy Council of Scotland, assembled the other Lords of the Council, as well as the local nobility at the city

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* p. 648.

⁷¹ State Papers Holland, Charles II. June – December, 1677. TNA. SP 84/205. p. 178.

⁷² A Short and Brief Relation from whence the War betwixt France, England & this State is Arisen for Instruction of the Peaceable Mynded Subjects (written by John Rothe, c.1677). Bod. Lib. MS Clarendon 87. f. 299v.

⁷³ See footnote 68.

gates.⁷⁴ Drums and trumpets heralded the town councillors, with sword and mace, accompanied by the Lord Provost and baillies, all attired in their official robes, as they processed toward the Mercat Cross, followed by the Town Guard.⁷⁵ Around the Cross, which was adorned with tapestries, an arbour, hung with oranges and a stage had been erected. From this stage and another, placed opposite, the Duke and the assembled quality drank the healths of the Prince and Princess and the royal family, while the Castle cannons roared and the conduits upon the Cross ran with wine.⁷⁶ The bells rang, bonfires blazed and sweetmeats were thrown into the assembled crowds.⁷⁷ Meanwhile, in Dublin, the Duke of Ormond, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, after attending “the play” extended an invitation to the nobility and gentry present to spend the evening at the Castle.⁷⁸ While the bells chimed and the bonfires and city guns flared outside, a great ball was held inside, followed by a magnificent banquet.⁷⁹

In addition to these civic festivities, a number of celebratory poems were penned proclaiming the benefits of the match. According to their authors it promised not only a new generation of royal heirs but also the preservation of the Protestant faith and, significantly, peace in Europe. Thus Oldham’s verse described the couple as “Sure Pledges of a firm and lasting Peace”, while Edmund Waller’s ode compared their union to the walls which protected Ancient Athens.⁸⁰ Indeed, the marriage and subsequent treaties between England and the Dutch Republic, represented a significant alteration in the alignments of the European

⁷⁴ Defoe, 1695. p. 16; See also Anon., *Relation Veritable, De ce qui s’est passé au Sujet du Voyage de Son Altesse Monseigneur le Prince d’Orange en Angleterre, & de Son Mariage avec la Princesse Marie Fille ainee de S.A.R. Monseign(eu)r le Duc d’Yorck* (The Hague, 1678). With thanks to Clarisse Godard Demarest for her assistance with the translation of this text.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* p. 16. *Ibid.* p. 22.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* p. 17. *Ibid.* p. 22.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* p. 17. *Ibid.* p. 23.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* p.19. *The London Gazette No1257*, 6th December, 1677. p. 1.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* p. 19. *Ibid.* p. 1.

⁸⁰ Oldham, 1677. p. 2. Waller, 1677. p. 4.

powers.⁸¹ Prior to this, France's position in Europe had seemed unassailable. By 1677 the protracted Franco-Dutch War had taken its toll on the coalition forces united against Louis XIV. In the Low Countries public support for the war had waned - trade was suffering and coffers were depleted, yet a peace acceptable to all sides seemed a long way off.⁸² Charles II's French sympathies were well known, but with this new understanding between the English and Dutch, it was hoped that the balance could be redressed.⁸³

A Dutch medal by O. Müller (1677, See Figure 72), pressed to commemorate William and Mary's marriage, further elucidates the perceived importance of this political alliance. The obverse depicts the couple, right hands clasped and holding a flaming heart. The heart serves a dual purpose, denoting both loving affection⁸⁴ and the sacred heart of Christ.⁸⁵ This double theme of emotional and religious devotion is continued in the periphery, where rays of light cascade from the sun above - indicative of God's blessing - and a Cupid spouts water in a nearby fountain. The Dutch legend reinforces this message: "In marriage with love and faith, God crowns with his blessing man and wife."⁸⁶ The reverse shows two armed female figures each bearing a spear topped with a liberty cap. The figure on the right, a personification of the Dutch Republic, holds seven arrows representing the seven united provinces, while the Dutch lion lies at her feet. Her counterpart, who represents Britain, holds the English flag with a harp and thistle at her feet, denoting Ireland and Scotland. Peace unites the shafts of their spears with an olive garland, while the legend reads: "Here Holy Peace unites Britain and Holland; let the world respect their alliance and dread their

⁸¹ Haley, 1958. p. 614.

⁸² Van Der Kiste, 2003. p. 28.

⁸³ Haley, 1958. p. 615.

⁸⁴ Bergeron, 1968. p. 446.

⁸⁵ While this imagery is commonly associated with Catholicism, it was also employed in Protestant art. A print of Charles II (1661) shows the newly restored monarch within a flaming heart – see Solkin, 1999. p. 218.

⁸⁶ Hawkins, 1885. Vol. I, p. 568.

standards.”⁸⁷ At the end of the legend an upturned *fleur-de-lys* is just perceptible. This subtle feature makes a pointed statement. William and Mary’s match is presented as a political alliance between two nation states – one which will not only bring an end to conflict in Europe but also to French supremacy. This reverse type with minor adjustments had occurred on two other medals commemorating the Peace of Holland in 1654 and the peace between Holland and the Bishop of Munster in 1666.⁸⁸ Thus here, to all intents and purposes, their marital union has been presented as if it were a ratified peace treaty.

Dutch propaganda, in particular, adopted this theme of concord and retribution. An intriguing and iconographically rich engraving (1677, See Figure 73), further underlines the various benefits of this royal match. Here, William, depicted as a Roman military general, and Mary, in the guise of a classical princess, take central stage on an elevated patch of land. A female personification of Peace, holding a laurel branch and crowned with an olive wreath, presides over the marriage ceremony. The couple hold hands through a snake eating its own tail - an *ouroboros* - symbolising eternity, above an altar adorned with their respective arms. Within the altar a snake, denoting heresy, writhes and burns, while a sacrificial boar, possibly alluding to France, is sprawled at their feet.⁸⁹ The subtext of this central grouping, which presents the marriage as an instrument of peace, protector of religion and undoer of French influence, is continued throughout the engraving. Behind Mary, among the wedding guests, Mercury is visible, a god associated both with marriage and commerce, while to her right, a woman, personifying Geography, clutches a pair of dividers and points to a globe. Unusually she is also depicted with a winged hourglass on her head, a symbol of transience. The inference is surely that as a consequence of this union the landscape of Europe is poised to change: the united nations of Britain and the Republic will dominate the world, while trade

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* p. 568.

⁸⁸ Hawkins, 1885. Plates I, Plate LVIII.

⁸⁹ With thanks to Professor Peter Rietbergen (Professor of Cultural History, Radboud University, Nijmegen) for this suggestion.

and wealth will flourish. Beside Geography a chubby youth, Plenty, bearing a cornucopia, holds two portraits representing the heads of state brought closer through this alliance. Above is the English King, Charles II, who consented to the match and gave Mary away in place of her Catholic father, the Duke of York,⁹⁰ while depicted below is his nephew, the bridegroom, William of Orange. To the left and beyond the central mound are two prelates, carrying palms of martyrdom. Denied access to the knoll, their significance is unclear but may refer to the rejection and demise of Popery. In the foreground lie broken and discarded arms and armour, rendered obsolete by these fortuitous nuptials.

In the sky above, The Hague, a woman crowned with a stork, bears a Latin inscription: “Defeated in battles, not in war.” Beside her, Amsterdam, blowing a horn and holding the *Nieuwe Kerk*, rests her foot on the Ebenezer, the stone which commemorated the defeat of the Philistines by Samuel and the Israelites. Inscribed upon the stone in Dutch are the words: “Thus far the Lord has helped us” (Samuel 7:12). This biblical reference plays upon the Dutch self-image of a new Israel - for like God’s chosen people, the Netherlanders had been delivered from oppression - previously under the Catholic Habsburgs - and had prospered.⁹¹ Beside this group, God, in the form of the sun, casts his light upon the virtuous, while St. George charges toward the figures below, bearing the British royal arms on his shield. In another reference to the Hebraic analogy the fiery column which guided the Israelites from Egypt stands out against the sky.⁹² Thus the engraving implies that just as the Republic was founded in resistance to Spanish despotism, now, with English aid, it will defeat French aggression.

⁹⁰ Waller, 2002. p. 96.

⁹¹ Schama, 2004. p. 94. For further discussion of Hebraic imagery in Dutch culture see Simon Schama’s chapter, *Patriotic Scripture* in *The Embarrassment of Riches* (London, 2004).

⁹² See Exodus 14:19 and 14:24. With thanks to Professor David Howarth (Professor of Northern Baroque Art, University of Edinburgh) for his assistance with this detail.

In the top right-hand corner, in a rather singular motif, a man, most likely a representation of French Tyranny, is besieged by two angels. One carries the fiery sword and scales of justice, while the other brandishes a handful of thunderbolts. In a pointed reference to the absolutist Louis XIV, Tyranny writhes as his crown falls to the ground. In his hands he holds the instruments of his aggression, a lit taper and two severed heads. This iconography would appear to have been borrowed and adapted from Romeyne de Hooghe's *A Mirror of French Tyranny* (1673, See Figure 74), depicting the sacking of Zwammerdam by French troops. Here, Tyranny is depicted as a harpy dressed in livery, decorated with the *fleur-de-lys*. In one hand she holds a flaming firebrand and in the other looted possessions and two severed heads. As she flees the scene, she is followed by an angel armed with the scales of justice and more thunderbolts.

This retaliatory theme continues below, where France, an old and shrivelled, bare-breasted hag, is expelled from the central mound by two warriors, similarly armed with thunderbolts. With a sword in her side, her tattered dress reads "Breve Liliūm", or the short-lived lily.⁹³ Her winged ankles and the hare upon her head symbolise fearfulness.⁹⁴ Beyond the mound, a man, personifying the Republic, itself, and holding the seven arrows of the United Provinces with the Dutch lion on his head, addresses those territories lost to the French. Held back by a rope, one displays a yoke of servitude, bearing the *fleur-de-lys*, while behind a mousetrap, denoting deceit, is carried aloft and masked envy is depicted with her snake-hair and fishing rod.⁹⁵ Finally, in the distance, Neptune and Triton drive away a band of Tritones and reclaim the seas. Taken as a whole, this engraving portrayed the marriage of William and Mary as significantly more than a partnership between man and wife. It was an

⁹³ From the first book of the Odes of Horace, Ode XXXVI. See Horace (Sydenham trans.), 2005. p. 67.

⁹⁴ Richardson, 1779. Vol.1, p. 124.

⁹⁵ For another depiction of Envy with a mask see George Glover's *Invidia*, published c.1630. Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London. For a representation of her with a fishing rod see Heinrich Aldegrever's engraving of *Invidia*, published in 1549. Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

alliance between nations. It proclaimed that together the English and Dutch would rule the waves, trade and wealth would prosper and Protestantism would be preserved. Its dense iconography further asserted that with Britain's new-found support the security of the Dutch territories would be ensured, French power and aggression curbed and peace established - for theirs was a match that would reshape Europe.

It was not only commemorative paraphernalia which portrayed the match in these terms. Following the couple's arrival in Holland, similar iconography was employed during their magnificent entry to The Hague on the 14th of December. Throughout the city triumphal architecture, firework displays and tableaux proclaimed the advantages of the match. The entry itself began in the afternoon.⁹⁶ Drawing up to The Hague Bridge the newlyweds were saluted by twelve companies of burghers. The Bridge, decorated with garlands, bore the greeting: "Enter the Court with favourable omens for the Dutch."⁹⁷ Beyond, twenty-four young girls, dressed in white - half from the public orphanage and half from the poor house - walked two by two beside their highnesses' coach, singing and strewing sweet-smelling herbs.⁹⁸ As the couple approached the City Hall, they passed through a triumphal arch, decorated with foliage and adorned with their arms and two hands clasped together. Its Latin caption read:

“AVRIACI HIS THALAMIS BATAVIS DOS REGIA PAX SIT”

- "Let the royal dowry by the marriage of Orange bring peace to the Dutch."⁹⁹ An acrostic within the inscription gives the year of the marriage in Roman numerals.¹⁰⁰ As they crossed the Market Place and entered the High Street another triumphal arch received them with these words:

⁹⁶ State Papers Holland, Charles II. June – December, 1677. TNA. SP 84/205. p. 227.

⁹⁷ "Ingredere Auspiciis Batavis Felicibus Aulam." *Relation Veritable*, 1678. p. 77.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 77. Defoe, 1695. p. 28.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 78.

¹⁰⁰ With thanks to Dr. Tom Tolley (Senior Lecturer, University of Edinburgh).

“Long Live Nassau’s Hector for his wife and for the Dutch,
Long live the Britannic Princess for Orange and her native land.”¹⁰¹

That evening they were entertained with pyrotechnics and bonfires on the river.

Among the displays, one presented the familiar imagery of two clasped hands with the arms of the Prince and Princess crowned by two angels; another was composed of a large diamond ring within which were William and Mary’s initials.¹⁰² Next a crowned red and gold lion was set alight. In its paws were placed opposing instruments of war and peace - its right claws gripping a gilded sword, while in its left it held a laurel branch, also a symbol of victory. The crowds were then offered the spectacle of St. George on horseback, battling a massive dragon, some twelve feet long.¹⁰³ The author of a pamphlet describing the celebrations informs the reader that across the city so many bonfires blazed that it seemed that The Hague was on fire.¹⁰⁴ Other displays were held outside the houses of John Maurice, Count of Nassau (now the Mauritshuis), the Spanish and Danish ambassadors, and those of the representatives of the Dukes of Brandenburg and of Lorraine.¹⁰⁵ Finally, an ox was roasted and the curious bystanders served traditional roast beef.¹⁰⁶

Thus, with her entry into married life, Mary was propelled onto the public stage. The disposal of her hand was an issue which had international repercussions. Yet, while a wealth of English and Dutch propaganda proclaimed the political significance and mutual advantages of the match, Mary, herself, seems a distant figure. Indeed, while her nuptial iconography vociferously reasserted both her Protestantism and her virtue, it is hard to escape

¹⁰¹ “Uxori et Batavis Vivat Nassovius Hector, Auriaco et Patriae Vivat Britanica Princeps.” *Relation Veritable*, 1678. p. 78.

¹⁰² *Ibid.* p. 80.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* p. 81.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* p. 79.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 84-89.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.* p. 92.

the impression that Mary's visual representation is anything more than emblematic. The match itself and the political alliance which it represents have subordinated its participants.

V

Remarkably little research has been carried out into Mary's life at the Orange Court and yet there can be little doubt that her years there proved decisive for the development of her public and self-image. Although, during the early years of her marriage, she was secluded from European politics and cut off from the British people, Mary emerged as the living embodiment of her own cultural representation. Her constructed *persona* had become self-fulfilling. Furthermore, while her public exposure was diminished by distance, her effect upon those travellers privileged with access to her Court could be profound. An anonymous journal, penned by an Englishman touring the Low Countries, demonstrates the impression Mary had upon her British subjects. Probably written in the late 1670s, it also reveals the importance of performance and display in perpetuating her *persona*. On arriving at Honselaersdijck, the Prince's country residence, our traveller and his friends were greeted by Dr. Hooper and Mr. Cox, Chaplains to the Princess.¹⁰⁷ The guests were escorted, through a gallery, to her chapel and, as she passed, permitted to kiss her hand. Watching her at prayer, seated in a chair with a cushioned stool before her, the author writes of her evident piety:

“We might well be devout, being animated by her devotion, and by such an Object put in mind of heavenly things.”¹⁰⁸

He continues, describing her appearance and physique, but focusing on her bearing:

“There is besides this an air of Majesty, with sweetness and calm wisdom, which like a glory plays about her, & strikes an admiration into them that are near her, the awfulness

¹⁰⁷ Fragment of a Travel Journal by an Unidentified Englishman in the Low Countries. B.L. Add MS 78670. f. 4v.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. ff. 5r-5v.

chastises the eye's delight to gaze on her: But all people's tongues . . . rejoice to be exercised in her praises. None ever saw a frown discompose her countenance; nor any seeds of passion to be discovered in it: Which as 'tis thought to be above the Moon is always serene and unclouded."¹⁰⁹

As this account demonstrates, those glimpses of the royal household permitted to guests were carefully stage-managed, centring upon Mary's status and religious devotion. The effect was compounded by her clerics who espoused her virtues throughout.¹¹⁰ Indeed, the strong impression which she made upon our anonymous tourist was repeated with many other guests to the Orange Court.¹¹¹ Gilbert Burnet's initial response to the Princess echoes the earlier account:

"Her person was majestic and created respect. She had great knowledge, with a true understanding, and a noble expression. There was a sweetness in her deportment that charmed, and an exactness in piety and virtue that made her a pattern to all that saw her."¹¹²

Mary's portraiture as Princess of Orange conveys a similar *persona*. A painting of her, executed by Caspar Netscher (c.1683, See Figure 75), revisits many of the themes and motifs common to her early representation. It also marks a new assurance and self-awareness in her depiction. Positioned just off centre, she sits upright, resplendent in orange silk, swathed in ermine-lined blue velvet. Created for a Dutch audience in Netscher's customary small-scale format, the sensuality and abandon of her English portraits have been replaced by an air of stately dignity and command - her loose-fitting gowns and shifts exchanged for a bodice and full skirt with the white sleeves of her *chemise* billowing dramatically at her elbows.¹¹³ The glossy sheen of her dress, combined with the subtle radiance of her velvet

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* f. 5v.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* f. 5v.

¹¹¹ Van Der Zee, 1973. p. 215.

¹¹² Burnet, 1875. p. 439.

¹¹³ The portrait measures 80.5 x 63 cm.

cloak and the heavy tufts of ermine which her elegant fingers grasp and stroke, provide a master class in painterly tactility. She gazes out confidently, placed within the picture plane so as to appear higher than the viewer. This powerful and regal portrayal is quite unlike the majority of her earlier representations; however, elsewhere the familiar motifs are still present. Mary's alliance with the House of Orange is underlined by the colour of her dress and the small orange tree in full blossom to her right. A fountain decorated with dolphins, on top of which sit a frolicking Venus and Cupid, denotes her new position as wife and future mother. Drawing on the mythology of love and fertility, it also recalls the biblical proverb: "Let thy fountain be blessed, and rejoice in the wife of thy youth."¹¹⁴ Meanwhile, a grey cockatoo is perched on the balustrade beside her. As well as an exotic seventeenth-century status symbol, the cockatoo's Indonesian origins allude to the scope and spread of Dutch colonialism, trade and economic power. In the distance, beyond the foliage, and illuminated by natural light, is a sculpture of Hercules defeating the monster, Cacus, a traditional emblem of the triumph of virtue over vice.¹¹⁵ The sunlight and the blue of the sky behind echo the play of light upon Mary and the azure of her cloak, so that it is clear to whom this epithet refers. In common with many of Mary's earlier portrayals, the composition is steeped in classicism. Aside from the figurative sculpture, a massive urn and carved column, decorated with putti and garlands, stand behind her, imbuing the scene with a sense of force and antique nobility. Thus while this image reiterates the customary themes of alliance, fecundity, empire and virtue, it does so with a new energy, centred on the majestic figure of the Princess. Painted as a pendant to a similarly dynamic portrait of her husband on the battlefield,¹¹⁶ although her position as wife is clear, her royal status is also explicit.

¹¹⁴ Proverbs Chapter 5, Verse 18. See McLeod and Marciari Alexander, 2001. p. 75.

¹¹⁵ Wieseman, 2002. p. 311.

¹¹⁶ See Caspar Netscher, *William III, Prince of Orange* (c.1678). Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

With the accession of her father as James II, Mary became heiress apparent to the thrones of Great Britain. As the daughter of a king she was now served at table on bended knee.¹¹⁷ Coupled with her advancement was a new interest in political affairs. In 1685, after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the subsequent occupation of Orange, the last Protestant enclave in France, Mary and her husband wrote to her father, asking him to intercede with Louis XIV.¹¹⁸ When the following year, Henry Compton, Bishop of London, was suspended under the King's orders, she personally wrote to protest to her father.¹¹⁹ Yet despite her growing awareness of and instruction in affairs of state under the Scottish refugee, Gilbert Burnet, his much recounted anecdote demonstrates her own perception of her position. Conversing privately with the Princess, Burnet broached the thorny issue of her husband's standing after her own accession. Presuming that "whatever accrued to her would likewise accrue to him", she was stunned to hear that she would be raised to his superior.¹²⁰ The following day, Burnet took the Prince to his wife where she declared that:

"She did not know the laws of England were so contrary to the laws of God . . . she did not think that the husband was ever to be obedient to the wife: she promised him she would always bear rule."¹²¹

Thus, while Mary was increasingly conscious of her royal birthright, she also upheld the conventional ideas of early modern womanhood – her crown would not be hers alone.

One final portrait (and its later derivations), painted by Willem Wissing (1685, See Figure 76) may realise this outlook visually. In 1685 Wissing was sent to Holland to paint the Prince and Princess of Orange at James II's command.¹²² The resulting composition bears close comparison with a portrait of Mary of Modena, executed by Wissing (1685, See figure

¹¹⁷ Van Der Zee, 1973. p. 190.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 209.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 211.

¹²⁰ Burnet, 1875. p. 440.

¹²¹ *Ibid.* p. 440.

¹²² Millar, 1963. p. 139.

77), shortly after she became queen. Wissing's portrait of Queen Mary shows her in casual dress - an umber coloured *sacque*, embellished with brocade, embroidery and jewels, worn over a white chemise. Her left arm rests upon a small female dog, possibly an Italian greyhound. The prominence of the nursing bitch's teat indicates that the themes of maternity and fecundity are at play, a suggestion borne out by the sitter's other attributes. Mary's right hand grasps a lock of her hair, draped over her left shoulder, a motif which directly references Renaissance depictions of Venus at her toilet.¹²³ The inference is developed by the solitary pink rose, a flower particularly associated with the goddess, lying to her right. By 1685, Mary had lost all four of her children, with her last pregnancy some three years prior. Thus the analogy with Venus, goddess of fertility, was an important one. As queen consort it was her duty to produce an heir. This composition asserted that there was still hope.

The similarities between the portraits of the Queen and the Princess of Orange are striking, yet their differences invite further examination. The angling of Mary's head, her pose and positioning on the canvas are almost identical to those of her stepmother. She wears similar jewellery and her clothing also appears to be derived from the earlier portrait. Although depicted in a relaxed state of dress, her appearance is more decorous than that of the elder Mary, the arrangement of her dress less suggestive. Its cut and decoration are also more formal, embellished with gold brocade, set off against midnight blue silk, hung with diamonds and pearls, while her shift is lined with ornate lace-work. Instead of a pet, her left hand rests upon a red velvet mantle, trimmed with ermine and draped about her. Thus, while contemporaries had noted that, upon her father's accession, she had received no appointments to support her new status - no allowance, jewels or presents - here Mary is depicted according to her rank – her standing underlined by her finery.¹²⁴ The most striking contrast between the

¹²³ McLeod and Marciari Alexander, 2001. p. 143.

¹²⁴ Van Der Zee, 1973. p. 212.

portraits of Mary and her stepmother is in the adaptation of the Venus motif - the substitution of a lock of hair for a veil. It is, perhaps, an understandable alteration, given that the veil had been an attribute of chastity from medieval times and, as has been shown, this theme was common to Mary's representation.¹²⁵ However, the similarities between these two compositions make this adjustment all the more pointed. While Mary of Modena has been portrayed in the guise of the goddess of love, her stepdaughter, shown in identical pose, has been cast in opposition, as the personification of sexual purity. It is possible that this implied comparison between the Catholic queen and the virtuous Protestant heiress was deliberate.

Intriguingly, however, later copies revert back to the Venus motif. Indeed, in another version, painted around a year later (c.1686, See Figure 78) not only does the Princess hold a lock of her tresses in her right hand but the solitary pink rose from her stepmother's painting has been placed upon her mantle. In fact it was this composition which prevailed, with copies of it produced well into her reign.¹²⁶ So why was the iconography of Mary of Modena, a queen consort, appropriated? As the wife of a prince renowned as a modern-day Mars, it may well have been deemed fitting that she be cast as a Venus. By so doing, unlike the earlier composition, her position as a married woman was underlined and her husband's presence was also subtly suggested. Just visible in the background is the obligatory orange tree. Thus while Mary's status as heir was acknowledged, the composition also alluded to her marriage, implying that there would be another power behind her throne. Mary's iconography as Princess of Orange built upon several of those themes common to her early portrayal; however, it also represented a new stage in the development of her public image. While her devout and upright *persona* remained, mature depictions of her also reflected an increasing awareness of her birthright. Portraits of her conveyed a sense of poise and majesty which

¹²⁵ Hall, 2001. p. 318.

¹²⁶ See for example, the versions by Jan Verkolje (c. 1690) and Jan van der Vaart (c.1692-4) both at the National Portrait Gallery, London.

hitherto had been downplayed. Nevertheless, Mary's position as a royal wife is embedded in these images, subtly implying that her husband will share in her inheritance.

Throughout the development of Mary's early public image, her representation was shaped by the continued hopes for a male heir. Reluctant to address the issue of a female successor, portrayals of her tended to downplay her royal standing and dynastic significance. Thus her first appearance on canvas provided assurance of her parents' fertility and their future production of a prince, rather than of her own birthright. At the same time, aware of her potential importance as a Protestant heir, those responsible for her portrayal cultivated a *persona* which distanced the young Princess from both her Catholic father and dissolute uncle, presenting her as morally upright, chaste and pious. Here, were laid the foundations of her later iconography, both as princess and queen. Alongside these images, Mary's representation increasingly focused on her potential fruitfulness. Presented as a future bride and mother, her portraits display a surprising sensuality. With little deference to her own status, they portrayed her as the fertile source of a long-awaited Stuart prince. In the period immediately following her marriage to William of Orange, it was felt necessary to reaffirm Mary's Protestant and virtuous credentials, as well as to emphasise the political repercussions of the match. An intensive propaganda campaign was waged, encompassing spectacle, literature and the visual arts. She was celebrated as a precious trophy, while the union was lauded as an international alliance. Yet, throughout, her representation seems exemplary - influenced by concept rather than personality. Mary's public image continued to develop at the Orange Court. As her political standing advanced she became increasingly conscious of her position and responsibilities. Her portraiture reflects this, portraying her with an air of self-confidence, composure and command. Behind this image, however, the preoccupation with the male heir remains and it is her husband who is put forward to fill that void. Thus Mary's early portrayal prized virtue over power. Her public image presented her as the ideal

courtly woman - devout, serene and chaste. Traditional patriarchal attitudes and the limitations of the seventeenth-century artistic vocabulary prevented the development of her distinct representation as heir.

VI

Following the death of William, Duke of Gloucester, the British public were faced with two potential heirs – an aged Protestant princess and a young Catholic prince. Neither candidate was ideal. Sophia, Electress of Hanover, claimed royal Stuart descent through her mother, Elizabeth of Bohemia. Although she was the nearest Protestant heir to the throne (her accession had been considered as early as 1689),¹²⁷ fifty-four Roman Catholic claimants, with closer blood-ties, were passed over.¹²⁸ She was not ignorant of the implications of this. The Earl of Aylesbury reported that on meeting her at Brussels in 1700, “she told me that a crown was glittering, and with a sigh added, ‘but it would be still more if it arrived by a natural succession’.”¹²⁹ Her rival was James, exiled Prince of Wales, son of the deposed James II. Abbé Rizzini, a representative of the d’Este interests at Saint-Germain, explained the significance of the Duke of Gloucester’s death for Prince James’ restoration:

“The consternation is great in London, because the difficulties are foreseen as to finding a legitimate substitute with any right to the succession, to the exclusion of the legitimate king, and his incontestable heir, the Prince of Wales. By the death of the Duke, the Prince is freed from the most formidable rival he had.”¹³⁰

Many now believed that the main obstacle barring the Prince of Wales from the succession had been removed. Mary of Modena commented: “As for the death of the young Prince, it

¹²⁷ Burnet, 1875. p. 533.

¹²⁸ Hatton, 1978. p. 74.

¹²⁹ Buckley (ed.), 1890. p. 495.

¹³⁰ Haile, 1905. p. 343.

has produced no visible change as yet, but of necessity it must do so, and perhaps sooner than is expected here.”¹³¹ Thus, as an anonymous print, published around 1702 (See Figure 79), demonstrates, the future of the English throne was caught up in uncertainty once again. Here, Britannia and Fame sit at the bottom of what is, literally, the Stuart family tree. A portrait of James I is positioned above the trunk, while foliage, roses and thistles surround portraits of the Stuart monarchs, with Queen Anne’s likeness in the centre. At the top of the image the two claimants are depicted; Sophia on the left and James on the right. The print favours neither party, makes no judgment: it simply presents the dilemma.

Following the Duke’s death, both sides were quick to react. In October 1700 Sophia visited William III in Holland to discuss the English succession, although she continued to downplay her claim and recommended Prince James as a more suitable heir.¹³² Meanwhile, the whole Jacobite Court, with the exception of the King and Queen, went into mourning, with the French court offering to perform the same gesture a little later.¹³³ Rizzini explained the reasoning behind these actions: “The tender age of the prince, prevented him from having any share in the crime of rebellion, and usurpation against his grandfather, as was the case with the Princess of Orange, and should not be debarred from the marks of respect due to his rank.”¹³⁴ Political prudence, however, was also undoubtedly an important consideration. Such a symbolic gesture might ease relations with Whitehall and bring the Prince closer to his birthright. Visual culture was also employed in the campaign to advertise and assert his claim. Just over a fortnight after the Duke’s death, Norbert Roettiers was charged with the completion of seven thousand medals of the Prince of Wales for distribution in Britain.¹³⁵ Meanwhile, another portrait of him was commissioned from François de Troy and sent to

¹³¹ *Ibid.* 29th August, 1700. p. 344.

¹³² Kroll, 1973. p. 200; Hatton, 1978. pp. 73-4.

¹³³ *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland: preserved at Welbeck Abbey, 1891-1931*. Vol. IV, p. 4; p. 6.

¹³⁴ Haile, 1905. p. 344.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.* p. 343.

Sophia (1700, Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum, Hanover, Germany). It is a variation of the single figure composition of James (See Figure 32), with the Prince this time pointing to his left. There can be little doubt that this diplomatic gift sought to remind the Electress of the young heir whose rightful place she would usurp, if she were to accept the crown.¹³⁶

In March 1701 the Act of Settlement was passed, determining that Sophia and the heirs of her body were to be next in line (after Princess Anne) to the English throne and that, henceforth, the sovereign would be obliged to join in communion with the Church of England.¹³⁷ In September, James II died and France, Spain, Portugal, and most of the Italian States acknowledged his son as King of England.¹³⁸ In a matter of months, Prince James' claim to the throne had been both legally disqualified in Britain and officially recognised throughout much of Europe. Despite her former altruism, Sophia was indignant when Louis XIV proclaimed the Prince, King James III.¹³⁹ One month before, her standing as heir had been underlined by a special embassy sent by William III.¹⁴⁰ John Toland, the self-appointed "literary champion of the Protestant succession"¹⁴¹ described the reception of the English delegation as "extraordinary magnificent."¹⁴² The climax of the diplomatic visit was Sophia's presentation with a copy of the Act of Settlement and the installation of her son, George Louis, Elector of Hanover, to the Order of the Garter. William's envoy, the Earl of Macclesfield, rode in a full carriage procession to Herrenhausen, where Sophia received him under a canopy in her presence chamber. He knelt before her, kissed her hand and presented

¹³⁶ It is interesting to note that the Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum in Hanover also has an anonymous portrait of Princess Anne, approximately dated to 1700. This may indicate that both sides were simultaneously employing portraiture to press their cases with the Hanoverian Court.

¹³⁷ Luttrell, 1857. Vol. V, 11th March, 1701. p. 26.

¹³⁸ Corp, 2001. p. 40.

¹³⁹ Hatton, 1978. p. 75.

¹⁴⁰ Kroll, 1973. p. 200.

¹⁴¹ Ward, 1886. p. 490.

¹⁴² Toland, 1705. p. 58.

her with the red leather *etui* containing the Act.¹⁴³ That evening a ball was held with “a splendid appearance of Ladys.”¹⁴⁴

Among the gifts presented to Macclesfield and his entourage were several images of the Electress and her family. The Earl was presented with a miniature of Sophia, mounted with the electoral crown and set in diamonds.¹⁴⁵ Toland received a number of gold medals, as well as “the Queen of Prussia, the Electress, the Elector and the young Prince’s Pictures done in oil colours and very like.”¹⁴⁶ Through these visual representations, the Hanoverians asserted their rights and prerogative, while presenting themselves to their future subjects across the Channel. The medals presented to Toland were probably casts of the so-called *Matilda Medal* (1701, See Figure 80), commissioned by Sophia and executed by Samuel Lambelet. Also produced in silver and copper, this design stressed her hereditary descent from the English royal line, both recent and ancient. The obverse displays a bust in profile of the Electress, her hair piled high at the front and covered at the back with her widow’s mourning hood. The legend reads: “Sophia, of the family of the Elector Palatine, grand-daughter of James I, King of Great Britain, widow of Ernest Augustus, Elector of Brunswick and Luneburg, Princess nominated to the succession of England, 1701.” On the reverse is a representation of Princess Matilda (1156-89), Duchess of Saxony, accompanied by the following inscription: “Matilda, Daughter of Henry II, King of England, wife of Henry the Lion, Duke of Bavaria and Saxony, mother of Otho IV, Emperor, previously Duke of Aquitaine, of Henry, Count Palatine of the Rhine, Duke of Saxony and of William, founder of the House of Brunswick.”¹⁴⁷ Thus the medal stressed the royal links between England and the Guelphs but more particularly it underlined the distinction of Sophia’s lineage and of that

¹⁴³ Kroll, 1973. p. 200.

¹⁴⁴ Toland, 1705. p. 61.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* p. 62.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.* p. 63.

¹⁴⁷ Matilda, Duchess of Saxony, was the daughter of Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine and grand-daughter of Empress Matilda and Geoffrey Plantagenet, Count of Anjou.

her own family. She was the direct descendant of the first Stuart king, while both her father and husband claimed descent from the House of Plantagenet through Matilda. The association with Matilda had another significance, however, for just as she had been the source of lines of emperors, counts palatine and dukes, so too, would Sophia be the mother of a new dynasty of kings. This image of Sophia as the bestower of future heirs is repeated in Toland's report of a conversation with the Electress where she confided that "she was afraid the nation had already repented their Choice of an old Woman but that she hop'd none of her Posterity would give them any Reasons to grow weary of their Dominion."¹⁴⁸ Thus, here, Sophia's representation focussed on her as the matriarch of a flourishing royal house.

Public interest in the Electress and the need to introduce England's new heiress presumptive appear to have resulted in the execution of a number of engravings of her.¹⁴⁹ One portrait print, published by John Bowles (c.1701, See Figure 81), is helpful for establishing the general manner of her depiction. Copied from an original painting, brought to Britain from Hanover by Thomas, Baron Raby, it shows Sophia wrapped in an ermine cloak, with her high-piled curls once more under a widow's veil. These two attributes recur in a great number of her engraved portrayals, as do variations of the inscription, informing the viewer that Sophia had been "declared by a late Act of Parliament for settling the Succession in the Protestant line to succeed to the Crown of England after Her Ma(jes)tie Queen Ann and her Royal Issue."¹⁵⁰ Therefore, this image, and its counterparts, emphasised her Protestantism, constitutional authority and royal inheritance, again presenting her as a noble

¹⁴⁸ Toland, 1705. p. 69.

¹⁴⁹ See for example, John Smith's *The Most Illustrious Princess Sophia Electrice Dowager of Brunswick* (c.1706). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; William Faithorne the Younger's *The Most Illustrious Anna Sophia of Hanover* (c.1702). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; and Bernard Lens II's *The Most Illustrious Anna Sophia of Hanover* (c.1702). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

¹⁵⁰ See those engravings listed in footnote 145. See also Johann Stridbeck II's *Sophia, Electress of Hanover* (c.1702); Anon., *The true Effigies of the most Illustrious Princess Sophia of Hannover* (c.1702). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; and William Sherwin's *Princess Anna Sophia of Hannover* (c.1702). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

matron. Indeed, although Sophia's faith was a virtue, as a Calvinist, her approval and acceptance of the Anglican Church was of real significance. Toland's rather obsequious account describes the ease and enthusiasm with which she heard the Book of Common Prayer,¹⁵¹ while the Electress, herself, commissioned the publication of two sermons by Church of England clergymen who had preached before her.¹⁵² Toland was in no doubt about where her natural disposition lay: "The Electress is so entirely English in her Humor, and all her Inclinations, that naturally she cou'd not miss of anything which peculiarly belongs to our Iland."¹⁵³ Thus the portrayal of Britain's new heiress underlined both her faith and legitimacy. The representational problems created by her age and sex were countered through emphasising her position as royal dowager, matriarch and as the source of a thriving posterity. Unfortunately, her image was to be self-fulfilling. She died in 1714, just two months before the death of Queen Anne. Sophia's legacy to her Hanoverian descendants was the British throne which she had been denied.

VII

The effects of the deaths of Stuart princes were long-lasting. The image of the youthful Protestant warrior promised stability and security; with its loss the dynasty was obliged to develop new modes of representation, also capable of communicating reassuring messages about the future. Despite these unsettling events, the house had to be seen to adapt and withstand. Often this process had to be negotiated assiduously and the resulting images had varying degrees of success. The resilience and continuity of the Stuart line was articulated through a series of images which depicted family members united, despite the rift

¹⁵¹ Toland, 1705. p. 62.

¹⁵² See Andrew Snape, *A Sermon Preach'd Before the Princess Sophia at Hannover* (Cambridge, 1706); Daniel Lombard, *A Sermon Preach'd at Hanover Before Her Royal Highness the Late Princess Sophia* (Oxford, 1714).

¹⁵³ Toland, 1705. p. 67.

of death. The surviving Stuarts were shown strengthening and increasing the royal line, while the deceased were portrayed unchanged and unforgotten. Alongside these depictions of the enduring and prevailing dynasty, the royal house had to address the representation of those left behind, the new heirs. Yet amidst the disappointment and anxiety of these losses, it could prove difficult for those next in line to fashion their own appealing and discrete *persona*. The memories and thwarted expectations of their predecessors inevitably influenced the portrayal of survivors. Thus Prince Charles, Henry Frederick's younger brother, was cast in the uneasy mould of his popular sibling. His representation was an inherited image which simplified, misrepresented and distorted the militant Protestantism which Henry had espoused. Accompanied by pressures to uphold his father's policies and interests, what emerged was ambiguous and indistinct. Yet for those unable to conform to the established model of Stuart princely representation, the creation of a successful cultural portrayal was even more challenging. The fixation with the production of a male heir impacted upon the representation of Mary II as princess. The repeated deaths of her brothers and a general reluctance to develop and manage her representation as heiress, resulted in a portrayal which emphasised her prescribed standing as daughter, wife and potential mother. Throughout she was cast with implicit reference to the men in her life. The death of William, Duke of Gloucester, created even more uncertainty. The public were presented with two possible successors, yet neither prospect was altogether appealing. Prince James' Catholicism proved an impenetrable barrier to his accession. Electress Sophia's faith was undoubtedly her greatest asset but her age and sex were problematic. Thus her representation focussed on her as the noble matriarch of a new line of kings. Neither heir was destined to rule and, instead, Sophia's son, George I, became the first Hanoverian monarch – an accession which was to create its own political and representational difficulties.¹⁵⁴ Thus, despite their efforts, it proved extremely difficult

¹⁵⁴ See Ragnhild Hatton, *George I, Elector and King* (London, 1978).

for the Stuart dynasty to recover from the premature deaths of princes. Prolonged apprehensions and uncertainties bred the rose-tinted nostalgia which promoted their enduring appeal and memory.

Chapter 5

“The Temple of Fame”: Enduring Memories

I

In February 1703 a rather singular engraving was published by Henry Playford:

“The Effigies of Four Protestant Princes, viz. King *Edward VI*th; *Henry*, Prince of *Wales*, Son of King *James I*st; *Henry*, Duke of *Gloucester*, Son of King *Charles I*st; *William*, Duke of *Gloucester*, Son to Her Present Majesty, Queen *Anne*.”¹

The resulting image (1703, See Figure 82), engraved by Simon Gribelin, showed the Princes’ portraits inside suspended medallions, each likeness derived from a contemporary portrait of the sitter. Edward’s portrayal was based upon that of Hans Holbein the Younger, Henry Frederick’s upon that of Isaac Oliver, Henry, Duke of Gloucester’s upon that of Simon Luttichuys and William, Duke of Gloucester’s upon that of Godfrey Kneller. At the bottom of the print, behind the portrait of William, is the top of a carved tomb, bearing, on its right side, symbols of mortality - a scythe, an hourglass and some wilting roses. On its left is a skull, crowned with laurel. Foliage springs from behind the portraits and a banner above reads: “Wee Reign in Heaven.” The composition, therefore, constitutes a strong visual statement of regret for what might have been, while, simultaneously, proclaiming that death is not the end. It infers that, denied their birthright on earth, these Princes have triumphed over mortality and, instead, rule in Paradise. Indeed, as the engraving also amply illustrates, ninety years after the demise of Henry, Prince of Wales, and over forty years after that of Henry, Duke of

¹ *Term Catalogue*. Vol. III, p. 336.

Gloucester, their images lived on and continued to hold a special allure. In early February an advertisement in the *Postboy* for a published *List of the Royal Navy of England in the year 1702*, sold from Playford's shop, also advised that here "are to be had the Effigies of the 4 young Protestant Princes neatly Engrav'd."² Again the Protestantism of these royal youths is emphasised, while their immaturity is also underlined. With the end of the Stuart line impending after the death of Queen Anne, this print mourned those whose survival could have changed its future. By implication, it also underscored the deficiencies of those who might claim the throne - Sophia of Hanover and the Jacobite king, James III. As the engraving highlights, the ideal of the young British Protestant prince was unattainable and, instead, the public was presented with the prospect of a foreign royal line or, even worse, a Catholic one.³ Thus it demonstrates the perceived impact of the loss of Stuart heirs, the effects of which were to prove long-lasting. It also exemplifies the nostalgia which surrounded their posthumous representation and which would contribute to the "cult" of the lost prince.

The retrospective turn evident in Gribelin's image was not an isolated occurrence. Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, images and texts revived the memory of deceased Stuart princes. Often the recurrence of their images coincided with political events which highlighted the loss of their person or principles. Thus representations of Henry, Prince of Wales, frequently emerged at times when Protestantism was seen to be under threat, while depictions of William, Duke of Gloucester, were principally associated with the end of the Protestant Stuart line. As such, their images came to embody an apparently incompatible combination of both promise and loss. Their portrayal was idealised, as was the alternate future which they represented. Yet, behind this, reality loomed large. The endurance of their

² *Post Boy*, Issue 1204, 30th January-2nd February, 1703. p. 2.

³ See pp. 193-99.

memory demonstrates the powerful appeal which the image of the Protestant warrior prince held. Analysis of the development of their representations, in the years and decades following their demise, reveals a complex and evolving process, through which the public came to terms with these losses. It also provides insight into an involved dialogue, evincing the articulation, reception and manipulation of early modern memory.

II

Of all the princes here examined, none can rival the sustained hold which Henry Frederick's image exerted over the public consciousness. Michael Ullyot's doctoral research describes three stages of public mourning for the Prince: incomprehension, confirmation and rationalisation.⁴ Indeed, it is clear from Richard Brathwaite's poem, *Upon the illustre Prince Henrie* (1614), which speaks of the author's "long meditated teares", that the process of acceptance and reconciliation was both slow and emotionally demanding.⁵ What emerged from these pains, however, was a new, potent conception of Henry as a paragon of virtuous and princely living. Ullyot identifies the beginnings of this transition in the elegies and epitaphs written after the Prince's death but also states that this legacy was short-lived, asserting that Henry's exemplarity was limited, continuing only as long as historical memories and poetic influences remained.⁶ Ullyot's research concludes in the 1620s; yet Henry's posthumous image maintained its powerful appeal through and well beyond the seventeenth century. Literary and artistic representations of the Prince were printed and re-printed throughout the decades and centuries following his death. The motivations behind the recurrence of his image are diverse; however, the persistence of Henry's idealised biography with its sustained emphasis on select exemplary virtues is striking for its endurance.

⁴ Ullyot, 2005. p. 86.

⁵ Brathwaite, 1614. p. 4.

⁶ Ullyot, 2005. p. 157; p. 214.

Henry's emergence as a paradigmatic British worthy was consolidated in the late 1610s and early 1620s with his inclusion in Henry Holland's illustrated *Baziliologia* (1618) and later, *Herwoologia Anglica* (1620).⁷ However, it was the publication in the 1630s and 1640s of biographies, written by members of his household and circle, which would prove most influential in the development of his posthumous image. Here, distilled into pamphlet-form, were the model qualities and virtues which would remain largely unaltered in the following years and decades. Interest in the Prince re-emerged in the eighteenth century, with reprints of the earlier memoirs but also with the publication of Thomas Birch's carefully researched, *The Life of Henry, Prince of Wales* (1760).⁸ Several of these texts directed their observations and examples at a specifically royal audience, presenting their protagonist as a pattern for princely conduct, while the inclusion of his character in religious and moral instruction books cast Henry, more generally, as a template for youthful virtue.⁹ Of course, amidst the eulogising, it was impossible to escape the inexplicable tragedy of Henry's fate and these testimonials also lamented the vanished hopes which the young Prince had embodied. Henry's biography was cautionary and became a byword for misfortune and lost promise. Nevertheless, the persistence and continuity of his portrayal demonstrates the ultimate power and appeal of his *persona*. In the decades and centuries after his death Henry came to represent the ideal British prince, an apotheosis, invested with expectations and hopes which, for a variety of reasons, could never be realised.

⁷ See Henry Holland, *Baziliologia, a Booke of Kinges Beeing the True and Lively Effigies of All Our English Kinges from the Conquest untill [sic] this Present* (London, 1618); and Henry Holland, *Herwoologia Anglica* (Arnhem, 1620).

⁸ See Thomas Birch, *The Life of Henry, Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I* (London, 1760).

⁹ For texts addressing a royal audience, see Thomas Birch, *The Life of Henry, Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I* (London, 1760); and Charles Cornwallis, *A Discourse of the Most Illustrious Henry, Late Prince of Wales* (1641, London). For texts focussing on youthful virtue, see Anon., *Early blossoms of Genius and Virtue; Including Maxims of Early Wisdom, Juvenile Memoirs, a Great Variety of Examples of the Moral Virtues* (London, 1797); and Samuel Crossman, *The Young Man's Calling* (London, 1713).

Early texts such as Daniel Price's sermon, *Prince Henry his Second Anniversary* (1614), and Henry Peacham's poem, *Prince Henry Revived* (1615), went some way in establishing Henry Frederick's representation as an exemplary worthy.¹⁰ However, it was his appearance in two later works, alongside other well-known models of nobility, which confirmed his paradigmatic status. *Baziliologia or A Booke of Kinges Beeing The True and Lively Effigies of all our English Kings from the Conquest until this present*, first published in 1618, was masterminded by brothers, Henry and Compton Holland.¹¹ Originally issued as an unbound set of engraved portraits of the Kings (and selected Queens) of England, with a separate title-page, it dominated British portrait print production at the end of the decade.¹² The initial series probably consisted of twenty-six royal portraits. However, it would appear that separate engravings of the same type were subsequently issued and routinely included in collectors' editions.¹³ Portraits of Edward, the Black Prince; John of Gaunt; Mary, Queen of Scots; Prince Charles (the future Charles I); and Henry, Prince of Wales, were published by the Hollands and frequently added to the series proper. Thus the scope and significance of the set was subject to reinterpretation and change. An 1847 Sotheby's sales catalogue of portrait engravings in the collection of Lieutenant-Colonel Durrant, illustrates this modification of the *Baziliologia's* intended reading:

“Early British Portraits
Intituled
The Baziliologia
Or
Book of Kings and *Eminent Men* During the

¹⁰ See Daniel Price, *Prince Henry his Second Anniversary* (London, 1614) and Henry Peacham, *Prince Henry Revived* (London, 1615) - written for the birth of Prince Frederick Henry of the Palatinate.

¹¹ Hind, 1955. Vol.II, p. 115.

¹² Griffiths, 1998. p. 49.

¹³ Levis, 1913. p. 105.

Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.”¹⁴

Thus, for some collectors the series was re-contextualised as a portrait set of worthies.

Of the ten extant copies, analysed in H.C. Levis’ study of the *Baziliologia*’s various manifestations, six contain the engraving of Henry, executed by Frances Delaram (c.1618, See Figure 83).¹⁵ Like the standard series, the portrait was sold by Compton Holland and is presented within a decorated, framed oval (in this case reminiscent of the paste-board shields used in tournaments), accompanied by *impresse* and devices. Crowning the frame are the feathered insignia and motto of the Prince of Wales, flanked on either side by assortments of weaponry and armour. The likeness itself shows him attired in Garter robes, with chain and George prominently displayed and holding a military baton in his right hand.¹⁶ Thus, Henry, who did not live to see military action, is portrayed as a warrior prince and noble general, decked in his robes of honour. Whereas each of the other engravings - with the exception of that of his mother, Anne of Denmark - is supplemented by a brief biography, Henry’s image is accompanied by a poem. Its contents underline this martial aspect:

“He that the LIFE of this FACE ever Sawe
The MILDNES in it noting and the AWE:
Will judge that PEACE did either in her LOVE
So soone advance HIM to her STATE above;
Or else in FEARE that HE wold (sic) WARRE prefer
Concluded with HIM, HE should LIVE with HER.”

The exact meaning of this verse is, perhaps, intentionally ambiguous. Repeated on a number of later engravings of the Prince, it may be interpreted as expressing both remorse and relief

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 2. The italics are my own.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 101.

¹⁶ Henry’s portrait is based upon Cornelis Boel’s engraving (c.1612). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London. This image is, in turn, derived from Isaac Oliver’s miniature of the Prince in armour (1610-12). Royal Collection, London.

that Henry's warlike passions had been contained.¹⁷ This ambiguity may have been considered prudent. Henry's father, James I, is represented both in his own portrait plate and on the original frontispiece to the *Baziliologia*. With the King determinedly pursuing a course of diplomacy in the face of increasing political instability across Europe, following the outbreak of the Thirty Years War and with mounting pressure from some of his own subjects to take up arms, those seeking royal pleasure were well advised to abstain from voicing contrary views to James' own policies.¹⁸ Thus Henry's portrayal has been carefully constructed, with his militant image both emphasised visually and abated textually. His subsequent representations would not be so enigmatic.

Henry Holland's next ambitious set of portraits was *Herologia Anglica* (1620). Unlike the *Baziliologia*, it was conceived as a discrete unit - a book containing a series of brief biographies in Latin by Holland, accompanied by engraved likenesses.¹⁹ Here was a collection of modern English Protestant worthies, from Henry VIII to Thomas Holland, the Oxford theologian. The political context in which the *Herologia* was created had changed significantly from that of the *Baziliologia*. In consequence, the restraint evident in Holland's earlier depiction of Henry Frederick, was replaced by unremitting bravura. On the Continent the position of Frederick V, Elector Palatine, and now King of Bohemia, had become critical.²⁰ With the Catholic League advancing on Prague, calls were becoming increasingly vocal for James I to send troops to defend his son-in-law's territories and to protect Protestant interests.²¹ Holland had visited the court of Frederick and his wife, Elizabeth (Prince Henry's sister), shortly after their marriage and was also closely associated with John, Lord

¹⁷ See Renold Elstracke's posthumous full length engraving, *The Most High and Mighty Prince Henry* (c.1620). Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London; and *Henry, Prince of Wales, Practicing with the Pike* (1620), from *Herologia Anglica*, attributed to Willem or Magdalena de Passe. Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London.

¹⁸ Webster, 2003. p. 258.

¹⁹ Wilks, 2007. p. 202.

²⁰ *Ibid.* p. 203.

²¹ Smuts, 2002. p. 383.

Harington, who had been entrusted with Elizabeth's care after her father's accession to the English throne.²² It is safe to assume that this political and military crisis touched the author personally and, nailing his colours to the mast, his rhetoric was altered accordingly.

Of all those represented in *Herwologia Anglica*, only Elizabeth I received more attention than Prince Henry, who has seven pages devoted to him, with three engravings. The special relationship between text and image is of particular interest. Holland's biography is prefaced by a portrait of Henry in armour within a roundel, attributed to Willem or Magdalena de Passe (1620, See Figure 84). The angularity of the Prince's physiognomy has been softened, his eyes enlarged and his countenance sweetened.²³ Having embarked on a description of Henry's "brilliant virtues", Holland invites the reader to view his portrait and to see his qualities displayed in his outward appearance.²⁴ He directs the viewer to discern Henry's piety, like that of Josiah; his wisdom, like that of Solomon; his learning and courage, like that of Caesar and Alexander.²⁵ Again, he encourages the viewer to observe his martial prowess, akin to Cyrus the Great; his intellectual skills, akin to King Ptolemy; and finally, his graceful form, reminiscent of another Adonis.²⁶

The use of the accompanying images as visual aids continues as the text goes on. The next engraving is a copy of one of Henry Frederick's most iconic images, *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* (1620, See Figure 85), originally published as a frontispiece to Michael Drayton's *Poly-olbion* (1612).²⁷ It shows Henry, full-length and in profile, with his pike charged, pointing beyond the borders of the print. The illustration is accompanied by

²² Wilks, 2007. p. 201.

²³ Henry's portrait is again based upon Cornelis Boel's engraving – see footnote 16.

²⁴ Holland, 1620. p. 46. With thanks to Dr. Peter Murray and Dr. Adam Bunni for their assistance with the Latin and Greek text.

²⁵ *Ibid.* p46.

²⁶ *Ibid.* p46.

²⁷ For further discussion of the development and recurrence of this image, see pp. 224-8.

two separate verses. At the bottom left of the plate, a short poem in Latin, repeated from the first portrait, states:

“The Hope of his father and of his fatherland. Taken by destiny before his time. I forsake tears and useless prayers.”²⁸

Beside this, in English, is the same verse which accompanied Henry’s earlier representation in the *Baziliologia*, supplemented by two new concluding lines:

“To both HIS aptness ffluentlie apeares;
In evrie SOLDIERS griefe SCHOLLERS teares.”²⁹

The addition of these lines lends the verse a far more emphatic tone, which positively bewails the loss of this militant prince and patron of the arts. This bombastic strain is developed by the corresponding text of Holland’s biography, which insists that not only should Britain weep for this Prince’s loss but that all of Europe’s Protestant nations should join in his mourning.³⁰ Holland continues, affirming that, before all the Princes of the Christian world, Henry would have scaled the walls of the Holy See, the undoubted seat of the Anti-Christ.³¹ He then directs the reader to look closely at the engraving and see Henry “skilfully depicted, twisting and brandishing his spear against Rome.”³² The author brings these passages to a close with a consideration of his funeral and again bids the reader to contemplate one final image, a representation of Henry’s hearse, after William Hole’s original of 1613.³³ Thus Holland’s narrative features all the principal characteristics which would become central to the Prince’s posthumous representation – his martial spirit, his rigorous Protestantism and the

²⁸ Holland, 1620. p. 48

²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 48. I have corrected the mis-spellings and mis-spacing present in the original print, no doubt due to the engraver’s unfamiliarity with English. The original text reads: To both, HIS aptness ffluentlie apeares; In evrie SOLDIER S griefeSCHOLLEES teares.”

³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 47.

³¹ *Ibid.* p. 47.

³² *Ibid.* p. 47.

³³ *Ibid.* p. 51. See *The Effigy and Hearse of Henry, Prince of Wales* (1620), attributed to Willem or Magdalena de Passe. National Portrait Gallery, London. For William Hole’s image see Figure 53.

woeful loss inflicted by his death. His forceful text establishes Henry as an English paragon, an exemplary character fit to be emulated. It also introduces the model to which later biographies would repeatedly subscribe. What is more, the complex and complementary relationship between text and image imbues the visual portraits with added meaning. Holland's rhetoric would influence readings of these iconic representations for decades to come.

It is important to consider one final text as instrumental in the early development of Henry's posthumous representation. Published in various forms throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it was the first extensive and detailed biography of the Prince, authored by an individual with close ties to his court.³⁴ Study of this text raises as many questions as it answers but analysis of its content, dissemination and reception is crucial to an understanding of the evolution of Henry's image. Written in 1613, *The Life and Death of our Late Most Incomparable and Heroic Prince, Henry*, was first circulated in manuscript form under different titles.³⁵ The existence of several copies in the same secretary hand, layout and binding indicates that it was the subject of, what Harold Love has termed, "entrepreneurial" scribal publication.³⁶ According to Love's definition, these manuscript books were created as an edition of multiple copies by a professional scribe and

³⁴ See for example, scribal publications such as A Copie of a Letter Sent unto a Certaine Friend. B.L. Add MS 11532; Account of The Life and Death of Henry, Prince of Wales. B.L. Add MS 30075; and Prince Henry His Life Death and Funerall. N.L.S. Adv. MS 33.7.14. See also Charles Cornwallis (attrib.), *The Life and Death of our Late Most Incomparable and Heroique Prince, Henry* (London, 1641); Charles Cornwallis (attrib.), *The Short Life and Much Lamented Death of that Most Magnanimous Prince, Henry, Prince of Wales* (London, 1644); Charles Cornwallis (attrib.), *An Account of the Baptism, Life, Death and Funeral of the most incomparable Prince, Frederick Henry* (London, 1751); Charles Cornwallis (attrib.), *The Life and Death of our Late Most Incomparable and Heroic Prince, Henry* in John Somers (ed.), *A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts*. Vol. II (London, 1809).

³⁵ See footnote 34. A Copie of a Letter Sent unto a Certaine Friend (B.L. Add MS 11532) bears the date 1613.

³⁶ Love, 1993. p. 74. See Account of The Life and Death of Henry, Prince of Wales. B.L. Add MS 30075; Prince Henry His Life Death and Funerall. N.L.S. Adv. MS 33.7.14; and Prince Henrie His Life, Death and Funerall. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Osborn MS b431. The original binding is preserved in the British Library and National Library of Scotland versions. It is particularly fine - vellum, gilt inlaid, decorated with cherubs' heads and tied with blue ribbons.

commissioned by a commercial dealer.³⁷ Even in the early seventeenth century scribal transmission was common-place and often chosen without any belief in its being inferior to the printing press.³⁸ Entrepreneurial publication was “strongly opposed to any notion of authorial control over distribution” – a fact corroborated by the creation and circulation of these manuscripts.³⁹ Copies in the British Library and the National Library of Scotland leave little indication as to the authorship of the text, although they do provide information which proves useful in establishing their date. Both versions contain a trimmed engraved portrait of Henry Frederick, pasted opposite the title page.⁴⁰ Taken from Holland’s *Baziliologia* (See Figure 83), its presence strongly suggests that the books were produced no earlier than 1618. The dedication of the N.L.S. copy is also helpful. Here, a certain John Woodward offers his service to “James Douglas Esquire one of his Ma(jes)ties Seecretaries [sic] for the Kingdome of Scotland.”⁴¹ An entry for 1648 in *The Register of the Great Seal of Scotland* records a James Douglas, second son of William Douglas of Whittinghame and secretary to James VI.⁴² If this is the James Douglas of the dedication, it provides an end date of 1625, when James VI and I died.⁴³ Thus these versions of *The Life and Death* represent a later edition, originating from between 1618 and 1625, with a date in the early 1620s most likely.

³⁷ Love, 1993. p. 44; p. 74. The National Library of Scotland possesses several other manuscript books, written in the same hand. See *The Life and Tragedy of the roiall Lady Mary, late Queen of Scotts* (Adv. MS 19.3.3) presented in the same binding; *The Life Araignment and Death of the famous and learned, Sir Thomas More* (Adv. MS 33.7.16); and a larger quarto, again in the same binding, *The Alphabet of Honnor: or The Succession and Armes of the Kinges, Princes, Dukes, Marquesses, Earls, Barons, and Gentry of England since the Conquest* (Adv. MS 31.3.19). This would appear to confirm that these manuscripts were the product of a professional scribe, working commercially - probably in a scriptorium.

³⁸ *Ibid.* p. 35.

³⁹ *Ibid.* p. 74.

⁴⁰ *Account of The Life and Death of Henry, Prince of Wales.* B.L. Add MS 30075. f. 2r.; *Prince Henry His Life Death and Funeralles.* N.L.S. Adv MS 33.7.14. f. 2r.

⁴¹ *Prince Henry His Life Death and Funeralles.* N.L.S. Adv MS 33.7.14. f. 2r.

⁴² *Registrum Magni Sigilli, 1634-51.* 1st November, 1648. Vol. 9, p. 742. Edinburgh University Library houses a collection of mathematical books, bequeathed in 1635 by James Douglas, secretary to James VI – see Jean R. Guild and Alexander Law (eds), *Edinburgh University Library 1580-1980: a Collection of Historical Essays* (Edinburgh, 1982). p. 48.

⁴³ Douglas is addressed as “one of his Ma(jes)ties Seecretaries.” If the dedication had been written following the death of King James, it would have referred to Douglas, specifically, as secretary to His Majesty, King James VI.

Tracing the authorship of the text presents even more problems. The first printed version was attributed to Sir Charles Cornwallis, treasurer of Prince Henry's household.⁴⁴ However, Cornwallis wrote his own *A Discourse of the Most Illustrious Henry, Late Prince of Wales* in 1626 (subsequently published in 1641). It is unlikely that he penned another biography.⁴⁵ What is more, Woodward's dedication informs the reader that the "proper Author" was already dead by the time this edition was transcribed.⁴⁶ Cornwallis died in 1629, so his involvement can, therefore, be discounted. The British Library copy has a short printed description affixed to the inside of the binding, stating that it is the "Autograph manuscript of the compiler" and that the author, John Hawkins, was no doubt a medical doctor and the same person who published *de Melancholia Hypochondriaca*, at Heidelberg in 1633.⁴⁷ This identification stems from the dedication by John Hawkins to Thomas Chapman.⁴⁸ Roy Strong has also seized upon the identity of the dedicator, affirming that there is no reason to "doubt that the author was a certain John Hawkins."⁴⁹ However, he identifies another John Hawkins - a whiffler and gunner at the Tower of London - as the probable author.⁵⁰ Strong's attribution has been accepted by a number of scholars and yet it is flawed.⁵¹ As has been shown, this document is not an autograph manuscript and the assumption of authorship, based solely on the dedication, is mistaken, since at least one other copy exists with a

⁴⁴ Charles Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. Sig. A1r.

⁴⁵ The collection of manuscripts belonging to Charles Cornwallis in the British Library (Add MS 39853) contains a copy of the *Discourse* but nothing which would appear to relate to *The Life and Death*.

⁴⁶ *Prince Henry His Life Death and Funeralls*. N.L.S. Adv. MS 33.7.14. f3v.

⁴⁷ Account of The Life and Death of Henry, Prince of Wales. B.L. Add MS 30075. See inside binding.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* f. 3v.

⁴⁹ Strong, 1986. p. 227.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* p. 227.

⁵¹ See Aysha Pollnitz, *Humanism and the Education of Henry, Prince of Wales*. p. 25; Gilles Bertheau, *Prince Henry as Chapman's 'Absolute Man'*. p. 143; Goldring, Elizabeth, 'So just a sorrowe so well expressed': *Henry, Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration*. p. 284 - all in Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (Southampton, 2007). See also Robin Headlam Wells, "'Manhood and Chevalrie': Coriolanus, Prince Henry and the Chivalric Revival" in *The Review of English Studies* (Vol. 51, No. 203, 2000). p. 400; and Henry Frederick's entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. 26 (Oxford, 2004). p. 563.

different dedicator.⁵² The attribution is also discredited by the fact that earlier copies of the text survive and that its contemporary version at the National Library of Scotland records the death of the author. Discounting candidates for its authorship is far simpler than proving them. Woodward states that: “The worke itself was committed unto me by the proper Author, since deceased, (though somewhat imperfect).”⁵³ What can be gauged from the earliest surviving copy is that the author was intent upon maintaining his anonymity. Somewhat deprecatingly, he claims that many were more qualified to write Henry’s biography,⁵⁴ but that this was the last duty of the Prince’s “Sometimes Unworthiest” servant.⁵⁵ The account’s tone and detail suggest that it was written by a member of the Prince’s household, with easy access to Henry and his circle. However, the author’s identity will remain supposition until a definitive attribution can be made, based upon new evidence or analysis of all the surviving manuscript accounts.

An important function of scribal publication was its ability to create communities of like-minded individuals.⁵⁶ The exchange of manuscript texts served to promote a shared set of values and to strengthen personal allegiances.⁵⁷ These social aspects of manuscript transmission and circulation are evident in the Hawkins and Woodward copies. Relationships of patronage and dependence are played out on their pages, with both dedicators pledging their service and, no doubt, also bidding for reward. Indeed, the fact that Woodward commissioned and dedicated another text to Douglas, *The Life and Tragedy of the roiall Lady*

⁵² Another manuscript in the N.L.S. collections, *The Life Araigment and Death of the famous and learned, Sir Thomas More* (Adv. MS 33.7.16), is dedicated by Hawkins to “Captaine Marmaduke Rawdon.” This would indicate that, like Woodward, Hawkins was employing gifts of manuscript texts to secure favour. It also provides further evidence that the attribution of Hawkins as author of *The Life and Death* is erroneous.

⁵³ Prince Henry His Life Death and Funeralles. N.L.S. Adv. MS 33.7.14. f. 3v.

⁵⁴ A Copie of a Letter Sent unto a Certaine Friend. B.L. Add MS 11532. f.3r.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* f. 1v.

⁵⁶ Love, 1993. p. 177.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* p. 177.

Mary, late Queen of Scotts (again in the same hand and distinctive binding), suggests that he was making a concerted effort to secure favour.⁵⁸ Meanwhile, Hawkins' address implores:

“Accept this favourably; soe shall your respective countenance both incourage and enable me to some better performance, wherein I shall ever resting (be) yo(ur) true honourer.”⁵⁹

While the identities of the dedicators and dedicatees remain murky, there is evidence to suggest that collectively they represent a circle with a shared personal interest in Henry's character and demise. Thomas Chapman may well have been the elder brother of the poet, George Chapman, who dedicated several works to the Prince and was appointed his sewer-in-ordinary around 1604.⁶⁰ Both Douglas and Chapman, therefore, had strong links to the royal household. That they were supporters of the Prince and the ideals he represented is evinced by the phrasing common to the dedications which introduced “that Princes memoriall, whose losse y(o)u can noe losse bewaile [more] than, y(o)u did love his person.”⁶¹ Equally, by selecting and presenting this text, Woodward and Hawkins have allied themselves with the Prince's values. Since these volumes were likely part of a larger edition of manuscript books, they demonstrate that, already, less than a decade after Henry's death, a strong retrospective interest in him was emerging.

From the outset, *The Life and Death* presents Henry as a paragon of virtuous and pious living: “Herein as in a transparent Mirroure, may every man behold the lively difference betwene a being and a well being.”⁶² Indeed, the prefaced “To the Reader” section labours

⁵⁸ See *The Life and Tragedy of the roiall Lady Mary, late Queen of Scotts*. N.L.S. Adv. MS 19.3.3.

⁵⁹ *Account of The Life and Death of Henry, Prince of Wales*. B.L. Add MS 30075. f. 3v.

⁶⁰ See the article on George Chapman in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004). Vol. 11, pp. 46-52. Strong, 1986. p. 130. Chapman's *Homer* (London, 1609?) and *The Iliads of Homer, Prince of Poets* (London, 1611) are dedicated to Henry. He also wrote *An epicede or funerall song on the most disastrous death, of the high-borne prince of men, Henry Prince of Wales* (London, 1612).

⁶¹ *Henry His Life Death and Funerall*. N.L.S. Adv MS 33.7.14. f. 2v; *Account of The Life and Death of Henry, Prince of Wales*. B.L. Add MS 30075. f. 2v.

⁶² *Ibid.* f. 3v; *Ibid.* f. 3v.

over the fact - lamenting the scarcity of such modern examples and committing Henry to a “Catalogue of famous Worthies”, who have earned immortality through their deeds.⁶³ As in the *Herwologia*, the author equates Henry to classical heroes, comparing him for “greatnesse of spirit” to Alexander and for his certain promise to Marcellus, Augustus’ nephew and heir, who also had died prematurely.⁶⁴ As the preamble concludes, it directs the readers, once more, to learn from the qualities and virtues described and to employ them as a template for their own improvement, for Henry’s biography was “the exemplar and patterne, what a great and good Man, nay a Prince was . . . as alsoe what a great and a good Man by the example of this Prince could be.”⁶⁵

The account which follows bears all the trademarks of Henry’s, already well defined, posthumous image, while providing a number of anecdotes and character sketches to which later biographers would repeatedly return. As usual, Henry is presented as a warrior prince, endowed with a martial spirit from infancy. The author informs us that, even from a tender age, no music was more pleasing to him than the sounding of the trumpet, beating of the drum and roar of the canon.⁶⁶ Over a hundred years later, when Birch wrote his account of Prince Henry’s life, he reused this commentary almost verbatim:

“Being asked very young what instrument of music he liked best? he answered a trumpet, in the sound of which, and of drums, and of small and great pieces or ordinance shot off near him, he took great delight.”⁶⁷

Similarly, his sobriety and strict piety is emphasised. The writer reports that in his fourteenth and fifteenth years he began to demonstrate a judgement and thoughtfulness beyond his

⁶³ *Ibid.* f. 3v; *Ibid.* f. 3v. This section is absent from later published editions.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* f. 4v; *Ibid.* f. 4v.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* f. 4v; *Ibid.* f. 4v.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* f. 6r; *Ibid.* f. 6r. Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. p. 6.

⁶⁷ Birch, 1760. p. 384. See also Samuel Crossman, *The Young Man’s Calling* (London, 1713). p. 287; and F.G.Waldron, *The biographical mirrour, comprising a series of ancient and modern English portraits, of eminent and distinguished persons* (London, 1798). Vol. II, p. 57.

years. He heard sermons with reverence and attentiveness and abhorred profanities, installing swearing boxes in Saint James, Richmond and Nonsuch, the proceeds of which were given to the poor.⁶⁸ Samuel Crossman's moral and religious instruction book, *The Young Man's Calling* (1713), faithfully recounts the same as a model of virtuous youthful conduct.⁶⁹ Henry is, again and again, praised for his masculinity, maturity and majestic bearing; lauded for his economy and charity, his love of learning and connoisseurship.⁷⁰ Concerning the Prince's faults, the author can venture none, "such a number of noble vertues did cover and wey downe the same, eclipsing their light, that they could not easely bee perceaved."⁷¹ Thus, while Prince Henry had already featured alongside other worthies and paragons, the creation and circulation of *The Life and Death of our Late Most Incomparable and Heroic Prince, Henry* represented a concerted effort to develop his biography and to establish further his exemplary credentials. The replication and transmission of manuscript copies in the years after its original authorship demonstrate that, in certain circles, Henry's allure persisted. The life of this text continued well beyond the 1620s, though. Its tone, descriptions and sketches would influence later biographers for over a century, while its general appeal would be recognised with its repeated publication.⁷² Thus, in the first decade after his death, the principal features of Henry's posthumous representation were already well formed. In the years following, those associated with his court would continue to shape his image. Their endeavours, however, would be addressed increasingly to those generations who had no memory of his passing.

⁶⁸ Henry His Life Death and Funeralles. N.L.S. Adv. MS 33.7.14. f.8v; Account of The Life and Death of Henry, Prince of Wales. B.L. Add MS 30075. f. 8v. Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. p. 11.

⁶⁹ Crossman, 1713. p. 288. See also p. 4 of the biography of Henry, Prince of Wales, contained in Edmund Lodge's *Portraits of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain*, Vol. IV (London, 1831).

⁷⁰ See, for example, Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. p. 8; p. 12; p. 18; p. 94; p. 98; p. 101 and *passim*.

⁷¹ Henry His Life Death and Funeralles. N.L.S. Adv. MS 33.7.14. f. 57v; Account of The Life and Death of Henry, Prince of Wales. B.L. Add MS 30075. f. 57v. Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. p. 102.

⁷² See footnote 34.

III

The 1630s and 1640s saw a resurgence of interest in the Prince, with the publication of a series of printed biographies. The first extended biography to be published was *The True Picture and Relation of Prince Henry* (1634), penned by W.H., who has been identified by William Brenchley Rye as William Haydon, a former senior groom of the Prince's bedchamber.⁷³ Dedicated to Henry's sister, Elizabeth, its forty-six pages detail his "Noble and Vertuous disposition" through specific examples of his conduct and speeches, concluding with another description of his illness and death.⁷⁴ The familiar representation of Henry as pious, martial, benevolent and judicious is reiterated. Haydon also devotes particular attention to the Prince's demeanour, regaling the reader with numerous examples of his masculinity and poise.⁷⁵ He illustrates his dignified bearing with the following anecdote:

"Being taught to handle the Pike, and his teacher instructing him both by word and example to use an affected kind of statelnesse in marching and holding of his hand, he learned all other points of him soo well (as all men know:) but in no wayes would he frame himselfe to that affected manner."⁷⁶

He continues that, although his master could dance better than any of his age and rank, he took little enjoyment from it.⁷⁷ Henry's decorum and self-control are highlighted again, when the author recalls how the Prince happened upon some of his household admiring a gentlewoman from afar. Reproaching them, he cautioned that looking leads to worse sins and, quoting from Psalm 119, admonished: "*Averte oculos tuos, ne videant vanitatem.*"⁷⁸ In effect, Haydon has positioned Henry as the epitome of the seventeenth-century "great man" -

⁷³ Rye, 1865. p. 451.

⁷⁴ Haydon, 1634. p. 1.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* p. 2; p. 5; p. 19; p. 25 and *passim*.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* p. 10.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* p. 10.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* p. 20. Psalm 119:37 actually reads "*Averte oculos meos, ne videant vanitatem.*" Henry's revised version can be translated as: "From bayse desires and worldly lusts turne back *your* eyes and sight", quoted from Hopkins, John, *The vvhole booke of Psalmes Collected into English meetre* (London, 1595). p. 73.

temperate and reserved in his manners.⁷⁹ His account is reminiscent of Henry Peacham's *The Compleat Gentleman* (1622), where the author advises that a noble carriage is dependent upon the "moderation of the minde wherewith, as a bridle wee curbe and breake our ranke and unruly Passions, keeping as the Caspian sea ever at one height without ebbe or refluxe."⁸⁰ Haydon's biography revived the Prince's idealised image, introducing his character to a new and wider audience, while enhancing and expanding upon his exemplary *persona*.

Why then, did he choose to issue his biography over twenty years after Henry's demise? In Britain, the distress and anxiety brought about by his passing had diminished with time. By 1634, Charles I had succeeded to his father's throne, married and fathered three surviving children. The Stuart dynasty appeared secure. Indeed, Haydon acknowledges this, beseeching God, in his infinite mercy, to "blesse and preserve our most noble King CHARLES, and the Royall family, without kindling his wrath any more against us."⁸¹ The motives behind its publication may well become clearer on consideration of its dedication:

"To the Most High and Peereles Elizabeth, Princesse of Great Britaine, Queene of Bohemia, Princesse Palatine, Duchesse of Bavaria, &c By Her Majesties Most Affectioned and Bound in All Humble Duty W.H."⁸²

In contrast with her younger brother, Elizabeth's position was precarious to say the least. Her husband's campaign to regain his Palatine territories and dignities had suffered a severe setback when Charles I entered into peace with Spain and concluded the Treaty of Madrid (1630), with no mention of the Palatinate.⁸³ The couples' fortunes further deteriorated with the death in battle of Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, the hero of European Protestantism, in

⁷⁹ Peacham, 1622. p. 5.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* p. 186.

⁸¹ Haydon, 1634. p. 32.

⁸² *Ibid.* sig. A1v.

⁸³ Oman, 2000. pp. 309-310.

whom they had placed high hopes for the recovery of their dominions.⁸⁴ Less than a fortnight later, Frederick V, himself, had succumbed to illness and the Queen found herself widowed.⁸⁵ Her focus now shifted from regaining the interests of her husband to asserting those of her son. Relations with her brother were soured in late 1633, however, when Sir Francis Nethersole, her secretary, caused a political outrage by publicly attacking the King's apparent disinclination to support his nephew's claims.⁸⁶ Thus by 1634 the Palatine cause had become politically side-lined, with Elizabeth and her family increasingly isolated. The fact that Haydon's text was published at Leyden suggests that he may have held a position at the *Prinsenhof*, where the Queen's large brood of children were brought up and educated.⁸⁷ It is possible that, with the publication of a biography, extolling the virtues of her deceased brother, the author sought to highlight the difficulties of his mistress. As has been shown, in the late 1610s and 1620s, Henry's representation was closely associated with the protection of European Protestantism and, especially, with the campaign to reinstate Elizabeth and her husband.⁸⁸ The appearance of an account of Henry's life and virtues, during a period of particular hardship for Elizabeth and her family, was most likely driven by political motivations. As Haydon observed of the Prince, he "made so many nations to admire him, and stand in feare of him."⁸⁹ With this text, it may well have been hoped that Henry's spirit would inspire future generations, re-invigorating support for the Palatine cause.

After Haydon's *True Picture*, two further biographies were issued in the 1640s. It seems likely that they were published in quick succession, with Sir Charles Cornwallis' *A Discourse of the Most Illustrious Prince, Henry Late Prince of Wales* (1641), succeeded swiftly by *The Life and Death of our Late Most Incomparable and Heroique Prince, Henry*

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* p. 324.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* p. 325.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* p. 335.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* p. 278.

⁸⁸ See pp. 207-10.

⁸⁹ Haydon, 1634. p. 30.

Prince of Wales (1641).⁹⁰ Cornwallis' *Discourse*, penned in 1626, is a short account of Henry's qualities, observed by his Treasurer during his period of service: "verities known to myself not things received by tradition from others."⁹¹ Its slightly rambling narrative again recommends the Prince as a paragon, who continuously strove for excellence during his lifetime:

"Hee thought not fit to lose any houres of the life that upon this earth were appointed to him, but to bestow them, as they might not only become profitable to himselfe, but imitable and exemplary to others."⁹²

Cornwallis' narrative pays particular attention to Henry's religious devotion, especially his resolute determination not to take a wife of a different faith.⁹³ Given the date of Cornwallis' authorship, this observation appears particularly pointed. After all, Charles I had married Henrietta Maria, Catholic Princess of France, in the summer of 1625 and tensions over the Queen's religion had soon caused friction between the couple.⁹⁴ The marital dispute culminated the next year, with Henrietta Maria's refusal to attend the King's coronation ceremony, followed by the subsequent expulsion of most of her French retinue.⁹⁵ Within this context, Cornwallis' text draws a direct comparison between the policies of the royal brothers, casting a critical eye over the apparent short-comings of the younger, surviving sibling. This attitude may also explain its publication in the early 1640s as both the King's authority and judgment became increasingly undermined.

⁹⁰ Both texts are dated 1641. The similarities between the illustrated frontispieces, dedications and authorial attributions suggest that *The Life and Death* was published in response to Cornwallis' *Discourse*. To avoid confusion between the texts, I have referenced the 1641 edition of *The Life and Death* as "Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641" throughout.

⁹¹ Cornwallis, 1641. p. 4.

⁹² *Ibid.* p. 15.

⁹³ Cornwallis, 1641. p. 2; pp. 19-10.

⁹⁴ Carlton, 1995. p. 65.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 86-7.

The Life and Death was published by Nathanael Butter, from a manuscript he had found among a collection of other papers.⁹⁶ Incidentally, Nathanael was the son of Widow Butter, the first publisher in England to obtain a licence to reproduce the account of Henry Frederick's baptism in 1594.⁹⁷ This may explain why he "could not passe by it as I did the rest".⁹⁸ The tone and content of this text have already been discussed above,⁹⁹ yet it remains to be seen what inspired the publication of these biographies, as well as the later republication of *The Life and Death* a few years after in 1644.¹⁰⁰ Again, the dedications may provide a clue. All three texts are dedicated to Prince Charles, the future Charles II. John Benson, the publisher of Cornwallis' *Discourse*, addresses the eleven-year-old Prince as the "true inheritour of your Noble Uncles vertues."¹⁰¹ Nathanael Butter advises:

"In reading Him You may Read Yourself: His Titles of Honour were the Same with Yours: Your Titles of Vertues the Same with His: He was, as You are the Mirror of the Age."¹⁰²

Michael Ulliot has demonstrated how, in the years after Henry's death, writers repeatedly directed the young Charles I to emulate his older sibling.¹⁰³ These dedications reveal that authorial attention had now shifted, from moulding Henry's brother, to guiding his nephew. The presentation of Henry as a suitable role-model for Prince Charles was timely to say the least. By the late 1630s and early 1640s his father's political fortunes were in steady decline due, in part, to the King's own misjudgement and inflexibility. The outbreak of the Bishops'

⁹⁶ Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. Sig. A3r.

⁹⁷ See Fowler, William, *A true reportarie of the most triumphant, and royal accomplishment of the bapisme of the most excellent, right high, and mightie prince, Frederik Henry, by the grace of God, prince of Scotland. Solemnized the 30. day of August 1594. Printed by Peter Short, for the Widdow Butter, and are to be sold at her shop under Saint Austines Church.* (London, 1594).

⁹⁸ Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. Sig. A3r.

⁹⁹ See pp. 214-6.

¹⁰⁰ See Cornwallis, (attrib.), *The Short Life and Much Lamented Death of that Most Magnanimous Prince, Henry, Prince of Wales* (London (?), 1644).

¹⁰¹ Cornwallis, 1641. Sig. A3r.

¹⁰² Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. Sig. A3r; Cornwallis (attrib.), 1644. Sig. A2r.

¹⁰³ Ulliot, 2005. p. 144. See also Chapter 4, pp. 161-3.

Wars in 1639, instigated by Charles I's imposition of the English liturgy on the Scottish Kirk, had both undermined the King's authority and vastly depleted the royal coffers, obliging him to recall Parliament in April 1640.¹⁰⁴ The ill-fated Short Parliament did little to alleviate the King's position and, following the Scots army's occupation of English soil, Charles once again issued writs for a new parliament.¹⁰⁵ Many of Charles' subjects felt that the years of his personal rule had threatened their liberty, property and religion: what would become the Long Parliament offered them the prospect of redress.¹⁰⁶ Parliament's immediate efforts were focused on removing those perceived as the cause of the current difficulties – the bishops and the King's advisors.¹⁰⁷ On 12th May 1641, the Earl of Strafford, one of the King's chief councillors and Parliament's prime targets, was executed.¹⁰⁸ Meanwhile as Parliament purged his ministers, Charles increasingly turned to his Catholic wife and her followers, exacerbating his opponents' fears about a papist threat.¹⁰⁹ These fears were further intensified by the outbreak of the Irish Rebellion in October 1641.¹¹⁰ It was amid this period of political tension and instability then, that Henry's biographies were published. It is surely not hard to understand why memoirs of this lost prince may have appealed to the Caroline reader. Both in life and death, Henry had been praised for his prudence and economy. According to his biographers, he had surrounded himself with wise and upright men and was renowned for his adherence to the Protestant faith. Passages describing his deliberate and careful judgment would surely have inspired a tinge of regret that this Prince had been denied his birth-right. As Cornwallis asserts:

¹⁰⁴ Coward, 2003. pp. 180-181.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* p. 182.

¹⁰⁶ Miller, 1991. p. 4.

¹⁰⁷ Coward, 2003. p. 190; Carlton, 1995. p. 217.

¹⁰⁸ Carlton, 1995. p. 224.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* p. 217.

¹¹⁰ Coward, 2003. p. 199.

“Counsells are to be chewed not swallowed, he would therefore unrip every seame of them by interrogations used by himself and receive reasons and resolutions by those that offered them.”¹¹¹

Meanwhile, the author of *The Life and Death* assures the reader:

“He well shewed his love to good men, and hatred of the evill, in discerning a good Preacher from a vaine-glorious, in whom above al [sic] things he abhorred flattery, loving and countenancing the good; of the idle and loytering never speaking but with disdain.”¹¹²

With the rise and fall of men like Strafford and Archbishop Laud, this account must have had resonance. Given the disillusionment which many of his subjects felt towards the King, it was natural that hopes should be focused on his young heir. Indeed, Charles himself was not averse to exploiting the memory of his older brother during this period. In 1638 Van Dyck had painted the diminutive Prince of Wales in a suit of armour which had belonged to his uncle and it is surely no coincidence that Charles' third surviving son, born in early July 1640, was also named Henry, once more invoking his staunchly Protestant uncle.¹¹³ Thus the renewed interest in Henry during the 1640s represents a nostalgic turn. In this period of political uncertainty and instability, readers were regaled with an idealised representation of what might have been. At the same time, they were presented with a new figure in whom to invest their hopes - Charles, Prince of Wales.

IV

Elizabeth Goldring's research has traced the recurrence and re-employment of William Hole's engraving of Henry Frederick's hearse (1613, See Figure 53) in the years

¹¹¹ Cornwallis, 1641. p. 8.

¹¹² Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. p. 95.

¹¹³ Gibson, 1997. p. 4. See Sir Anthony Van Dyck's *Charles II when Prince of Wales* (1638). Royal Collection, London. See also p. 52.

following his death.¹¹⁴ She argues that its later depictions and adaptations were reproduced during periods of political and religious instability and that it represented a reassuring image of militant Protestantism.¹¹⁵ Describing the appropriation of elements of Henry's obsequies and hearse at the funeral of Robert Devereux, third Earl of Essex, she explains: "The militant Protestantism embodied by Prince Henry and epitomized by Hole's effigy print was re-conceived and re-deployed at a moment of crisis."¹¹⁶ While this engraving's afterlife is important, Henry's posthumous visual representation constitutes significantly more than one image and is, correspondingly, complex. Images from his lifetime and shortly after his death were re-issued repeatedly in the decades and centuries after his demise, accompanied by new artistic conceptions.¹¹⁷ Furthermore, while the effigy engraving may, in some form, have come to represent Protestant fervour, it also surely stood for lost hopes and unfulfilled promise.¹¹⁸ Its role was cautionary rather than consolatory.

Another image, however, was to become particularly synonymous with Henry's brand of Protestantism in the decades following his death – the Pike portrait. Between 1612 and 1641 William Hole's engraved portrait, *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* (1612, See Figure 48), was reworked, revised and re-printed by a number of engravers and publishers. Hole's original plate (based on a lost drawing by Isaac Oliver) was prepared as the frontispiece to Drayton's *Poly-olbion* (1612), republished as a memorial print both in 1613

¹¹⁴ See Elizabeth Goldring, "'So just a sorrowe so well expressed': Henry, Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration" in Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (Southampton, 2007).

¹¹⁵ Goldring, 2007. pp. 289-295.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 290.

¹¹⁷ See for example, R. Clamp's engraving, after Robert Peake, of *Henry Frederick a la Chasse* (1798) from F.G. Waldron, *The biographical mirrour, comprising a series of ancient and modern English portraits, of eminent and distinguished persons* (London, 1798); Richard Gaywood's *The Effigy and Hearse of Henry, Prince of Wales* (1677), from Francis Sandford, *Genealogical History of the King's of England* (London, 1677); Jacobus Houbraken's engraved portrait of *Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales* (1738), from Thomas Birch, *The Heads of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain* (London, 1737-42); and George Vertue's *Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales* (1736), from his own *Heads of the Kings of England Proper for Rapin's History* (1733-6).

¹¹⁸ For further discussion of this aspect of Henry's posthumous *persona* see pp. 224-40.

and in 1622 and issued again at some point in the 1630s by William Ridiard.¹¹⁹ Between 1616 and 1622, Simon de Passe executed a larger version (see Figure 86) with the addition of a military garden in the background.¹²⁰ Willem or Magdalena de Passe engraved another type to accompany *Herwologia Anglica* in 1620 (see Figure 85). Finally, in 1641 William Marshall produced another copy as the frontispiece to *The Life and Death*, while an anonymous version, after the de Passe plate, accompanied Cornwallis' *Discourse*.¹²¹ What was it about this image then that so appealed? The answer may once again lie in the relationship between text and image.

As Timothy Wilks has observed, Henry's portrait is derived from an illustration in *The Exercise of Arms for Calivres, Muskettes and Pikes* (1608), depicting a pike-man engaged in combat.¹²² Unlike the helmeted pike-man in his functional breast-plate and tassets, breeches and doublet, Henry is portrayed in ornate armour with ruff, jewelled bombasted trunk-hose, rosette-embellished shoes and the garter of St. George, prominently displayed on his shapely calf. To his right sits a helmet, richly adorned with plumes. The context of its prototype, therefore, has been altered from one of armed combat to courtly and chivalric exercise. Wilks' assertion that Henry was depicted in "the role of foot soldier" should thus be treated with caution.¹²³ On writing in 1609 to his close friend, Sir John Harington of Exton, the Prince boasted: "When I see you (and let that be shortlie) you will find me your better at tennis and pike."¹²⁴ Henry's affable bragging clearly equates the activity with competitive sport. At the *Barriers*, staged in January 1610 as a martial debut for the Prince, he demonstrated his prowess: giving and receiving thirty-two pushes of the pike

¹¹⁹ Wilks, 2007. pp. 189-90.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 188-189.

¹²¹ As late as c.1816, Robert Dunkarton executed a mezzotint of *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike*, after Simon de Passe. Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum.

¹²² Wilks, 2007. p. 186.

¹²³ *Ibid.* p. 181.

¹²⁴ Wilks, 2007. p. 197.

and about 360 strokes of the sword.¹²⁵ Henry was, as yet, too young to participate in jousting, yet the event was conceived in a consciously theatrical and chivalric framework, reminiscent of the Elizabethan tournament.¹²⁶ That the Pike portrait was both created and received within this romanticised courtly context is borne out by the addition, in Simon de Passe's version, of a tilt-yard, complete with practicing combatants. Thus *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* served to consolidate the chivalric cult which had developed around him, presenting the young Prince participating in an age-appropriate, princely exercise.¹²⁷

Yet the martial aspect of this engraving should not be dismissed. In its first manifestation the engraving is accompanied by Drayton's dedicatory poem:

“BRitaine, behold here portray'd to thy sight,
Henry, thy best hope, and the world's delight,
Ordain'd to make thy eight Great Henries, nine:
Who, by that virtue in the trebble Trine,
To his own goodness (in his Being) brings
These severall Glories of th'eight English Kings;
Deep Knowledge, Greatnes, long Life, Policy,
Courage, Zeale, Fortune, awfull Majestie.
He like great Neptune on three Seas shall rove,
And rule three Realms, with triple power like Jove;
Thus in soft Peace, thus in tempestuous warres,
Till from his foote, his Fame shall strike the starres.”¹²⁸

Above Drayton's poem, within a decorated border, is the IHS christogram.¹²⁹ It is likely that this combination of image, text and marginalia sought to represent Henry as a Christian

¹²⁵ Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. p. 183.

¹²⁶ Young, 1987. p. 40.

¹²⁷ Drayton, 1612. Sig. A3v.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* Sig. A3v.

soldier of God in-waiting. When he issued his challenge for the *Barriers* - an event from which this image surely derives – he assumed the pseudonym, *Moeliades, Prince of the Isles*.¹³⁰ As well as referring to Henry’s style as the eldest son of the King of Scots, William Drummond of Hawthornden recorded that, in anagram it produced “a *Word* most worthie of such a Knight, as he was a Knight (if *Time* had suffred his Actions answeare the Worlds expectation) onely worthie of such a *Worde*, MILES A DEO.”¹³¹ The Prince was, therefore, actively cultivating the image of a Christian warrior in-the-making and this image should be viewed as part of that campaign. Its depiction of Henry tossing the pike showed him practicing and preparing for his future role as Defender of the Faith. The accompanying verse endowed his image with further significance, rendering it visually representative of the qualities which would define his reign:

“Deep Knowledge, greatnes, long Life, Policy,
Courage, Zeale, Fortune, awfull Majestie.”¹³²

The pike portrait was a triumphalist statement, proclaiming great hopes for the future, invested in the person of the Prince. As Richard Badenhausen has commented, Drayton was following Henry’s lead, “operating within the symbolic construct of the young heir as Protestant conqueror.”¹³³ So too, then, were William Hole and Isaac Oliver. Hole’s engraving came to represent those virtues which “in youth gave so many presages of his becoming to his divine Majesty” and it was under these terms that the Pike portrait was later understood.¹³⁴ As has been shown, when the design was re-issued as part of Holland’s *Herwoologia Anglica*, the militant Protestantism implicit in Hole’s print became more

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* Sig. A3v.

¹³⁰ Drummond, 1614. Sig. B4r.

¹³¹ *Ibid.* Sig. B4r.

¹³² Drayton, 1612. Sig. A3v.

¹³³ Badenhausen, 1995. p. 28.

¹³⁴ Cornwallis, 1641. p. 1.

pronounced.¹³⁵ The accompanying passages and verses converted the martial aspirations of the original image into a lost reality, where, before his untimely death, the Prince was already actively attacking Popery.¹³⁶ Subsequent copies drew on these traditions so that by the 1640s no image better represented Henry's brand of Protestantism and exemplary virtues. Indeed, so important was *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* to his posthumous memory that, when George Vertue executed his portrait of the Prince (1736, See Figure 87) to accompany de Rapin-Thoyras' *History of England* (1732-43), he included the engraving's pike, helmet and gauntlets as attributes. Jacobus Houebracken also referenced the composition in his portrait (1738, See Figure 88) for Birch's *The Heads of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain* (1743-52). In this image two pikes are depicted resting against the picture of Henry, while the frieze below bears a tilt-yard scene derived from Simon de Passe's print. Unlike *The Effigy and Hearse of Henry, Prince of Wales*, which represented a pessimistic image of Protestant zeal defeated, the Pike portrait offered hope. Its recurrence constituted a confident assertion of the continuing importance of the qualities which Henry had embodied. Yes, its protagonist was lost but his ideals remained. Its posthumous re-publication in the late 1610s, early 1620s and 1640s suggest that it constituted a reassuring gesture, emphasising continuity in the face of instability and uncertainty.

V

By the second half of the seventeenth century Henry's appeal had abated. The eighteenth century, however, was to witness a marked and sustained revival of interest, with the publication of texts and images, both old and new. Again a sense of continuity and consistency typified the Prince's representation. This renewed concern with Henry's life and

¹³⁵ See pp. 208-210.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.* p. 47.

character began in 1703 with the republication of William Fowler's account of Henry's baptism, printed in Edinburgh and re-titled, *A True Account of the Most Triumphant and Royal Accomplishment of the Most Excellent, Right High, and Mighty Prince Henry Frederick*. In 1738 Cornwallis' *Discourse* was reissued as *The Life and Character of Henry-Frederic, Prince of Wales*, supplemented by "several other curious, authentic *Testimonies*, from scarce and credible Writers", as well as an account of his illness and a collection of elegies.¹³⁷ *The Life and Death* was also republished, in 1751, as *An Account of the Baptism, Life, Death and Funeral of the most incomparable Prince, Frederick Henry*. As well as these reprinted seventeenth-century biographies, Thomas Birch's *The Life of Henry Prince of Wales, eldest son of King James I* appeared on the market in 1760. Birch's *Life* represented a concerted effort to piece together a comprehensive picture of the Prince's history, habits and household. Compiled from Henry's own papers and manuscripts, as well as early printed texts, the author was presented with the problem of digesting "the whole into as much order and connection, as the nature of such materials would admit."¹³⁸ Birch informs the reader that his motivation for the undertaking was to elucidate the character of a prince still universally admired but whose reported qualities were defined by and dependent upon the writers of the past.¹³⁹ It was, therefore, his intention to "do justice to his memory."¹⁴⁰ What emerges is a distinctly familiar representation of Henry as a princely paragon whose example has been recorded for the benefit of his successors.¹⁴¹ The author reiterates the Prince's customary virtues, underlining his accomplishment, modesty, judgment, decorum, his love of truth, his generosity, accompanied by personal economy and, most importantly, his sincere piety.¹⁴²

¹³⁷ Cornwallis, 1738. Sig. A1r.

¹³⁸ Birch, 1760. Sig. A7v.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.* Sig. A5r.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.* Sig. A5r.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.* p. 393.

¹⁴² *Ibid.* Sig. A3r-A3v.

While it was Birch's intention to provide a new, in-depth life of the Prince, his approach was not without its critics. In 1831 Edmund Lodge dismissed his biography as inept:

“Dr, Birch, with that indefatigable assiduity and accuracy by which he was distinguished, drew together from all authentic sources which he could discover, perhaps every letter extant which the Prince had ever received; every dedication which had ever been addressed to him; every public instrument, regarding his government, his establishment, and his revenue . . . All this is useless. The life of Prince Henry was a life of prospects, and not of events.”¹⁴³

In addition to his own biographies and memoirs, the eighteenth century produced a number of religious and moral instruction books which further enhanced Henry's reputation as a youthful worthy. For example, Samuel Crossman's *The Young Man's Calling: Or the Whole Duty of Youth* (1713) presented Henry alongside other adolescent exemplars – from biblical figures, such as Isaac and St. John the Evangelist, to modern Protestant paragons, such as Lady Jane Grey and John, Lord Harington. These models provided “the Young Man's Looking-glasses, the Patterns and Presidents [sic] that he should imitate and copy out.”¹⁴⁴ Henry's entry is preceded by a rough engraving (1713, See Figure 89), derived from the Pike portrait, depicting him in profile and inscribed in Latin: “Distinguished by his family, more noble by his character.”¹⁴⁵ Similarly *Early Blossoms of Genius and Virtue* (1797) praised Henry as the epitome of youthful goodness, emphasising his happy and pious acceptance of death.¹⁴⁶ F.G. Waldron's *The Biographical Mirrour* (1798), a collection of lives of “eminent and distinguished persons”, portrayed him in the company of scholars, soldiers and

¹⁴³ See p. 1 of the biography of Henry, Prince of Wales, contained in Lodge's *Portraits of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain*. Vol. IV (London, 1831).

¹⁴⁴ Crossman, 1713. p. 7.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* p. 286.

¹⁴⁶ See Anon., *Early Blossoms of Genius and Virtue; including Maxims of Early Wisdom, Juvenile Memoirs, a Great Variety of Examples of the Moral Virtues, and a Selection of Moral Poesy* (London, 1797). p. 91.

clergymen - from the poet, Richard Lovelace, to Gilbert Sheldon, Bishop of London.¹⁴⁷

Waldron's account is derived from Birch but concludes with a personal comment asserting that Henry's "character ought from early youth to be held up as a model for the imitation of every prince that is likely to ascend the English throne."¹⁴⁸ Thus by the end of the eighteenth century Henry's posthumous representation had been confirmed and consolidated. When Paul de Rapin-Thoyras came to writing the Prince's character in his *History of England* (1725-31), he was able to comment that "no historian has taxed him with any vice", while David Hume's *History* (1754-62) noted that "'tis with peculiar fondness that historians mention Henry."¹⁴⁹ Yet his reputation had not always been so secure. In marked contrast, shortly after Henry's death, Sir John Holles, his Comptroller, wrote "worse than swine be they then, who not only with lies, & slanders endeavor to tear his boddy from the quietness of his grave, but seek to defile his sacred memorie."¹⁵⁰ William Haydon expressed a similar sentiment in the *True Picture*, when he pointedly reproves those who, seeking preferment, flatter and scrape before princes but who do not mourn or commemorate them after death.¹⁵¹ Cornwallis too, tells of "moaths and mice of Court" who had advanced their own ambitions by sullyng his good name.¹⁵² The survival and endurance of the Prince's exemplary *persona* then, is a testament to the devotion of his household and circles. For it is ultimately through the success of their commemorative enterprises that his legacy was protected and perpetuated.

As well as a pattern for youthful virtue and upright living, Henry was also presented as the ideal English prince, fit for emulation and imitation by those who succeeded him. As has been shown, both *The Life and Death* and Cornwallis' *Discourse*, published in the 1640s,

¹⁴⁷ Waldron, 1798. Vol. I, pp. 83-89 and pp. 50-53.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.* p. 55.

¹⁴⁹ de Rapin-Thoyras, 1729. Vol. IX, p. 339; Hume, 1754. Vol. I, p. 46.

¹⁵⁰ Letter from Holles to Lord Grey, 27th February 1612. B.L. Add MS 32464. f. 63r.

¹⁵¹ Haydon, 1634. pp. 1-2.

¹⁵² Cornwallis, 1641. p. 3.

were dedicated to Henry's nephew, the future Charles II.¹⁵³ Nathaniel Butter's dedication of *The Life and Death* presents the text almost as an educational treatise, relating the deeds of "so rare a Prince, as it may seeme worthy your Highnes perusal."¹⁵⁴ Similarly, John Benson's dedication of the *Discourse* implores the young Prince to add the precepts of his uncle to those of his father in the pursuit of honour and virtue.¹⁵⁵ The motives behind this focus on the young, hopeful Prince Charles, in response to the uncertainty of the early 1640s have already been discussed;¹⁵⁶ yet this propensity to promote Henry as a princely role model continued into the eighteenth century.

The Life and Character of Henry-Frederic, Prince of Wales (1738), a reprint of Cornwallis' *Discourse*, was dedicated to Frederick, Prince of Wales, the son of George II. Here, once more, the dedicator, J.M., adopts Henry as a "PRINCE So very worthy the Imitation of all who are born to inherit Crowns, to be the Rulers of People, and whose amiable character is So well worthy of being transmitted to the lastest Posterity."¹⁵⁷ The choice of Henry as princely exemplar to Frederick was astute. Like Henry, Frederick was an alien prince born of a new royal dynasty, in whom the British public could invest their hopes, in spite of disappointments with his Hanoverian elders. Henry provided the perfect example of what a British prince should be and how he could be shaped. The similarities between the two do not end there, however. The pamphlet's compiler devotes considerable attention to accounts of the relationship between Henry and his father, James I. The appendix draws on several near contemporary accounts of the court of King James, including Francis Osborne's *Traditional Memoirs of the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I* (1658); A. Wilson's *The History of Great Britain, being the Life of King James I* (1653); and Anthony Weldon's

¹⁵³ See p. 221.

¹⁵⁴ Cornwallis (attrib.), 1641. Sig A3r.

¹⁵⁵ Cornwallis, 1641. Sig. A3v.

¹⁵⁶ See pp. 221-3.

¹⁵⁷ Cornwallis, 1738. Sig. A2v.

The Court and Character of King James I (1651). Osborne charges James with jealousy and fear of his son: “The Father did Discontent to find all the Worth he imagined in himself wholly lost in the Hopes the People had of this young Gentleman.”¹⁵⁸ Wilson too, writes of the King’s fears “like thick clouds”, while Weldon repeats the suspicions of poisoning which were aimed at the King following Henry’s death.¹⁵⁹ These tales of a relationship broken down and of a father intent upon curbing his son’s ambitions would have had some resonance with the eighteenth-century reader. After all, the text was published at a time when the deterioration in relations between Frederick and his own father, George II, seemed almost irreparable. Just a year before, when his consort, Augusta, had gone into labour with their first child, Frederick had insisted on moving his wife to St. James’ Palace so that his mother and father could not be present at the birth.¹⁶⁰ As a result the Prince and his family were ordered to leave St James’ and barred from entering the King or Queen’s presence.¹⁶¹ Thus the intention may well have been to present Frederick as the successor to Henry’s legacy, the bright star of the Hanoverian dynasty, who, like his predecessor, was intent upon asserting his prerogative.

With Frederick’s death in 1751, focus shifted and new hopes were rested upon his son, George. It may not be surprising then, that Birch’s *The Life of Henry Prince of Wales* was dedicated to this young Prince. Again Henry is espoused as “an example to all succeeding kings” and indeed, George, himself, was to succeed to the throne within months of the book’s publication.¹⁶² Unlike his father, George had been born in Britain, a fact which he would later exploit, proclaiming in his first speech to Parliament: “Born and educated in

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.* p. 25.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.* p. 31; p. 45.

¹⁶⁰ Jones, 1981. p. 15.

¹⁶¹ Brooke, 1974. p. 15.

¹⁶² Birch, 1760. Sig. A8r.

this country, I glory in the name of Britain.”¹⁶³ It was appropriate then that Henry, the self-styled first Prince of Great Britain, should be promoted as a model for his great-great-great-great nephew to follow. Of course, Henry too was the dedicatee of an educational treatise, *Basilikon Doron* (1599), penned by his father. It is fitting then that his life should, in turn, have become a text for princely conduct. Henry had been adopted as the shining example of a new concept, a truly British prince.

VI

As has been shown, Henry Frederick’s posthumous representation was complex and multi-faceted; yet there was one aspect of his life-story which was inescapable. For all his youthful promise, the Prince never attained his birthright to sit on the throne but instead left behind him a series of lost hopes, never-realised plans and regrets. As such, his image came to represent a sense of loss and missed opportunity. As the publisher of the 1703 reprint of the account of his baptism informs the reader: “It is a proverb to this day, *Did not Good Prince HENRY Die*. Used as a mitigation to those who Bemoan the loss of their Friends and Relations.”¹⁶⁴ One of the first instances when Henry’s memory was appropriated to this end was following the death of his nephew, Frederick Henry of the Palatine. In 1629, just a few days after his fifteenth birthday, Frederick died at sea, while accompanying his father to Haarlem.¹⁶⁵ Until his death Frederick had been second-in-line to the English throne after his mother, Elizabeth, and had, from infancy, been lauded as Henry’s successor. It was natural then that following the death of a Prince, whose birth had inspired the poem, *Prince Henrie Revived* (1615), writers should continue to exploit the sad parallels between the two.¹⁶⁶ For

¹⁶³ Brooke, 1974. p. 156.

¹⁶⁴ Fowler, 1703. See the preface, *The Publisher to the Reader*.

¹⁶⁵ Abbey, 1629. p. 1.

¹⁶⁶ See Henry Peacham, *Prince Henry Revived or A Poeme upon the Birth, and in honor of the Hopefull Yong Prince Henrie Frederick* (London, 1615).

example, in *An Elegie upon the Most Deplorable Death of Prince Henry* (1629) the author laments:

“Thus both our *Henries* soone away did goe,
Showne to the earth not suffered to remaine,
Now in the Heaven, more bright than ere did show.”¹⁶⁷

In 1646 Henry’s memory was explicitly appropriated once more – this time to commemorate the death of Robert Devereux, third Earl of Essex. Essex, the deceased General of the Parliamentarian forces, whose actual military effectiveness and achievements are open to debate, was afforded an immense and opulent state funeral, modelled on that of the Prince.¹⁶⁸ An anonymous engraving, published to commemorate the Earl’s exequies (1646, See Figure 90), presents him laid out on a hearse virtually identical to that of Henry. What is more, it is inscribed *W. Hole* in reference to the prototype from which it is derived (See Figure 53). A close companion of Henry as an adolescent, the Earl’s infamous family name and martial reputation had earned him popular admiration so that, for many, he represented “the glories of England’s good old days.”¹⁶⁹ It is entirely plausible then that, as J.S.A. Adamson has argued, this replication of Henry’s obsequies and iconography served “to order and rationalise the traumatic and dislocated politics of 1646 by an act of relocation in the past.”¹⁷⁰ Yet there may well be a secondary motive behind this evocation of Henry’s memory. It is quite possible that Devereux’s death was viewed by many as the end of an era. He was, after all, one of the last survivors of Prince Henry’s court and of those nobles associated with his principles. The Earl of Oxford and Sir John Wentworth, who had fought with the expeditionary forces in the Palatine, were long dead.¹⁷¹ So too, were the Prince’s

¹⁶⁷ Abbey, 1629. p. 1.

¹⁶⁸ Adamson, 1994. p. 191.

¹⁶⁹ Snow, 1960. p. 233.

¹⁷⁰ Adamson, 1994. p. 193.

¹⁷¹ Wilks, 2007. p. 203.

companions and associates, John Harington, Baron Harington of Exton; Edward Cecil, Viscount Wimbledon; and Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, while Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, was in exile on the Continent and would, himself, die only a few weeks later.¹⁷² As Timothy Wilks has observed, only the most “durable and fortunate” of Henry’s peers were to fight in the Civil War.¹⁷³ Thus the particular brand of nobility and honour which the Prince’s court had symbolised was on the wane. This sentiment is echoed in many of the elegies and epitaphs written to commemorate the Earl’s death, several of which, in deliberately chivalric language, dub him England’s “champion”.¹⁷⁴ In *An Elegie upon the Most Lamented Death of the Right Honourable and Truly Valiant, Robert Earl of Essex* this impression of a bygone age is created by a description of England’s great soldiers vying for a glimpse of the Earl in heaven:

“How the Ghosts throng to see their new Ghest [sic];
Talbot, Vere, Norris, Williams, and the rest,
Those valiant Shades, England’s best sonnes each one.”¹⁷⁵

Similarly, the fact that the Earl has died childless, with no heir to continue the family name or legacy, is considered:

“And is’t not pittie so Fam’d worth should dye
Without an Heire? No sonne to close his eye?”¹⁷⁶

A broadside depicting the image of Essex’s hearse continues in this vein, lamenting the end of a line which had served England so well.¹⁷⁷ Adamson has pinpointed Devereux’s funeral

¹⁷² Howarth, 1985. p. 218.

¹⁷³ Wilks, 2007. p. 203.

¹⁷⁴ See Anon., *An Elegie upon the Death of the Right Honourable Robert Devereux, Late Earl of Essex* (London, 1646); Anon., *A Funeral Monument: Or the Manner of the Herse of the Most Renowned Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex* (London, 1646); William Rowland, *An Elegie upon the Death of the Right Honourable & Most Renowned Robert Devereux Earl of Essex* (London, 1646).

¹⁷⁵ C.G., 1646. Sig. A2r-A2v.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.* Sig A3v.

¹⁷⁷ Rowland, 1646. p. 1.

as the final grand gesture of the chivalric tradition in seventeenth-century Britain, arguing that, with Cromwell's rise to power, chivalry was left behind and replaced with models derived from the Old Testament.¹⁷⁸ It is possible then that the conscious appropriation of the Prince's funeral rites and imagery mourned the gradual demise of old-fashioned ideals of virtue and of an outmoded language of nobility.

Following the Restoration, the evocation of Henry Frederick's memory persisted at times of loss. Henry, Duke of Gloucester's early death from smallpox, in late 1660, prompted one of his eulogists to write:

“What will become of that so glor'ous Name?
... That Name which to Three Nations deer
We loved in thy Uncle here.”¹⁷⁹

In Scotland his memory appears to have assumed a special resonance, with one text, in particular, the subject of multiple reprints.¹⁸⁰ In 1703 John Reid the Younger published a new edition of William Fowler's account of Henry Frederick's baptism. His motives are explained in the preface and it is worth quoting them at length:

“We have therein in some measure a View of the Antient Glory and Splendour of this Kingdom, and in what estimation it was had with Neighbouring Countries, tho ever since the Union of the Crowns, our Greatness has been declining, till at length we are come to a wonderfull Low Ebb, which it is hop'd the Parliament will now Effectually Consider, and do

¹⁷⁸ Adamson, 1994. p. 194.

¹⁷⁹ Brett, 1660. p. 8.

¹⁸⁰ See William Fowler, *A True Account of the Most Triumphant, and Royal Accomplishment of the Baptism of the Most Excellent and Mighty High Prince Henry Frederick* (Edinburgh, 1687); William Fowler, *A True Account of the Most Triumphant and Royal Accomplishment of the Most Excellent, Right High, and Mighty Prince Henry Frederick* (Edinburgh, 1703); William Fowler, *A True Account of the Most Triumphant and Royal Grandeur, at the Solemnization of the Baptism of His Royal Highness, Henry Prince of Scotland, and afterwards Prince of Wales* (Edinburgh, 1745); William Fowler, *A True Account of the Baptism of the Most High and Mighty Prince, Henry Frederick, by the Grace of God, Prince of Scotland, and since of Wales* (Edinburgh, 1764).

something that may retrieve our Ancient Power and Glory, as (Thanks to God) many shew great Propensity to do.”¹⁸¹

There can be little doubt that Reid’s re-publication of this text was politically motivated. The 1690s had been disastrous for Scotland, with a run of poor harvests and widespread famine, the decline of Scottish trade as a result of the Nine Years War and the failure of the Darien scheme.¹⁸² Many were inclined to point to England as the cause of the nation’s difficulties.¹⁸³ Following Queen Anne’s accession, the new Scots Parliament, which met in 1703, proved to be markedly independent and wilful, with Scottish national interest very much at its heart.¹⁸⁴ The Jacobite political commentator, George Lockart of Cornwath, recorded its aims and achievements: “The Parliament proceeded to frame and finish such Acts as tended to secure their liberties and Freedom from the Oppression they sustained thro’ the Influence of English Ministers over Scots counsels and Affairs.”¹⁸⁵ The ultimate assertion of Scotland’s autonomy, however, came on 13th August with the passing of the Act of Security. With the death, in 1700, of William, Duke of Gloucester - second-in-line to the throne after his mother, the future Queen Anne - and the passing of the Act of Settlement of 1701, the crown of England had been settled upon Sophia, Electress of Hanover, and her descendants.¹⁸⁶ In contrast, the Scottish Parliament had deliberately left the question of the succession open.¹⁸⁷ Through the new Parliament’s Act of Security the accession to the Scottish throne after Anne’s death was rendered dependent upon conditions which would preserve Scotland’s dignity and liberty.¹⁸⁸ Thus Reid’s preface speaks to this rise in nationalist fervour. For him, Fowler’s account of Henry’s baptism represented a record of hopes and aspirations. Those invested in the Prince

¹⁸¹ Fowler, 1703. See the preface, *The Publisher to the Reader*.

¹⁸² Whateley and Patrick, 2006. p. 139.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.* p. 185.

¹⁸⁴ Daiches, 1977. p. 71.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.* p. 71.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.* p. 52.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.* p. 52.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.* p. 77.

had been shattered by his early death, while those placed upon the nation had been slowly eroded by Scotland's subordination to England, following the Union of the Crowns. Yet all was not lost. A Parliament prepared to defend and assert Scottish interests was capable of reviving the kingdom's past glory. This nationalistic reading continued when the text was re-issued to coincide with the Jacobite Rising of 1745.¹⁸⁹ In the preface to this edition - taken from an earlier copy of 1687 - the publisher affirms that Fowler's account is testament to the "Genius, Wit, Learning and Delicacy of the Scottish Court", dedicating it to those who love "the antiquities of this kingdom".¹⁹⁰ Thus Henry had become synonymous with the lost glories of pre-Union Scotland - his tragic demise representative of the nation's decline.

The Prince's association with lost promise and misfortune re-emerged in the wake of the death, in 1751, of Frederick, Prince of Wales. That year, J. Freeman published another version of *The Life and Death: An Account of the Baptism, Life, Death and Funeral of the most incomparable Prince, Frederick Henry* – note the reversal of Henry's names to highlight the analogy. Meanwhile, Frederick's eulogists were quick to exploit similarities between the two. In a miscellany entitled, *The English Poems Collected from the Oxford and Cambridge Verses on the Death of His Royal Highness Frederick, Prince of Wales* (1751), several of the elegies cite Henry. For example, a verse by Frederick North, the future Prime Minister, reflects that:

"If just the grief our fires to Henry gave,
If justly fell the tear on Glo'ster's grave,
Who will to FREDERICK'S riper age refuse
The deep-fetch'd sigh and melancholy muse?"¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁹ Buchanan, 1836.p. 470.

¹⁹⁰ Fowler, 1745. p. 2.

¹⁹¹ Anon., *The English Poems Collected from the Oxford and Cambridge Verses on the Death of His Royal Highness Frederick, Prince of Wales* (1751). p. 8.

Another, by James Clitherow, reminds the reader of the calamity which followed Henry's death and the disaster of his brother's accession, praying that the same will not befall them.¹⁹² Thus Henry's memory was evoked repeatedly at times of tragedy and loss. The public outpouring of grief prompted by his death was not forgotten and continued to shape responses to his and others' loss well into the eighteenth century. His image embodied a sense of unfulfilled promise and disappointed aspiration. For all the predictions of greatness, the Prince's inability to survive had rendered his life a failure.

For a life so short, Henry's left its mark. The Prince's posthumous representation was complex and diverse; yet his appeal was enduring. The images and texts produced during the first decade after his death were instrumental in framing and forming him as an exemplary figure. The emergence of his distinctly militant Protestant *persona* was a response to the unsettled political and religious climate of the late 1610s and early 1620s. Amongst certain circles, who continued to share the values which Henry had embodied, the evocation of his memory represented more than mere nostalgia but rather it constituted a potent call-to-arms. The texts of the 1630s and 1640s attempted to develop and consolidate the Prince's biography, again for political ends. The publication of comprehensive and detailed memoirs of the Prince's life and Court ensured that accounts of his character reached a wider audience and a new generation of readers. Disillusionment and disappointment with King Charles' government prompted a retrospective interest in the Prince and, accordingly, provoked comparisons between the brothers, while focusing new hopes on the young Prince Charles as the successor to his uncle's virtues and policies. This need for continuity is also evident in the afterlife of Hole's engraving, *Prince Henry Practicing with the Pike* - an image which became synonymous with Henry's brand of zealous Protestantism. Its repeated republication in the decades after his death constituted a reassuring gesture at times of instability and

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.

uncertainty. The turn of the eighteenth century marked a revival of interest in the Prince. Seventeenth-century texts were re-issued, a new biography was penned and Henry's inclusion in moral and religious instruction books became customary. His paradigmatic status was confirmed; yet descriptions of his piety, decorum and prudence were still dependent upon the standard accounts of his character produced in the early seventeenth century. The endurance and uniformity of Henry's portrayal demonstrates the real allure of his *persona*, as well as the efficacy of his princely representation - both in life and death. His image represented a set of old-fashioned values still held dear and its recurrence comprised a comforting relocation in an idealised past. Yet underlining this was the unavoidable fact that the Prince had never fulfilled those aspirations invested in him. Thus the paradox emerges that while Henry's representation stood for a series of hopes and ideals, he also stood for their loss. The power of his appeal ultimately rested upon unrealistic expectations and mythical predictions which he could never achieve. As the contemporary essayist and commentator, Francis Osborne, observed: "It may be doubted, whether it ever lay in the Power of any Prince, merely human, to bring so much felicity into a Nation . . . The truth is, Prince Henry never arrived at the great test, Supremacy in power, that leaves the will wholly to its owne guidance."¹⁹³

VII

The principal aspects of Henry Frederick's posthumous *persona* - exemplarity, promise and loss – are all evident, to a lesser extent, in the representations of other deceased Stuart princes. Thus Richard Flecknoe's volume of epigrams, published in 1670 and written "in praise of worthy persons",¹⁹⁴ described Henry, Duke of Gloucester as:

"The gallantst person nature ever made

¹⁹³ Osborn, 1701. pp. 423-24.

¹⁹⁴ Flecknoe, 1670. Sig. A3r.

And hopfulst Prince as England ever had.”¹⁹⁵

Henry’s youthful commitment to the Protestant faith was central to his portrayal. In *Anglorum Speculum, Or the Worthies of England* (1684), the author praised his steadfastness in religion and aversion to the Catholic Church, “whose temptations he resisted beyond his years.”¹⁹⁶ He continued, commending his learning, deportment and courtesy which “commanded mens Affections to love him.”¹⁹⁷ In *The Character of a Trimmer* (1688), which was penned by George Saville, Marquis of Halifax, in 1684 and circulated in manuscript until its publication in 1688,¹⁹⁸ Henry’s constancy, in the face of his mother’s harassment, is again extolled.¹⁹⁹ To this is pointedly added the statement that: “It is to be believ’d this had better success with another of her Sons, who, if he was not quite brought off from our Religion, at least, such beginnings were made, as made them very easie to be finish’d.”²⁰⁰ The allusion to Henry’s elder brother, James, Duke of York, is patent. While Halifax had been an opponent of the Exclusion Bill, he was behind two proposals brought before Parliament in 1680 and 1681, advocating a series of limitations upon James’ royal prerogative during his reign.²⁰¹ He was also the instigator of the unsuccessful attempt in 1683 to reconcile Charles II with his Protestant illegitimate son (and would-be heir), James, Duke of Monmouth.²⁰² This brief reference, and its negative reflection on James, may indicate, therefore, a retrospective tendency to view Henry as a lost opportunity – as a more acceptable alternative to his elder brother, if only he had survived. This is also inferred in *Bishop Burnet’s History of His Own Time* (1724). Burnet’s characterisation of the Prince asserts that through Henry’s death was

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 5. For analysis of Henry’s posthumous representation in the long nineteenth century, see Chapter Six.

¹⁹⁶ Sandys, 1684. p. 796.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 796.

¹⁹⁸ Faulkner, 1973. p. 73.

¹⁹⁹ Halifax, 1688. p. 24.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.* p. 24.

²⁰¹ Faulkner, 1973. p. 77.

²⁰² *Ibid.* p. 78.

lost “the only person that could ballance” the Duke of York.²⁰³ Hume’s *History of England* (1754-62) reiterates this point, describing the Duke as a “young Prince of very promising hopes”²⁰⁴ and reports that: “Glocester was observed to possess united the good qualities of both his brothers: The clear judgment and penetration of the King; the industry and application of the Duke of York. He was also believed affectionate to the religion and constitution of his country.”²⁰⁵ Again the reader is presented with a telling comparison between the virtuous Duke and his rather more flawed siblings. It may well be for this reason that George Vertue chose to conclude his series of engraved royal portraits, in *The Heads of the Kings of England* (1736), with Henry’s likeness. Indeed, the Duke of Gloucester’s portrayal (1736, See Figure 91) is one of the few to show an uncrowned sitter. Like his two brothers, he is depicted within an oval frame, above an emblematic device. Whereas Charles II is shown with the British royal arms and James II is illustrated with a collection of anchors (signifying his position as Lord High Admiral, when Duke of York), Henry’s portrait is presented together with his ducal crown and two snuffed-out candles. The imagery is easily understood – the Duke of Gloucester was a bright light, extinguished too soon.

Henry’s memory was invoked visually once more in a posthumous portrait of his nephew, James, Duke of Cambridge. In October 1685, Mary, Princess of Orange, wrote to her close friend, Lady Bathurst, bidding her to tell the artist, Willem Wissing: “I write by this post to the King about the Duchesses picture & my brothers.”²⁰⁶ In July the following year she explained this statement, having apparently decided to cancel the commission: “I had ordered Mr. Wissing when he was heer to make me a copy of ye princes picture onely a head & yt he should send it me with the rest . . . but now I find he has forgot it w(hi)ch I am glad

²⁰³ Burnet, 1724. Vol. I, p. 171.

²⁰⁴ Hume, 1757. Vol. III, p. 209.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.* p. 210.

²⁰⁶ Bathurst (ed.), 1924. 4th October, 1685, p. 194. Bathurst has dated this letter to 1686. However, since Mary reports that Wissing has recently returned to England with her commission (which he did in September 1685), a date one year earlier is appropriate. I have revised the dating of Mary’s other letters accordingly.

of because I have changed my mind as for my mothers & brothers picturs.”²⁰⁷ The cause of these qualms would appear to have been her father’s reluctance to pay for the portraits.²⁰⁸ However, despite the withdrawal of the commission and Mary’s insistence on a “little picture”,²⁰⁹ Wissing did actually paint the Duke’s portrait – full-length. The resulting composition (c.1686, See Figure 92) is derived from Lely’s portrait of Henry, Duke of Gloucester as a boy (c.1649, See Figure 93). Like Henry, James is depicted within an arcadian setting, dressed in gold and blue drapery with a crook over his shoulder. Both are caught mid-stride, gazing out at the viewer and gesturing into the distance. James’ likeness is taken from John Michael Wright’s portrait of him (1666, See Figure 5), and it was no doubt this portrait which Mary had intended as the source for her small copy. Instead, Wissing has shown considerable self-confidence, adapting both Wright’s and Lely’s compositions to produce a dynamic and enigmatic portrait. He has enlarged and modified Lely’s original, depicting the Duke of Cambridge full-length, within an autumnal grove. The setting spaniel of Henry’s portrait has been replaced by a frisking springer spaniel, while in the distance the silhouette of a leaping stag is just visible.

Why then was this portrait of James – a child prince, who did not live to see his fourth birthday - executed some twenty years after his death? From Mary’s letters, the approximate time of conception of the commission can be dated to between August and September 1685, when Wissing visited the Orange Court. As such it was an idea formed just months after the failed rebellion and execution of Mary’s cousin, James Scott, Duke of Monmouth. The Princess’s feelings towards Monmouth must have been mixed. Encouraged by her husband, she had spent many pleasant hours with the Duke during his recent exile in The Netherlands,

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.* 14th July, 1686. p. 202.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 14th July, 1686. p. 203.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 24th April, 1686. p. 201.

regularly taking the air, dancing and even skating with him.²¹⁰ Yet Monmouth's subsequent actions denied both her father's, and her own, hereditary rights. On 20th June 1685, Monmouth declared himself rightful King. His proclamation, delivered from Taunton Market Cross, asserted that the crown "did legally descend and devolve upon the most illustrious and high-born Prince James Duke of Monmouth, son and heir apparent to the said King Charles II."²¹¹ While Mary's attitude to her royal prerogative may have been somewhat passive, she was, nevertheless, deeply conscious of her birthright.²¹² It may have been for this reason, therefore, that she decided to charge Wissing with the execution of portraits of both her brother and her mother. By so doing she hoped to underline her own ancestry and legitimacy. Through the demise of James, Duke of Cambridge, and the deaths of her other brothers, she had become heir. Yet Wissing's composition draws out further significance. Crucially, James had been born before the conversion to Catholicism of his father, then James, Duke of York. By modelling the posthumous portrait of the Prince upon an earlier portrait of his uncle, another prematurely deceased Protestant heir, the painter highlighted the absence and loss of that paradigm. Following the death of Monmouth, Charles II's Anglican bastard son, who had attempted to fill that void, this message was all the more resonant. It reminded the viewer that in lieu of that ideal, Mary and William were Protestant Britain's best hope. Thus both James and Henry had come to epitomise lost promise. In response to the instability prompted by the prospect of a Catholic royal dynasty, their image represented the Protestant male line of which the public had been repeatedly deprived.

This notion persisted and developed with the formation of William, Duke of Gloucester's posthumous portrayal. With his death in 1700, the public were confronted both with the likely end of the Stuart Protestant line and with the probable accession of a foreign

²¹⁰ Hamilton, 1972. p. 143.

²¹¹ Watson, 1979. p. 278.

²¹² See p. 190.

royal dynasty. In common with his deceased forerunners, William's image was heavily informed by his religious devotion, as well as his maturity and possession of qualities fitting to what should have been his future role. The theologian and historian, Gilbert Burnet (who was also William's preceptor), described how: "he came to understand things, relating to Religion, beyond imagination . . . I went thro' Geography so often with him, that he knew all the Maps very particularly; I explained to him the forms of government in every Country . . . He had a wonderful memory and a very good judgment."²¹³ In 1703 *The Young Man's Golden Pattern; or the Royal Youth's Last Legacy* was published. Its author contended that William had been "too good to live long in this sinful world."²¹⁴ Echoing Burnet's description of his qualities, he adds that the Prince:

"took great delight in learning, even from his infancy; being carefully Train'd up in the Principles and Fundamentals of the Church of England, taking great delight in the company of pious and learned Divines, being very inquisitive and full of good questions, and was very diligent to observe and remember what he heard, his Arguments being more like a steadfast Christian and learned Scholar, than a child."²¹⁵

The pamphlet concludes with a series of "remarkable and wise sayings", supposedly found in William's study shortly after his death, which the anonymous author "sought fit to communicate to the youth of this nation, as a true pattern of piety."²¹⁶

In the 1707 edition of Francis Sandford's *Genealogical History*, the political impact of his death was reiterated. Sandford affirmed the real distress felt by "all good men who were well wishers to the Protestant Religion and, Lovers of their Country."²¹⁷ In the conclusion to the book, he dwells again upon the lamentable loss of the young Duke, closing

²¹³ Burnet, 1734. pp. 245-6.

²¹⁴ D.B., 1703. p. 4.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 3.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 13.

²¹⁷ Sandford, 1707. p. 862.

with a final hope “that the Almighty, who gives, as well as takes away, may still Bless Her Majesty and Her People, with an Heir from Her own Royal Loins who may live to Sway the Scepters of her Flourishing Kingdoms and Dominions, and from whom may Spring a numerous Progeny of Princes.”²¹⁸ Of course, Queen Anne was never to conceive after her son’s demise and no further heir was born. Thus William came to symbolise lost hopes for the continuation of the Protestant line. For example, an engraving, sold by Charles Price around 1714 (See Figure 94), depicts William alongside the Stuart monarchs. Medallion portraits of James I, Charles I, Charles II, James II and Mary II (William III is noticeably absent), surround a larger likeness of Queen Anne. Above, sit the orb, sceptre and sword of the royal regalia, while cornucopias adorn the arrangement. Below, paraphrased from Alexander Pope’s *Windsor Forest* (1712), the caption reads:

“In their Time

Rich Industry Sat Smiling on the Plain,

And peace, and Plenty, told a STUART’S Reign.”

The inclusion of William’s representation, alongside the medallion portraits, emphasises his part in the demise of the line, presenting him as the final, vanished hope for the succession. Like his inclusion in Playford’s image of *Four Protestant Princes* (1703, See Figure 82), his portrayal mourns the end of the dynasty and the disappointing loss of its last protector. Most probably printed after Queen Anne’s death and the accession of George I, it evinces the beginnings of a nostalgic recollection of the Stuarts, as well as expressing the uncertainty prompted by the settlement of the crown upon the House of Hanover. Similarly, a design executed by Jacobus Houbraken in 1745 (See Figure 95) and re-engraved by Johann Sebastian Müller a few years later, also presents William as a lost leader.²¹⁹ Kneller’s final

²¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 865.

²¹⁹ See Johann Sebastian Müller’s *William, Duke of Gloucester* (c.1750). National Portrait Gallery, London.

portrait of the Prince (1699, See Figures 30 and 31) is resurrected once more, with William attired in classicised armour and ermine. Below the draped oval frame of his likeness, lie his ducal coronet and an emblematic pendant. Here, Britannia sits beside the royal Stuart arms, holding her spear and shield and weeping into her cloak. Certainly, the engraving's date would have made this message all the more poignant, for the consequences of William's death were surely amplified amidst the political turmoil of the Jacobite Rising, which was, itself, headed by a charismatic young Stuart prince, Charles Edward. The creation and sale of this image, alongside Charles' attempt to return the crown to the exiled Stuarts, called attention to the loss of the Protestant line and again encouraged the viewer to contemplate an alternative reality. Within this context, the engraving implies that William's survival might have prevented the uncertainty and insecurity with which the British public were now faced. Once more, the image of a deceased heir was employed to highlight dissatisfaction with the present by reminiscing over the past.

As has been shown, the allure and appeal of lost Stuart heirs was enduring. The compelling pull of the iconography of the young Protestant warrior is borne out by its posthumous refinement and accentuation so that, as the years passed, their images became increasingly emblematic. As a consequence of their early demise, their representations were never challenged or compromised. Accordingly, these Princes were raised to paradigmatic status and lauded as patterns for youthful and princely virtue. Above all, their pious adherence to Protestantism was underlined. Those responsible for their portrayal played upon and manipulated this aspect of their *persona*, while the recurrence of images of deceased heirs often coincided with perceived threats to the established Church. The public response to Henry Frederick's loss and the development of his posthumous representation established a precedent for the portrayal and remembrance of later princes. Like him, the hopes invested in these youths, during their lifetimes, were amplified after death and, with the benefit of

hindsight, the impact of their passing was inflated. Repeatedly, during periods of apprehension or discontent, their images offered a comforting retrospection and a glimpse of another, better present. Thus a rueful nostalgia pervaded posthumous representations of prematurely deceased Stuart heirs. As such, their portrayal came to embody a powerful sense of vanished promise and lost protection.

Chapter 6

“The Mere Parade of Truthfulness”: Re-telling the Past

I

The nineteenth century or the “century of history”, as Roy Strong has termed it, witnessed the development of a widespread British historical consciousness.¹ Building upon the rise of antiquarian studies in the eighteenth century and the influential civil histories of Paul de Rapin-Thoyras and David Hume, the Victorian conception of the past was formed not only through the texts of leading historians but also through popular volumes, works of fiction and, importantly, through visual culture.² For just over a century painted re-creations of moments from the British past lined the walls of the Royal Academy exhibitions. No other period struck a chord with the Victorian present as strongly as the factious seventeenth century.³ Yet the interest and adulation which, in the preceding years, had surrounded the posthumous representation of Henry, Prince of Wales, was to subside and instead it was the troubled reign of his brother which captured the imagination. The numerous canvases which presented the conflicts between royalist and roundhead attest to this fascination. British painters, including Sir John Everett Millais, William Frederick Yeames and Charles West Cope, repeatedly returned to this theme.⁴ A minor but significant group of these paintings

¹ Strong, 1978. pp. 9-11. Mitchell, 2000. p. 2.

² See Paul de Rapin-Thoyras, *The History of England* (London, 1725-31); and David Hume, *History of England* (Edinburgh and London, 1754-62).

³ Lang, 1995. p. xi. See also Strong, 1978. p. 137; Ollard, 2000. p. 193.

⁴ See for example, John Everett Millais’ *The Proscribed Royalist* (1852-3). Collections of Lord Lloyd Webber; William Frederick Yeames’ *And When Did You Last See Your Father?* (1878). Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool; and Charles West Cope’s series of frescoes for the Houses of Parliament which depict episodes from the English

depicted scenes from the lives of the children of King Charles I. The majority were concerned with the last meeting of the King and his two youngest children, Henry, Duke of Gloucester, and Princess Elizabeth, and with their subsequent imprisonment at Carisbrooke Castle on the Isle of Wight. These images conveyed a romanticised perception of the English Civil War, distilling all its human tragedy into one domesticated scene.

Timothy Lang's analysis of the elite publications of historians, such as Macaulay, Carlisle and Gardiner, has provided considerable insight into how seventeenth-century themes encroached on the Victorian mindset.⁵ Yet, as Rosemary Mitchell has observed, the reach of popular and illustrated histories also played a crucial part in the formation of historical consciousness.⁶ The works of Agnes Strickland were particularly influential, with their emphasis on character study and anecdote and with their construction of *black-and-white* heroes and villains. An understanding of the content and reception of such texts is critical to any interpretation of nineteenth-century history painting. Seventeenth-century visual sources were also important. Artists conducted increasingly extensive research into the physiognomy, dress, furniture and architectural surroundings of their subject matter. Yet historical accuracy and what they perceived as truth were not always equivalent and frequently facts were distorted for artistic and emotional effect. In consequence, the resulting paintings often reveal more about the artists and their intended audience than the actual events depicted.

What was it about these private and intimate events then which so appealed to the artist and public of the long nineteenth century? As historical interest and awareness developed, so too did the impulse to learn from the past - to employ it to express beliefs about

Civil War, including *Speaker Lenthall Asserting the Privileges of the Commons against Charles I* (1866). Houses of Parliament, London.

⁵ See Timothy Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage: Interpretations of a Discordant Past* (Cambridge, 1995).

⁶ Mitchell, 2000. p. 3.

the present or to assess contemporary predicaments.⁷ In scenes of Charles I taking leave of his children the Victorians saw their own domestic ideal of the affectionate family threatened (and ultimately shattered) by radicalism and revolution. Living in a period of intense political, social and religious change, the nineteenth-century Briton was well attuned to this warning from the past. From the mid-nineteenth century onwards the visual emphasis altered from scenes depicting King Charles with his children to those depicting the young prince and princess alone, removed from parental protection. These canvases drew on the Victorian fascination with the innocence and vulnerability of childhood. Indeed, it may be no coincidence that as society's concern for child welfare grew,⁸ images of children from the past, exposed to cruelty and danger, held a special appeal. In these paintings of Henry, Duke of Gloucester, history was often appropriated, re-presented and obscured. Indeed, in many ways a particular Stuart myth was created through which the nineteenth-century public could scrutinise the issues of their own age.

II

Nineteenth-century depictions of the imprisoned Charles I with his children drew on eighteenth-century pictorial precedents. As early as 1722, the French artist, Jean Raoux, had painted *King Charles Taking Leave of His Children, 29th January 1648/9* (unlocated). In 1728 it was engraved, accompanied by an explanatory text in English and French (See Figure 96). Raoux's composition went some way to perpetuating the affectionate family image which would really take hold in the following century. It shows Charles I, enthroned and seated at a table, a protective arm around his youngest son, Henry, who, in turn, places a tentative hand on his father's knee. The group is reminiscent of a similar arrangement in Van

⁷ Haskell, 1987. p. 75; Strong, 1978. p. 141.

⁸ See pp. 273-4.

Dyck's *Charles I and Henrietta Maria with their eldest children* (1632, See Figure 61), where the King's arm encloses the small figure of his eldest son, Prince Charles. In Raoux's image, however, the authoritative and dynastic overtones of the original have been softened, so that Charles no longer confronts the viewer with his penetrating gaze but instead, looks upon his son, wholly occupied with his careful instruction. His other children, James, Duke of York and Princess Elizabeth, watch this scene, while a group of soldiers, a foreboding presence in the doorway, underline the tragic nature of the meeting. The text below contributes to the portrayal of Charles I as a caring and prudent *paterfamilias*, explaining that during his captivity, the King took pains to give his children such advice as might benefit them after his death. Describing the scene illustrated, it tells of how, on the day before his execution, the King extracted a resolute promise from his eight-year-old son, Henry, not to accept the throne while his elder brothers lived. By so doing, this print typifies the close relationship between image and text which would become characteristic of paintings of the Stuart children, while, at the same time, highlighting the picture's historical inaccuracy. For, James, Duke of York, was not privy to this last meeting. In 1648 he had escaped from his custodians and joined the rest of his family in exile. Thus Raoux's composition expresses the beginnings of an increasingly sentimentalised perception of the family of Charles I - one which valued intimate and domestic episodes above the historically momentous and which prized emotional impact above accuracy.

Arguably the most influential visual source for representations of the hapless monarch and his children was Thomas Stothard's painting of *Charles I Taking Leave of His Children* (1794, unlocated), now known through engraved copies (1794, See Figure 97). Exhibited in Robert Bowyer's Historic Gallery in London's Pall Mall, it was commissioned as one of the illustrations to Bowyer's folio edition of David Hume's *History of England* (1793-1806),

then the standard text on English history.⁹ More than a hundred other pictures were painted to accompany scenes from Hume's narrative, spanning centuries of England's past.¹⁰ The aim of the project was to provide the opportunity for "contemplation of faithful images of those whom we have been taught to admire or revere."¹¹ Yet it was also hoped that these images would serve to rouse "the passions, to fire the mind with emulation of heroic deeds, or to inspire it with detestation of criminal actions."¹² Once more, the moment depicted centres on the conversation between Charles and his youngest son the day before the King's execution. It is described by Hume as follows:

"Holding him on his knee, he said, 'Now they will cut off thy father's head.' At these words the child looked very steadfastly upon him. 'Mark child, what I say! They will cut off my head and perhaps make thee a king! But mark what I say! Thou must not be a king, as long as thy brothers, James and Charles are alive. They will cut off thy brothers' heads when they catch them! And thy head too, they will cut off at last! Therefore I charge thee do not be made a king by them! The Duke, sighing, replied, 'I will be torn in pieces first!' So determined an answer from one of such tender years, filled the king's eyes with tears of joy and admiration."¹³

Hume's narrative draws heavily upon Princess Elizabeth's own eye-witness account which was first published just months after her father's death and frequently recited in biographies and histories thereafter.¹⁴

⁹ Lang, 1995. p. 3. Strong, 1987. p. 14.

¹⁰ Strong, 1978. p. 21.

¹¹ Bowyer, 1795. p. 14.

¹² *Ibid.* p. 14.

¹³ Hume, 1806. Vol X, p. 470.

¹⁴ For what is probably the first published account see Anon., *Munday the 29th. January, 1648 A true relation of the Kings speech to the Lady Elizabeth, and the Duke of Gloucester, the day before his death*, published in March 1649 (new calendar). Among the numerous texts which recount this story are Anon., *The life and death of Charles the First King of Great Britain, France and Ireland: containing an account of his sufferings; his tryal, sentence, and dying words on the scaffold; and his sorrowful farewel and advice to his children, and the whole nation in general* (London, 1690); Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The history of the rebellion and civil*

Stothard's composition too had a life beyond its inception, known not only through the extremely popular illustrated editions of Hume but also through later plagiarised copies, featured in books as diverse as Lady Calcott's *Little Arthur's History of England* (1856) and W.H.S. Aubrey's *The National and Domestic History of England* (1867).¹⁵ He favoured a pyramidal composition, with a stubborn-looking, cross-armed Henry perched on his father's left knee and Elizabeth sprawled over his right, gazing up intently.¹⁶ This formation and the viewer's proximity to the picture plane create a real sense of intimacy, which is heightened by the guard standing to their right, who bows his head in acknowledgment of his intrusion on this private meeting. The influence of Stothard's composition can be seen in several nineteenth-century paintings of the subject but is perhaps most striking in Alexandre-Evariste Fragonard's version (1830, See Figure 98). Fragonard's composition appropriates Stothard's pyramidal arrangement but to different ends. Young Henry, held close to his father's bosom, looks up and gestures in distress. Elizabeth – attired and coiffured more like a woman of the French Revolution than of the English Civil War – leans into the King, grasping his arm with both hands. Charles gesticulates with his right arm and gazes upwards in anguish and dismay, while a composed Bishop Juxon observes in the background. The requisite attributes of discarded hat and books and loyal dog are present. The overall effect is one of baroque theatricality and drama, rather than quiet poignancy. Thus it was that the works of both Stothard and Hume played a significant part in the conception and development of

wars in England, begun in the year 1641 (Oxford, 1702); and John Adams, *The flowers of modern history. Comprehending, on a new plan, the most remarkable revolutions and events* (London, 1796).

¹⁵ See Maria, Lady Calcott, *Little Arthur's History of England* (London, 1856). p. 191; and W.H.S. Aubrey, *The National and Domestic History of England* (London, 1867). Vol. 3, p. 169.

¹⁶ This arrangement is surely derived from Renaissance depictions of the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist. See for example, Jacopo Bassano's *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist* (1570). Galleria Degli Uffizi, Florence.

representations of Charles I and his family, a subject which would remain a regular feature in the Royal Academy exhibitions until 1850 and then disappear.¹⁷

On display in the 1851 summer exhibition was Charles Lucy's *The Royal Captives of Carisbrooke, A.D. 1650* (unlocated). This painting marked a shift in taste and a new interest in the depiction of Prince Henry and his sister, Elizabeth, while under parliamentary care. Their father's absence was notable, underlining both the children's innocence and helplessness. In early 1849, a number of newspapers ran a brief account of the death of Princess Elizabeth, who had died in 1650 while in custody at Carisbrooke Castle on the Isle of Wight. Attributed to Thomas Babington Macaulay, these identical reports stated that Elizabeth's demise was, perhaps, an even greater tragedy than that of her father:

"The men who slew her father pleaded cause, but they had no argument but the common argument of the caprices of tyranny for slowly murdering this exquisite child, by inflicting on her youthful timidity all the horrors of a prison . . . (for her qualities) the fanatic king-slayers cared as little as the murderers of Marie Antoinette cared for those of her child, the dauphin."¹⁸

This passage illustrates not only the highly emotive style which characterised many of the accounts of her captivity and death but also the spread of historical knowledge through media other than the history book. Nevertheless, the catalyst for this change in painterly subject matter and its sustained appeal was undoubtedly influenced by Queen Victoria and Prince Albert's efforts to commemorate Princess Elizabeth. With their purchase of Osborne House on the Isle of Wight, the Queen and Prince Consort began to take a special interest in island

¹⁷ The last painting to be exhibited was Charles Lucy's *The Parting of Charles I with his Two Youngest Children, the Day Previous to his Execution* (1850), see Graves, 1905-6. Vol. 5, p. 109.

¹⁸ See *Trewman's Exeter Flying Post or Plymouth and Cornish Advertiser*, Thursday 11th January, 1849. Issue 4336, p. 6; *Royal Cornwall Gazette, Falmouth Packet and General Advertiser*, Friday 26th January, 1849. Issue 2379, p. 7; *The Morning Post*, Thursday 1st February, 1849. Issue 2349, p. 7; *Bristol Mercury*, Saturday 24th February, 1849. Issue 3075, p. 6. *The Morning Post* credits MacAulay, however, I have been unable to trace the source of this text.

affairs. In 1850 they gave a stained-glass window in memory of Elizabeth to the parish church at Carisbrooke.¹⁹ Four years later, the Queen expressed her wish that a monument be erected to the Princess, replacing the engraved brass plate which since 1793 had marked her grave at St. Thomas' Church.²⁰ The Italian sculptor, Carlo Marochetti, received the commission.²¹ In 1856 the monument was unveiled - an understated marble effigy, placed within a niche, lined with iron bars (See Figure 99). The teenage figure lies lifeless - her left arm fallen by her side, her head turned in the same direction and, as history would have it, reclining on the open pages of her Bible. Inscribed upon the leaves is the consolatory message of Matthew 2:28: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden."²² For all its restraint there is something of the fairytale fantasy about the sculpture, a characteristic which could also be applied to later painted depictions of the subject. The commissioning, execution and installation of the monument were widely publicised in the press.²³ However, although some of the reports contain a description of the effigy, its actual appearance had little influence on painted representations. Thus, while the Elizabeth monument may have played a significant part in instigating the vogue for depictions of the Stuart siblings in captivity, it was, in fact, a literary rather than a visual source which was to prove definitive in their conception.

¹⁹ Ward-Jackson, 1990. p. 275.

²⁰ *Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle*, Saturday 29th July, 1854. Issue 2860, p. 4.

²¹ Ward-Jackson, 1990. p. 275.

²² *Ibid.* p. 276.

²³ Between 1854 and 1857 reports on the progress of the monument feature in issues of the *Caledonian Mercury*, *Liverpool Mercury*, *The Ipswich Journal*, *The Aberdeen Journal*, *Isle of Wight Observer*, *The Examiner* and *Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle*. Its success can be gauged by the *Hampshire Advertiser & Salisbury Guardian*'s report that the Queen wished to have stained glass installed in St. Thomas' chancel window, in order to throw "the light on the beautiful statue of the Princess Elizabeth, with the view of its being seen with better effect." Saturday 29th August, 1857. Issue 1774, p. 7.

III

In 1843 the first exhibition connected to the decoration of the new palace of Westminster opened. The display of cartoons illustrating subjects from British history or the works of selected literary masters proved immensely popular.²⁴ Sir Charles Eastlake, secretary of the Commission responsible for the project, wrote of the daily multitude who came to Westminster Hall out of love “for pictures when they represent an event.”²⁵

Interestingly, he continued:

“I abridged the catalogue to a penny size for the million, but many of the most wretchedly dressed people prefer the six penny one with the quotations.”²⁶

Again the special relationship is apparent between word and image in the nineteenth-century imagination. Julia Thomas has observed how written devices, such as titles, quotations and pictured words were employed in contemporary genre painting to instruct the public in their understanding of an image.²⁷ In history painting, too, the written word often played a decisive role. Between 1801 and 1901, of the twelve paintings portraying Charles I and his children, exhibited in the Royal Academy exhibitions, only one was not accompanied by a quotation or extended title.²⁸ Indeed, of those paintings supplemented by a quotation, one author’s work appears to have held a special appeal - the historical writings of Agnes Strickland. The most prominent female historian of her time, Strickland’s twelve volume series, *Lives of the Queens of England* (1840-8), proved a great commercial success, as did her later works, which included biographies of the queens of Scotland and of Tudor and Stuart princesses.²⁹ Strickland specialised in a form of whimsical historical biography which stylistically owed a

²⁴ Boase, 1954, p. 325.

²⁵ Robertson, 1978, p. 65.

²⁶ *Ibid.* p. 65.

²⁷ Thomas, 2004, p. 5.

²⁸ The exception is John Bridges’ painting, “King Charles I, After the Last Interview with his Children, the Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Gloucester” (1838) – see Graves, 1905-6. Vol. 1, p. 279.

²⁹ Maitzen, 1995, p. 372.

significant debt to the romantic novel. “Facts not opinions” was the motto adopted by Agnes and her co-author and sister, Elizabeth.³⁰ Yet, while their investigations were supplemented by extensive manuscript research, the resulting books are characterised by partiality and partisanship, as was well recognised by contemporaries.³¹ Perhaps the best account of the position held by these books, both as literary works and as scions of popular culture, is Margaret Oliphant’s commentary, which featured in *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*:

“Instead of a slow succession of elaborate volumes, full of style and pomp, accuracy and importance, it is a shower of pretty books in red and blue, gilded and illustrated, light and dainty and personal . . . It is not Edward Gibbon but Agnes Strickland – the literary woman of business, and not the antique man of study – who introduces familiarly to our households in these days the reduced pretensions of the historic muse.”³²

Another critic, reviewing Strickland’s Stuart volume of the *Lives of the Queens of England* singled out one particular fault:

“It would be endless to collect the innumerable passages in which she has exerted her ingenuity to cast an air of romance, of pathos, or of humour, over some pointless anecdote.”³³

What the reviewer has so derided, however, may well be that which was to prove so appealing to the artist and his audience. Indeed, several of the charges laid at Strickland’s door could be applied equally to nineteenth-century history paintings.

The extent to which she helped shape artistic representations of Charles I and his children can be seen by close examination of another painting, depicting their last meeting, currently in the collections of Hartlepool Museum (1851, See Figure 100). The picture shows Charles I, one arm bent against a window, his head held melancholically in his hand. Behind

³⁰ See the *Oxford Dictionary of Biography*’s (2004) article on Strickland. Vol. 53, p. 69.

³¹ *Edinburgh Review*. April 1849, p. 462.

³² Oliphant, 1855. p. 443. See Miriam Elizabeth Burstein, “‘The Reduced Pretensions of the Historic Muse’: Agnes Strickland and the Commerce of Women’s History” in *The Journal of Narrative Technique*. Vol. 28, No. 3, Fall, 1998.

³³ *Edinburgh Review*. April 1849, p. 437.

him, Bishop Juxon casts a concerned look in his direction, comforting the diminutive figure of the Duke of Gloucester, as he leads the children away from their father. A crowned portrait of the absent mother, Henrietta Maria, surveys the scene. Meanwhile, a soldier stands, just visible in the doorway, his halberd dissecting Van Dyck's portrait of *King Charles I a la Chasse* on the opposite wall. Comparison of the composition with Strickland's account of the last interview reveals the source for this arrangement:

“The King fervently kissed and blessed his children, and called to Bishop Juxon to take them away. The children sobbed aloud; the King leant his head against the window, trying to repress his tears.”³⁴

In 1850, Charles Lucy exhibited *The Parting of Charles I with his Two Youngest Children, the Day Previous to his Execution*, accompanied by a quotation virtually identical to Strickland.³⁵ A stylistic analysis of the Hartlepool picture shows the same broad handling of paint and soft tonal definition characteristic of Lucy's other known works.³⁶ The re-attribution and dating of the painting, previously catalogued as a nineteenth-century work of the English School, is confirmed by a contemporary review of the painting by Dante Gabriel Rossetti:

“The arrangement adopted by Mr. LUCY is simple and suggestive. Bishop JUXON, holding the young prince's hand, leads him out of the ante-chamber, where the sentry is posted, and where VANDYCK's portrait of the King has been left hanging; the princess now on the threshold, looks back at her father once more; while the quiet head and pattering shoe of the little boy, who is evidently trying to walk faster than he is able, and the delicate manner

³⁴ Strickland, 1848. Vol. VIII, p. 126.

³⁵ “The King fervently kissed and blessed his children, then suddenly rising, called to Bishop Juxon to take them away; the children sobbed aloud. The King, standing, leant against the window; trying to repress his tears.” See Graves, 1905-6. Vol.5, p. 109.

³⁶ See for example Lucy's paintings of *Oliver Cromwell* (1868). Victoria and Albert Museum, London; *Landing of the Pilgrim Fathers* (1848). National Heritage Museum, Lexington, Massachusetts, U.S.A.; and *Nelson Meditating in the Cabin of the Victory Previously to the Battle of Trafalgar* (1854). Royal Naval Museum, Portsmouth.

in which he is being led by the good bishop, are peculiarly happy in their sympathetic appeal. CHARLES, standing, raises one hand to his brow; his face is bewildered with anguish. He is turning unconsciously against the window.”³⁷

Thus, Lucy’s painting is akin to a book illustration, so closely does it follow Strickland’s text and tenor, expressing in visual form the pathos and drama of her prose.

Strickland’s influence can also be seen in depictions of Henry and Elizabeth. When, in the following year, Lucy exhibited *The Royal Captives of Carisbrooke, A.D. 1650*, his accompanying quotation was from her *Historic Scenes and Poetic Fancies* (1850).³⁸ In 1855 Charles West Cope’s *Royal Pensioners at Carisbrooke Castle, 1650* (See Figure 101) and in 1863 T.P. Downes’ *Last Moments of the Princess Elizabeth, Daughter of Charles I* (See Figure 102) were both supplemented by extracts from her *Lives of the Queens*.³⁹ T.P. Downes’ version again shows how literally artists interpreted her historical descriptions. His Elizabeth, dark haired and porcelain skinned, her body sits slouched, her head resting on the pages of the Bible on the table before her. The Princess’ suffering has ceased. Agnes’ account similarly relates:

“She expired alone, sitting in her apartment at Carisbrooke Castle, her fair cheek resting on a Bible, which was the last gift of her murdered father, and which had been her only consolation in the last sad months of her life.”⁴⁰

Strickland’s writing merged historical narrative with melodrama. Her accessible histories caught the public imagination, playing a significant role in the formation of Victorian perceptions of Charles I and his family. The employment of her books in nineteenth-century history painting, as well as the works of other popular writers, illustrates the close complementary relationship between text and image during this period. Rosemary

³⁷ *The Critic*, 15th May 1850, p. 254.

³⁸ Strickland, 1850. p. 114; Graves, 1905-6. Vol. 5, p. 110.

³⁹ Graves, 1905-6. Vol. 2, p. 156; Graves, 1905-6. Vol. 2, p. 361; Strickland, 1848. Vol. VIII, p. 146.

⁴⁰ Strickland, 1848. Vol. VIII, p. 146.

Mitchell has described the genre as providing: “a domestic and miniaturised version of national history.”⁴¹ Similarly, these paintings monumentalise the intimate moments of history’s great and good, while also reducing and domesticating its broad sweep into a series of affecting episodes.

Commenting on Charles Lucy’s *The Parting of Charles I with his Two Youngest Children, the Day Previous to his Execution*, Rossetti mused:

“In no painter whose works we can remember is there to be found more of resolute truth, while in none is it accompanied by less of the mere parade of truthfulness.”⁴²

“Truth”, it would appear, is a subjective term and one which has little relation to historical accuracy. For Lucy’s composition, although it has the impression of historicity, is, in fact, a largely imagined re-creation – a hotchpotch of superficial research and filling in the gaps. For example, Charles I’s figure and physiognomy are clearly derived from Van Dyck’s iconic portraits, in particular, his likeness of the King in black, with the Garter Star emblazoned on his cape (1635-6, See Figure 103). However, this portrait, painted around 13 years before his execution, has little of the wizening features and weary resignation of Charles’ final portraits by Peter Lely and Edward Bower.⁴³ Likewise, Lucy’s King Charles appears remarkably fit and youthful. The figure of Archbishop Juxon appears to be derived from an anonymous portrait of the cleric, painted around 1640 (National Portrait Gallery, London) and widely reproduced in engraved form. The figures of the children, however, are entirely imagined. Elizabeth, who was thirteen at the time of her father’s execution, is depicted as a girl of tender years, while the Duke of Gloucester, then eight years old, has been reduced to infancy. Rossetti finishes his review by praising the painting’s great sense of reality.⁴⁴ Clearly then,

⁴¹ Mitchell, 2000. p. 63.

⁴² *The Critic*, 15th May 1850. p. 254.

⁴³ See Peter Lely’s *Charles I and James, Duke of York* (1647). Syon House, Brentford, Middlesex; and Edward Bower’s *Charles I at his Trial* (1649). Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh.

⁴⁴ *The Critic*, 15th May 1850. p. 254.

historical correctness was not the priority of either the painter or the critic. The semblance of authenticity and projection of emotional truth were more important; through one, the disbelief of the viewer was suspended and, through the other, their involvement with the subject was intensified.

IV

It is puzzling, on the one hand, that many of these paintings display detailed research into seventeenth-century portraiture, dress or furniture, and yet, on the other, they exhibit clear, sometimes absurd, historical inaccuracies. For example, John Everett Millais' *Princess Elizabeth in Prison at St. James's* (1879, See Figure 104) depicts another real-life incident. Based on Agnes Strickland's account in *The Lives of the Last Four Princesses of the Royal House of Stuart* (1872), it shows the moment in 1643 when Elizabeth wrote to the House of Lords pleading for their intercession, after Parliamentary Commissioners had dismissed her servants for refusing to take the Covenant.⁴⁵ Millais' pursuit of accuracy had previously led him to employ historic buildings, such as the Tower of London and Knole, as appropriate settings for his paintings, while his home and studio were furnished with a variety of antique furniture and tapestries which he included in his compositions.⁴⁶ Millais' antiquarian interests are also evident in this picture. Here, the Princess sits upon a seventeenth-century chair, deep in thought, resting one elbow upon a seventeenth-century table, complete with ink-well, quill and candlestick.⁴⁷ Behind her, are a portrait of her father, barely visible nowadays, and an early seventeenth-century cabinet. The cabinet, purchased by the artist a few years earlier, was believed to have belonged to Charles I and to have sat in the Great Hall of Theobald's

⁴⁵ Strickland, 1872. pp. 162-3; Chapel and Hardy, 1980. p. 424.

⁴⁶ Chapel and Hardy, 1980. p. 424.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* p. 424.

Palace.⁴⁸ Having taken such pains to re-create a suitable period setting, the account of how a model for the picture was selected provides an interesting counterpoint. Millais' son and biographer recounted the incident:

“My sister Sophie, then a child of twelve, sat for the figure; but it was by the merest accident that she was selected . . . One morning, while on her way to the studio, she had a nasty fall, that so disfigured one side of her face as to make it impossible to proceed with her portrait. A vacant canvas was, however, at hand, and also the dress Millais had procured for “Princess Elizabeth,” and as he hated to lose time, he started at once upon the new picture, taking Sophie as his model, instead of the professional he had intended to employ.”⁴⁹

Thus the artist's attempts to create a historically correct backdrop are ultimately undermined by his rosy-faced Elizabeth, with long blonde hair and ringlets, mock-Stuart costume and cap - a child ill-suited to her surroundings.

This indifference to the accurate portrayal of the Stuart children is echoed throughout the century. Elizabeth is depicted both as a fully-grown woman and as an infant, while Henry is portrayed as a blonde and a brunette, with short hair and long.⁵⁰ Little attempt was made to research or replicate their physiognomies, which is all the more perplexing when several known portraits of the children were in existence.⁵¹ Mary Anne Everett Green's *Lives of the Princesses of England* (1849-1855), even carried a portrait of Elizabeth as a frontispiece, based on a contemporary engraving of her in mourning.⁵² One final example amply illustrates

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* p. 425.

⁴⁹ Millais, 1899. p. 123.

⁵⁰ See for example, Alexandre-Evariste Fragonard's *Charles I Taking Leave of his Children* (1830). Musee des Augustins, Toulouse, France; Daniel Maclise's *An Interview Between Charles I and Oliver Cromwell* (1836). National Museum of Ireland, Dublin; Margaret Isabel Dicksee's *The Children of Charles I* (1895). Oldham Gallery, London and Julius Schrader's *Charles I's Farewell to his Family*. Staatliche Museen, Berlin, Germany.

⁵¹ For example, Peter Lely's portraits of *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1647 and 1649) in the Royal Collection, London; Lely's portrait of *The Youngest Children of Charles I* (1647). Petworth House, West Sussex; and Francis Barlow's engraving of *Elizabeth Steward [sic], 2nd Daughter to the Late King* (1649). British Museum, London.

⁵² See Mary Anne Everett Green, *Lives of the Princesses of England*. Vol VI (London, 1855). The portrait is based on Barlow's engraving after Peter Lely of *Elizabeth Steward 2nd Daughter to the Late King*.

painterly priorities when depicting the family of Charles I. Daniel Maclise's *An Interview between Charles I and Oliver Cromwell* (1836, See Figure 105) depicts a fictional meeting between the King and the leaders of the Independents. Represented in profile, dressed in armour and with his sword prominently displayed, Cromwell's likeness is loosely based on Robert Walker's portrait (c.1649, National Portrait Gallery, London). He sits, cast in shadow, focusing his intense gaze on the royal captive. Behind him, Ireton cups his chin in his hand as he records the proceedings, while Fairfax's figure emerges from the gloomy background. In contrast, Charles - again closely modelled on Van Dyck's portraiture - is illuminated; animals and children alike gather to his bosom.⁵³ One hand rests on an opened and discarded letter, while his other arm encloses the figure of his son. The dress and appearance of the young prince are drawn from Van Dyck's portrait of the second Duke of Buckingham as a child (1635, See Figure 106). Indeed, Maclise has gone further, appropriating the red and gold attire, which had been employed so strikingly in the original composition of the Duke and his brother, and adapting it for the clothing of the Prince and his sister. The appearance of the little Princess, with her chubby cheeks, large brown eyes, fine curls and cap, is derived from an actual likeness of Elizabeth, contained within Van Dyck's *The Five Eldest Children of Charles I* (1637, See Figure 8). So too, is the little dog which she nuzzles on her father's lap. Once more then, the viewer is presented with a painting which, at first glance, has the appearance of historical authenticity and realism, influenced - if not formed - by original visual sources. On further analysis, however, the full extent of Maclise's artistic licence is revealed and, predictably, the greatest liberties have been taken with the royal children. The quotation which accompanied the painting describes the scene:

⁵³ See Figure 61. The King's dress and posture are clearly derived from Van Dyck's *Charles I and Henrietta Maria with their eldest children* (1632).

“After the surrender of Charles I from the Scottish camp to the English commissioners, many interviews took place between that prince and the leaders of the independent party, with a view to some final accommodation . . . One of these interviews forms the subject of the picture, Charles I, the young Duke of York and the Princess Elizabeth (the only members of his family left in England), Cromwell, Ireton, Fairfax and his officers, are the persons represented.”⁵⁴

Thus the painting’s apparent accuracy is undermined, first and foremost, by the omission of the King’s youngest son, Henry, Duke of Gloucester. Maclise’s composition consists of an absurd assortment of likenesses, some drawn from portraits painted over fifteen years before the period represented. The figure of the seven-year-old Duke of Buckingham, for example, serves for Prince James, Duke of York, who would actually have been around fifteen at the time, while Princess Elizabeth’s infantile appearance is some eleven years out of date. Why then, has the artist employed detailed research into primary visual sources only to alter, adapt and obscure reality? The answer again lies in the emotional effect of the painting. By reducing the ages of the royal offspring and portraying them as children of immature years, he has reinforced their vulnerability and innocence, heightening the painting’s sentimentality. The hero and villains of the piece are clearly delineated - for only the most unfeeling viewer could not be moved by such a touching sight. Once more, historical accuracy has been subordinated to emotional impact. To the Victorian history painter, poignancy and pathos were of the utmost importance. The accurate depiction of the royal children was not, therefore, significant because their appearance was symbolic. Their own histories were misrepresented because they served as emblems - for embedded within their representation were messages about contemporary nineteenth-century issues and modern day anxieties.

⁵⁴ Graves, 1905-6. Vol. 5, p. 153.

V

So what did images of the children of Charles I mean to their nineteenth-century audience and how did their depiction and its significance change over this period?

Commenting on her contemporaries' tendency to look back into history as a means of explaining the dilemmas of the present, Margaret Oliphant observed:

“We recollect that these old heroes had not a thought of the nineteenth-century under these grim visors of theirs, nor the smallest intention of benefiting us by their blunders and mischances.”⁵⁵

Yet, despite Oliphant's caveat, the continuing appeal of the hapless Stuarts lay precisely in the apparent parallels between the struggles of the seventeenth century and the issues which affected Victorian society.⁵⁶ One of those was the safeguarding of the home and family, for few aspects of society were regarded with greater respect.⁵⁷ Indeed, in describing this preoccupation, Anthony Wohl remarked that “it was more than a social institution, it was a creed and it was held as a dogma carrying all the force of a tradition that family life distinguished England from less stable and moral societies.”⁵⁸ What is more, as Chase and Levenson have observed, the nineteenth-century public were not only conscious of inheriting this fixation but also actively sought out historical precedents for their own family affection and domestic difficulties.⁵⁹ The Stuarts provided one such precedent. Culture at the court of Charles I celebrated and revered the bonds of love between King and Queen and in turn, rejoiced in the fruits of their union, the royal family.⁶⁰ Van Dyck's royal portraits, in particular *Charles I and Henrietta Maria with their eldest children* (See Figure 61), gave visual expression to this sentiment. As can be seen from the number of nineteenth-century

⁵⁵ Oliphant, 1855. p. 438.

⁵⁶ Strong, 1978. p. 141; Lang, 1995. p. 1.

⁵⁷ Wohl, 1978. p. 9.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* p. 10.

⁵⁹ Chase and Levenson, 2000. p. 13.

⁶⁰ Schama, 1986. p. 164; Smuts, 1987. p. 195; Sharpe, 2010. p. 174.

pictures which appropriated or adapted this imagery, it struck a chord with the Victorians, providing a prototype for their own domestic ideal. These later paintings then, serve almost as sequels to Van Dyck's canvas, showing the subsequent destruction of this model - the affectionate family torn apart by extremism – and, for many, this was a familiar message.

To those who remembered the French Revolution it had become an object-lesson and a warning foretold by the events of the Civil Wars.⁶¹ Indeed, it was not difficult to draw parallels. Commenting on the imprisonment of Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Gloucester, Strickland wrote that “there are few who would defend Cromwell's treatment of the orphaned children the barbarity of which has only been exceeded by the leaders of the French Revolution to the son and daughter of Louis XVI, for which it formed a disgraceful precedent.”⁶² The message was clear – radicalism was the natural enemy of those morals and social institutions held so dear by the Victorians. The public did not even have to look as far back as the French Revolution for the unsettling effects of political change. Following the Napoleonic Wars demands for parliamentary reform had become increasingly pronounced. By the end of 1830, economic depressions, agricultural revolts, the growth of political unions at home, as well as successful revolutions abroad, threatened to bring down the ruling classes.⁶³ The governing elite faced a situation analogous to that which had confronted the early Stuarts. They could replicate the events of the seventeenth century, oppose change and risk civil unrest or worse; or they could learn from them, accept reform and avoid revolution by expanding the political community.⁶⁴ However, the eventual passing of the 1832 Reform Act did not mark the end of these political tensions, as both the rise of the Chartist Movement, during the 1830s and 1840s, and a new wave of revolutions on the Continent in

⁶¹ Rubinstein, 1998. p. xii; Lang, 1995. p. 2.

⁶² Strickland, 1850. p. 116.

⁶³ Evans, 2001. p. 261.

⁶⁴ Lang, 1995. p. 50.

1848 continued to shake the establishment.⁶⁵ Within this context, it is interesting to revisit the phrasing of the quotation which accompanied Daniel Maclise's *An Interview between Charles I and Oliver Cromwell* (See Figure 105), painted in 1836:

“After the surrender of Charles I from the Scottish camp to the English commissioners, many interviews took place between that prince and the leaders of the independent party, with a view to some final accommodation. They were conducted chiefly by Lieut.-General Cromwell and the Commissioner-General Ireton, whose education as a lawyer proved of great service in all the state negotiations of the army. The General-in-Chief, Fairfax, and others of the principal officers, also took part in these interviews, but without sharing, it is understood, the active zeal of Cromwell or his son-in-law. They closed, finally, in a rejection by the king of the terms proposed.”⁶⁶

Maclise focuses on negotiation and accommodation. His emphasis on the breakdown of the talks, brought to an end by the inflexibility of Charles I, is telling. Thus the painting is endowed with an added poignancy, presenting the King's later fate as inevitable. It warns of the dangers of fanaticism; yet may also be perceived as advocating a positive attitude towards compromise and moderation, sentimentally drawing attention to the family, the innocent victims of this failure. Images of the last interviews of Charles I and his children embodied a conservative stream in nineteenth-century thought. In a period of immense political change, they represented a noble notion of tradition, institution and establishment. Yet their depiction also looked back to the end of the *ancien regime* and contained warnings about the consequences of the failure to adapt. These paintings played to contemporary nineteenth-century anxieties. They presented their audience with a model of their own domestic ideal

⁶⁵ Evans, 2001. p. 322. Strong, 1978. p. 141.

⁶⁶ See *The Exhibition of the Royal Academy MDCCCXXXVI* (London, 1836).

shattered by civil unrest. Radicalism and revolution were portrayed as the enemies of family life; moderation and temperance as its preservation.

As well as political change, the first half of the nineteenth century also witnessed substantial religious change. Relations between the Anglican Church and the state were difficult. The Church of England was in urgent need of reform.⁶⁷ Overpopulated with country clergymen, non-conformists often outnumbered its ministry in urban areas.⁶⁸ Too many of its incumbents were not resident in their parishes and charges of corruption were rife.⁶⁹ The demands of Roman Catholics and dissenters for religious toleration were also gaining support, culminating with the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828.⁷⁰ With this apparent weakening of the Church, some feared that the social order too was at risk of degradation.⁷¹ Once more the struggles of the seventeenth century were studied in order to negotiate contemporary issues.⁷² Within this dialogue Charles and his family represented a noble, unflinching form of Anglicanism, as demonstrated by the Reverend Richard Cattermole's commentary on their final meetings:

“The subject of religion was that which, on each repetition of his counsels, the king concluded. He enjoined them all alike to persevere, against all entreaty and opposition in the profession of that form of Christianity in which they had been educated ‘what discountenance and ruin soever (sic) might befall the poor church’.”⁷³

Indeed, paintings of the Stuarts, executed throughout the century, were filled with the emblems of their piety. The King's open and well-thumbed Bible makes frequent

⁶⁷ Lang, 1995. p. 44.

⁶⁸ Evans, 2001. p. 297.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* p. 297.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* p. 258.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* p. 258.

⁷² Lang, 1995. p. xii. Strong, 1978. p. 45.

⁷³ Cattermole, 1845. p. 206. See also Strickland, 1850. p. 126; Penrose, 1867. p. 326. No doubt the failed conversion of Henry, Duke of Gloucester, was also called upon in these images. For, as Strickland reported in her account of this episode Henry had entreated his mother and “solemnly pleaded to her the promise that his murdered father had exacted from him in their last interview, never to renounce the Church of England.” See Strickland, 1848. Vol. VIII, p. 153.

appearances in depictions of the last interviews.⁷⁴ Solomon Alexander Hart's *Dinner-time at Penshurst in the year 1655* (1876, unlocated) portrayed the orphaned Prince and Princess at grace before their meal.⁷⁵ Much of the appeal of images depicting the recently deceased Elizabeth surely stemmed from the fact that she had expired contemplating her father's holy book, "which had been her only consolation in the last sad moments of her life."⁷⁶ Indeed, pictures of her can be read as part of an artistic trend which exalted the young female victim and, like another Victorian favourite, Lady Jane Grey, offered a model of virtue, learning and Protestant piety to which daughters of the nineteenth century might aspire.⁷⁷ Thus unlike the members of their family who were already in exile on the Continent and exposed to Catholic influences, Charles and his children, Henry and Elizabeth, represented a pure, devout and untainted form of Anglicanism. Despite the Interregnum and the threats which followed it, the High Church had survived. It may well be that in images of Charles I and his children that message was reiterated and the devout were charged to stand firm.

As has been noted above, following the exhibition of Charles Lucy's *The Parting of Charles I with his two youngest children, the day previous to his execution* (1850, See Figure 100), a new preference emerged for paintings of Henry and Elizabeth in captivity, without their father.⁷⁸ Pictures, like Margaret Isabel Dicksee's *The Children of Charles I* (1895, See Figure 107), appealed to a nineteenth-century sentimentalised view of the innocence and

⁷⁴ See for example, Daniel Maclise's *An Interview between Charles I and Oliver Cromwell* (1837). National Museum of Ireland, Dublin; Alexandre-Evariste Fragonard's *Charles I Taking Leave of His Children* (1830). Musee des Augustins, Toulouse; Engraving after John Bridges, *King Charles I, after the last interview with his children, the Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Gloucester* (1841). National Portrait Gallery, London; and Rudolph Ackermann's aquatint, *Charles I Parting from his Children* (1838). Heritage Images.

⁷⁵ Graves, 1905-6. Vol. 4, p. 14. Note the error in the title's date - Elizabeth was already 5 years dead by 1655, while, in 1653, Henry had been released to live in exile on the Continent.

⁷⁶ Strickland, 1848. p. 146. This theme was re-iterated in the quotations accompanying Charles Lucy's *The Royal Captives of Carisbrooke, A.D. 1650* (1851), unlocated; Charles West Cope's *Royal Pensioners at Carisbrooke Castle, 1650* (1855). Carisbrooke Castle, Isle of Wight; and T.P. Downes' *Last Moments of the Princess Elizabeth, daughter of Charles I* (1863), sold at Christies London, 8th November, 1996, Lot 78. See Graves, 1905-6. Vol. 5, p. 110; Vol. 2, p. 156, Vol. 2, p. 361.

⁷⁷ Strong, 1978. p. 126.

⁷⁸ See p. 256.

vulnerability of childhood, while representing a smaller, related sub-genre, specifically concerned with the child victim. In Dicksee's composition a frail and rheumy-eyed Elizabeth gazes from her place of confinement, through a window, to the world outside. Rays of sunlight spill through, illuminating her figure. Depicted as an invalid, with her head propped against a pillow and her wasted hands drooping over the rests of her chair, she is dressed in white, her mantle lined with ermine and a black ribbon in her hair, denoting her mourning. Perched on a stool to her left, Henry, dressed in black, looks up at his sister, with a concerned glance. To the children's left lies a pile of discarded books in which her father's Bible is no doubt present, as well as the familiar *vanitas* symbols of an hourglass and a lute with a broken string. Elizabeth's sad fate is implicit within this maudlin arrangement, while the hopelessness of the children's predicament is underlined by the conspicuous absence of a parental protector. The theme of the suffering child - both imagined and real - had immense hold over the mid to late nineteenth-century public. Accounts of children in distress could be found in writings of diverse kinds: in novels, poetry, newspapers and reform pamphlets.⁷⁹ Child victims featured in the fictional works of some of the most famous authors of the time, including those of Anne Bronte, George Eliot, Charles Dickens and Lewis Carroll.⁸⁰ They were also a popular subject for the artist, with painters such as Frank Holl (1845-88) and Thomas Benjamin Kennington (1856-1916) regularly revisiting it.⁸¹ In short "the often sensational story of children at risk was endlessly repeated."⁸²

In history painting too, this theme found expression. Between 1769 and 1893, seventeen canvases showing scenes from the lives of Edward V and the Duke of York,

⁷⁹ Berry, 2000. p. 165.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* p. 2.

⁸¹ See for example, Frank Holl's *Hush!* (1877). Tate Britain, London; *Faces in the Fire* (1867). Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; and *Widowed* (1879). National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia; and Thomas Benjamin Kennington's *Orphans* (1885). Tate Britain, London; *Homeless* (1890). Bendigo Art Gallery, Bendigo, Australia; and *The Pinch of Poverty* (1889). Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia.

⁸² Berry, 2000. p. 165.

popularly known as the “Princes in the Tower”, were displayed in the Royal Academy exhibitions and, like images of Henry and Elizabeth, around the middle of the century, a change in visual emphasis can be discerned.⁸³ Between 1769 and 1842 the majority focused on the moment when Elizabeth Woodville delivered her youngest son, Richard, Duke of York, to be conveyed to the Tower of London.⁸⁴ Then from the Princes’ next appearance in 1850 until 1893, their representation is dominated by paintings which show the boys alone in the Tower.⁸⁵ Thus, in common with images of the children of Charles I, an early interest in the parental parting was gradually replaced by an emphasis on the unprotected child. There are compositional similarities, too. James Northcote’s *King Edward V and his brother Richard, Duke of York, murdered in the Tower by order of Richard III* (1786, See Figure 108), shows the two cherub-like boys innocently asleep, a Bible by their pillow, while a soldier and a guard approach silently overhead, ready to smother their charges. A similar arrangement is used, with different effect, in Alfred Joseph Woolmer’s *The Royal Captives of Carisbrooke Castle* (c.1850s, See Figure 109). Here, Elizabeth lies on her side as if asleep, her head pillowed by her Bible. Facing the viewer, her pose is reminiscent of the older Prince in Northcote’s image. In place of the assassins, Henry approaches, leaning over her figure, pictured at the moment of realisation. Clearly then, these images had an affinity and were indicative of a wider concern.

So what relevance did the historical child victim have to the Victorians? From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, Britain saw the creation and growth of social practices, institutions and legislation designed to protect the child.⁸⁶ The interests of the young were increasingly viewed as synonymous with the interests of the state and it was believed that

⁸³ Strong, 1978. pp. 159-160.

⁸⁴ *Ibid*, 1978. p. 159. Six of the ten paintings displayed depict this scene; three show the Princes in the Tower; and one illustrates the marriage of the Duke of York to Lady Anne Mowbray.

⁸⁵ *Ibid*, 1978. pp. 159-160. Of the seven paintings displayed, five depict the Princes in the Tower; one shows the parting of Queen Elizabeth and her youngest son; and one portrays the Duke of York’s marriage.

⁸⁶ Berry, 2000. p. 163.

childhood must be one of dependence and protection within the bounds of a family.⁸⁷ Laura Berry has argued that representations of childhood suffering invariably positioned their discourse in relation to social reform projects and debates.⁸⁸ Likewise, images of historical child victims played to these concerns. By tugging on Victorian heart strings, pictures of Henry and Elizabeth underlined the vulnerability of childhood. At a time when the role of the parent was coming under increasing scrutiny, paintings of suffering children, deprived of adult protection, appealed to the nineteenth-century moralising sensibility. In a way these images were self-affirming, for by depicting child cruelty from the past, the Victorians, in contrast, could identify themselves with enlightenment and progress.

VI

Nineteenth-century history paintings reveal a wealth of information about the modern construction of a national self-image. Thus, while images of Charles I and his family represent the creation of a Stuart myth, they may also hold the key to deciphering a Victorian one. They provide considerable insight into the public's conception of the past – articulating both what that notion was as well as helping to unravel how it was formed. These paintings are full of drama, pathos and romance, focusing on private, personal tragedy as a more immediate means of expressing the calamities of civil unrest. Their conception is indebted to the rise of the popular historical text and they echo much of the whimsy and anecdote found in the pages of Strickland and her contemporaries. Yet while a vivid portrayal of the past was important to the nineteenth-century artist, historical accuracy was less so. Broad treatment and sketchy handling characterise the painter's attitude, with authenticity subordinated to emotional impact. The distortion of the royal children's history was not regarded as

⁸⁷ Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1973. Vol. 2, p. 163. Cunningham, 2005. p. 148. See also Herbert Spencer's article, *What Knowledge is of Most Worth?* in *The Westminster Review* XVI, 1859.

⁸⁸ Berry, 2000. p. 17.

important, because their presence was symbolic. Through their representation the nineteenth-century audience could negotiate a range of contemporary issues and debates about politics, religion and society. Most significantly perhaps, Charles I and his children provided a precedent for the affectionate Victorian family. In images of the last interviews and the royal captives at Carisbrooke the middle-class public were presented with visions of two of their most pressing social concerns – the safeguarding of family life and the prevention of child cruelty. Within these historical dialogues, it is interesting to note how the only survivor of this family group emerged. When, in *Mrs Markham's History of England* (1867), one of the young protagonists asks what became of the little Duke of Gloucester, the authoress replies: “He died young and has left an amiable character.”⁸⁹ The later episodes of his life were, therefore, obscured from the constructed nineteenth-century memory of the Prince. To the Victorians, Henry remained the little boy who, innocent and uncomprehending, witnessed the deaths of his father and sister.

Throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries then, the memories of Stuart princes were appropriated and manipulated. The development of their images was invariably shaped by changing political, social and religious circumstances. Accordingly, their representations often became sites for negotiation of the issues and anxieties of later ages.

⁸⁹ Penrose, 1867. p. 324.

Conclusion

Following the death of Queen Anne in 1714 and the accession of George I and the house of Hanover, Richard Newcomb published a broadside on *The Life, Birth, Noble Character and Heroick Actions of the Most High, Most Powerful, and Most Mighty Prince George*, accompanied by a double-portrait woodcut (See Figure 110). Together, text and image combined to produce a reassuring portrayal of Britain's new royal dynasty. Yet the imagery and its significance are familiar, with the customary emphasis on Protestantism and martial prowess. King George is shown alongside his son, the Duke of Cambridge. The King holds the sceptre and orb in his hands; he wears the crown and an ermine-lined cloak, while his garter star and lesser George are prominently displayed. In a gesture symbolic of his Protestant devotion, he rests one foot on the papal crown. Concerning his foreign birth and blood the author informs us that the royal house will soon become anglicised, for "contrary to the frivolous Exception of some, who said . . . That we should become Subject to Foreign customs and Manners, Foreigners will become Subject to our Customs, which in one Age will render our Princes of that Extraction entirely English in every respect."¹ This statement shifts focus onto the line proceeding from George I and to the figure of his son, who stands beside him. Despite the fact that the Prince was actually thirty-one years of age at the time of his father's accession, he is depicted as a boy. In one hand he holds a small military baton, while with the other he clutches a pasteboard shield, bearing the Prince of Wales' feathers and motto.² He is represented as a martial youth, a successor to the old tradition of English

¹ Anon., *The Life, Birth, Noble Character and Heroick Actions of the Most High, Most Powerful, and Most Mighty Prince George* (1714). p. 1.

² This motif is reminiscent of Robert Peake's portrait of *Henry, Prince of Wales* (1608). Palazzo Reale, Turin, Italy.

chivalry. Certainly, the image of a young heir was more appealing than that of a fully-grown and mature prince. An adolescent was as yet unproven and unchallenged; he could still be shaped and influenced. Thus, while the requisite attributes of Protestant piety and military command were yet again employed to appease the immediate concerns of the British public, so too was that potent mark of hope – youth. Never mind that it was a fallacy; it was a comforting one.

As has been shown, these three representational traits - Protestantism, martial aptitude and youth - were crucial to the enduring appeal of the deceased Stuart Prince. Having striven to forge an effective and popular *persona* in life, their posthumous portrayal maintained and amplified those characteristics, while, as a consequence of their demise, their images were never undermined or challenged. This study has reassessed Stuart princely representation, through analysis of the developing and shifting *personae* of the prematurely deceased royal heirs of seventeenth-century Britain. Through examination of a broad cache of visual and cultural evidence, it has been argued that their images were constructed in response to popular concerns and that what emerged was effective, powerful and alluring. Indeed, such were the achievements of this process of fashioning and framing that, following their deaths, the impact of their loss was amplified and they increasingly came to represent a series of lost hopes and aspirations.

It is important to underscore what is often taken for granted – royal heirs were of vital import to their parents, to the dynasty as a political entity and to the security of the realm. One needs only to consider the political implications of the births of Prince Henry Frederick and of James, Prince of Wales, as well as to study the surrounding festivities, to appreciate that the production of royal progeny was a serious concern. Royal male infants were emblematic of their parents' successful and fruitful match. As long as they survived, the line of succession was guaranteed and the nation's stability protected. As they matured, however,

it became important that their representation constituted more than simply confirmation of their parents' marital achievements. The future of kingdom and dynasty was embodied in their persons and their portrayal needed to address the principal concerns and anxieties of their subjects. Thus, while their *personae* were undoubtedly formed in response to specific and altering circumstances and demands, the established archetype persisted of the royal youth in-training as defender of the faith and guardian of the state. This paradigm was not without its problems. Any deviation from the traditional model could result in de-stabilising incongruities or adulterations, while, if the image proved too potent and a prince became too popular, ideological conflicts with, and challenges to, his elders might emerge. Princely images were complex and had to be negotiated assiduously.

After the premature deaths of these princes, the political repercussions of their loss were compounded by the ideological impact. Despite the reduction and simplification of official acts of commemoration, the personal and individual compulsion to mourn and memorialise endured. It may well be to this persistent need that the burgeoning "trade in death" responded, while the wealth of commemorative ephemera, issued in the days and weeks following, was instrumental in locating, advancing and securing their posthumous representations. Their images were fixed and the most alluring aspects of their portrayal would remain untested. Consequently, the general sense of affliction was intensified, for not only had the nation lost a source of stability and protection, a shining ideal and a brighter future had also vanished. Unsurprisingly, the surviving Stuarts often found it difficult to present a strong, united front under these circumstances. It was not easy to overcome the rift of bereavement and to look ahead, when the prevailing tendency was one of retrospection. Matters were made worse if the remaining heirs could not conform to the conventional model of Stuart princely portrayal. Religion, gender and age could impede the cultivation of an effective and appealing image, emphasising the absence of that longed-for paradigm. Indeed,

it was amidst periods of apprehension and disappointment that the powerful pull of the deceased prince would become most compelling. In the decades and centuries following their demise, images and texts continued to dwell upon these lost royal youths. Inevitably, their representation responded to contemporary political, religious and social events. Their religious commitment, military aptitude and youthful promise were amplified and accentuated, so that their portrayal evoked a woeful sense of “what if”. Nostalgia pervaded their posthumous depiction, encouraging the audience to imagine an alternative, more hopeful present, while, conversely, inciting them to mourn all that had been lost. In fact, the image of the Stuart prince continued to be adapted and appropriated well into the nineteenth century and, again, it was to prove symptomatic of contemporary issues and concerns. In his closing remarks upon the life of Henry, Prince of Wales, Roy Strong commented that: “The writing of history must always take into account lost visions and lost hopes, the world that might have been but never was.”³ This study has sought to do just that and, in so doing, has established that this concern also pervaded the early modern mind-set. Nostalgia, in its various forms, held as much appeal then as it does today.

While this thesis has dealt specifically with the representation of short-lived Stuart princes, new light has been shed on broader issues of historical debate. These include traditions and continuities in the cultural articulation of royal authority, the construction of gendered modes of representation, as well as the manipulation, projection and reception of early-modern memory. Indeed, it is hoped that this work will not only inform but promote further analysis and discussion. What is most striking, are the wide-ranging implications, associations and complexities, embodied in representations of these lost heirs. For lives which amounted to little more than a series of unfulfilled promises and disappointed

³ Strong, 1986, p. 225.

aspirations, their sustained and enduring cultural impact is remarkable. In many ways, death was not the end but, instead, constituted a new beginning.

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources:

Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A.
Prince Henrie His Life, Death and Funerallles: Osborn MS b431.

Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Clarendon State Papers: January 1652 - June 1653, Clarendon MS 45; August 1654 - March 1655, Clarendon MS 49; 1668-80, Clarendon MS 87.

Clarendon Family Papers (1627-1664): Clarendon MS 129.

Heraldic Papers: Ashmole MS 840.

Ormonde Papers: Carte MS 48; Carte MS 79.

British Library, London.

Additional MS:

A Copie of a Letter Sent unto a Certaine Friend: Add MS 11532.

A List of Her Majesties Pictures in Kensi(n)gton, Hampton Court and Windsor Castle: Add MS 20013.

Account of The Life and Death of Henry, Prince of Wales: Add MS 30075.

Correspondence and Papers of Sir Charles Cornwallis: Add 39853.

Cotton Pedigree: Add MS 53781.

Evelyn Papers: Add MS 78670.

Letter book of Sir John Holles: Add MS 32464.

Letters Patent of James I, creating his son, Henry, Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester: Add MS 36932.

Miscellaneous papers relating to court ceremonial: Add MS 4712.

Original Letters addressed to Elizabeth of Bohemia: Add 18744.

Original Letters of Royal and Other Personages: Add 24023.

Papers of Sir William Dugdale, Norroy King of Arms (1660-77): Add MS 38141.

State Papers, Historical Documents and Official and Private Letters, formerly belonging to the family of Malet, Baronets of Wilbury: Add MS 32095.

Volume of Heraldic and Historical Treatises: Add MS 12514.

Cotton MS:

Historia rerum Anglicarum: Cotton MS Vespasian B VI.

Miscellaneous Royal Papers: Cotton MS Titus C VII.

Royal Ceremonial Papers: Cotton MS Julius B XII.

Royal Ceremonial Papers: Cotton MS Vespasian C XIV.

Egerton MS:

Correspondence and Papers of Sir Edward Nicholas: 1650-1654, Egerton MS 2534; 1660-61, Egerton MS 2537.

Harley MS:

Inventory of His Majesty's Goods 1688: Harleian MS 1890.

Miscellaneous Papers: Harleian MS 305.

Miscellaneous Papers: Harleian MS 5176.

Lansdowne MS:

Miscellaneous Papers: Lansdowne MS 261.

Stowe MS:

Edmond's Papers: 28th March 1609 – 24th March 1610, Stowe MS 171; 1st July 1612 – 12th March 1613, Stowe MS 173.

College of Arms, London.

Garters Register 1 (1644-64).

Heraldic Papers: Vincent MS 151.

Royal Funerals 1618-1738: Nayler (Press 20F/Royal Funerals).

National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh.

Prince Henry His Life Death and Funeralls: Adv. MS 33.7.14.

The Alphabet of Honnor: or The Succession and Armes of the Kinges, Princes, Dukes, Marquesses, Earls, Barons, and Gentry of England since the Conquest: Adv. MS 31.3.19.

The Journal of Sir David Nairne: MS 14266.

The Life and Tragedy of the roiall Lady Mary, late Queen of Scotts: Adv. MS 19.3.3.

The Life Araigment and Death of the famous and learned, Sir Thomas More: Adv. MS 33.7.16.

National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

Letters to Sir John Ogilvy from James VI asking him to prepare to be present at the Baptism of Prince Henry: GD205/1/21 and GD205/1/22.

Royal letter summoning the Master of Gray to the baptism of Prince Henry, scribed James. GD1/212/55.

Volume of accounts of the King's and Queen's apparel furnished by Robert Jousie, merchant, at the direction of George Home of Spott, Master of the Wardrobe 1590-1600: E35/13.

The National Archives, London.

Records Assembled by the State Papers Office:

State Papers Domestic, Charles II: December 1666, SP 29/180.

State Papers Domestic, Charles II: 29th November, 1677 – 31st December 1677, SP 29/398.

State Papers Domestic, James I: March – April 1610, SP 14/53; June 1610, SP 14/55;

State Papers Domestic, King William's Chest: April 1674 – June 1686, SP 8/3.

State Papers France, Charles II: 1660-61, SP 78/115.

State Papers Holland, Charles II: June – December, 1677, SP 84/205.

State Papers Scotland, Elizabeth I: January – July, 1594, SP 52/53; August – December, 1594, SP 52/54.

Records of the Exchequer:

Privy Purse of Henry, Prince of Wales: 1st October 1610 - 6th November 1612, E 351/2794.

Records of the Lord Chamberlain and other Officers of the Royal Household:

Provisions for the Funeral of His Highness the Duke of Gloucester: LC 2/14/1.

The Accompt of the Right honourable Edward Earle of Sandwich, Master of his Ma(jes)ties Great Wardrobe. For the Funeralls of the Duke of Gloucester, The Princess of Aurange, The Duke of Cambridge and the Queen of Bohemia: LC 2/7.

The p(ar)ticular accompte of the right honorable the Lord Hay, M(aste)r of His Ma(jes)t(y)s Great Warderoabe for the funeral of the high and mightie Prince Henry, Prince of Wales: LC 2/4/6.

Records of the Privy Council:

Memorandum relating to the Deaths of Princes of the Royal Family from 1660 to the Present time 1772: PC 1/13/47.

Privy Council Registers, Charles II: 3rd May 1649 – 6th March 1650 and 13th January 1658 – 28th September 1660, PC 2/54.

Privy Council Registers, James II: 6th February 1685 – 18th March 1687, PC 2/71.

Results of searches made for precedents concerning mourning ordered for, and the burial places of, younger children of the Monarch, 1660-1700: PC 1/13/55.

Primary Published Sources:

Anon. *A Cordial Elegie and Epitaph upon the Much Lamented Death of that Incomparable Prince Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1660).

Anon. *A form of prayer with thanksgiving for the safe delivery of the Queen; and happy birth of the young Prince . . . By His Majesties special command* (London, 1688).

Anon. *A Funeral Monument: Or the Manner of the Herse of the Most Renowned Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex* (London, 1646).

Anon. *A Perfect Relation of the Memorable Funeral of the Right Honourable, Robert, Earle of Essex* (London, 1646).

Anon. *A Poem to Her Royal Highness, Upon the Birth of her Daughter* (London, 1682).

Anon. *A Thanksgiving and Prayer for the safe Child-bearing of the Queenes Majestie* (London, 1629).

Anon. *A Thanksgiving for the safe delivery of the Queene, and happy birth of the yong Prince* (London, 1630).

Anon. *An Elegy on the Death of the Duke of Cambridge, which happened on the 12th of December 1677* (London, 1677).

Anon. *An Elegie upon the Death of the Right Honourable Robert Devereux, Late Earl of Essex* (London, 1646).

Anon. *An Elegie upon the Universally-lamented Death of the Thrice Noble and Vertuous Prince, Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1660).

Anon. *An Exact Narrative of the Attempts made upon the Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1655).

Anon. *Dying Tears. Or, England's Joy Turned to Mourning* (London, 1660).

Anon. *Early blossoms of Genius and Virtue; Including Maxims of Early Wisdom, Juvenile Memoirs, a Great Variety of Examples of the Moral Virtues* (London, 1797).

Anon. *Englands triumphs for the Prince of Wales, or, A short description of the fireworks, machines &c. which were represented on the Thames before Whitehall to the King and Queen, nobility and gentry, forreign ministers and many thousands of spectators, on Tuesday-night July 17, 1688* (London, 1688).

Anon. *His Maiesties commission to all the Lords, and others of the Priuie Counsell, touching the creation of baronets whereunto are annexed diuers instructions, and His Maiesties letters patents containing the forme of the said creation. Also the forme of an oath to be taken by the said baronets* (London, 1611).

Anon. *Munday the 29th. January, 1648 A true relation of the Kings speech to the Lady Elizabeth, and the Duke of Gloucester, the day before his death* (London, 1649).

Anon. *Prayers appointed to be vsed in the church at morning and euening prayer by euery minister, for the Queenes safe deliuerance Set foorth and inioyned by authoritie* (London, 1605, reissued 1606).

Anon. *Relation Veritable, De ce qui s'est passé au Subject du Voyage de Son Altesse Monseigneur le Prince d'Orange en Angleterre, & de Son Mariage avec la Princesse Marie Fille ainee de S.A.R. Monseign(eu)r le Duc d'Yorck* (The Hague, 1678).

Anon. *Some Teares Dropt ore the Herse of the Incomparable Prince Henry Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1660).

Anon. *The Character of a Prince* (London, 1689).

Anon. *The copie of the Kings Maiesties letters patents for the making of allomes, in England, Scotland; and Ireland, or in any other his Maiesties dominions* (London, 1610).

Anon. *The English Poems Collected from the Oxford and Cambridge Verses on the Death of His Royal Highness Frederick, Prince of Wales* (Edinburgh, 1751).

Anon. *The Life, Birth, Noble Character and Heroick Actions of the Most High, Most Powerful, and Most Mighty Prince George* (London, 1714).

Anon. *The life and death of Charles the First King of Great Britain, France and Ireland: containing an account of his sufferings; his tryal, sentence, and dying words on the scaffold; and his sorrowful farewell and advice to his children, and the whole nation in general* (London, 1690).

Anon. *The Protestants Satisfaction* (London, 1689).

Anon. *The Queen's Lamentation* (London, 1660).

Anon. *Thraenodium Britannicum* (London, 1700).

Abbey, R. *An Elegie upon the Most Deplorable Death of Prince Henry, Eldest Sonne to the King of Bohemia* (London, 1629).

Adams, John. *The flowers of modern history. Comprehending, on a new plan, the most remarkable revolutions and events* (London, 1796).

Allyne, Robert. *Funeral Elegies upon the Most Lamentable and Untimely Death of the Thrice Illustrious Prince Henry, Prince of Wales* (London, 1613).

- Ashbee, Andrew and Harley, John (eds). *The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal* (Aldershot and Burlington, 2000).
- Aubrey, W.H.S. *The National and Domestic History of England*. 3 Vols, Vol. 3 (London, 1867).
- Bathurst, Benjamin (ed.). *Letters of Two Queens* (London, 1924).
- Baudius, Domenicus. *Monumentum Consecratum Honori & memoriae Serenissimi Britanniarum Principis Henrici Frederici* (Leiden, 1612).
- Birch, Thomas. *The Heads of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain*. (London, 1742).
- Birch, Thomas. *The Life of Henry, Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I* (London, 1760).
- Bowyer, Robert. *An Elucidation of Mr. Bowyer's Plans for a Magnificent Edition of Hume's History of England with a Continuation by G. Gregory* (London, 1795).
- Boyle, A.J. and Woodard, R.D (eds), Ovid. *Fasti* (London, 2004).
- Brathwaite, Richard. *The Poet's Willow* (London, 1614)
- Brett, Arthur. *Threnodia* (London, 1660).
- Bristol Mercury*. Issue 3075 (Bristol, 1849).
- Buchanan, Robert. *Tracts Illustrative of the Traditionary and Historical Antiquities of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1836).
- Buckley, W.E. (ed.). *Memoirs of Thomas, Earl of Ailesbury* (London, 1890).
- Burnet, Gilbert. *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time*. 2 Vols, Vol. I (London, 1724-34).
- Burnet, Gilbert. *Burnet's History of His Own Time* (London, 1875).
- C.G. *An Elegie upon the Most Lamented Death of the Right Honourable and Truly Valiant, Robert Earl of Essex* (London, 1646).
- Caledonian Mercury*. Issue 20422 (Edinburgh, 1854).
- Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series): James I, 1611-18* (London, 1858); *Charles II, 1660-61* (London, 1860); *Charles II, 1663-4* (London, 1862); *Charles II, 1664-5* (London, 1863); *Charles II, 1666-7* (London, 1864); *Charles II, 1673-5* (London, 1905).
- Calendar of State Papers (Venetian Series): James I, 1610-13* (London, 1905); *Charles I, 1640-42* (London, 1924); *Charles II, 1659-61* (London, 1931); *Charles II, 1669-70* (London, 1937).
- Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury: The Cecil Manuscripts*. Vol. xxi, 1609-12 (London, 1970).
- Calendar of Treasury Papers*. Vol. IX, Part IV, 1689-92 (London, 1874).

- Callcott, Maria, Lady. *Little Arthur's History of England* (London, 1856).
- Cattermole, Richard. *The Great Civil War of the Times of Charles I* (London, 1845).
- Chapman, George. *An Epicede or Funerall Song on the Most Disastrous Death, of the Highborne Prince of Men, Henry Prince of Wales* (London, 1613).
- Chapman, George. *Homer* (London, 1609?).
- Chapman, George. *The Iliads of Homer, Prince of Poets* (London, 1611).
- Charles II. *A Letter sent from the King at Collen to his brother Henry Duke of Gloucester att Paris* (London, 1654).
- Clapham, Henoch. *An Abstract of Fayth* (London, 1606).
- Clarendon, Earl of (Edward Hyde). *The history of the rebellion and civil wars in England, begun in the year 1641* (Oxford, 1702).
- Cornwallis, Charles. *A Discourse of the Most Illustrious Henry, Late Prince of Wales* (London, 1641).
- Cornwallis, Charles. *The Life and Character of Henry-Frederic, Prince of Wales* (London, 1738)
- Cornwallis, Charles (attrib.). *An Account of the Baptism, Life, Death and Funeral of the most incomparable Prince, Frederick Henry* (London, 1751).
- Cornwallis, Charles (attrib.). *The Life and Death of our Late Most Incomparable and Heroique Prince, Henry* (London, 1641).
- Cornwallis, Charles. *The Short Life and Much Lamented Death of that Most Magnanimous Prince, Henry, Prince of Wales* (London, 1644).
- Cornwallis, Charles (attrib.) "The Life and Death of our Late Most Incomparable and Heroic Prince, Henry", John Somers (ed.), *A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts*. 13 Vols, Vol. II (London, 1809).
- Cotton, Robert. *Cottoni Posthuma: Divers Choice Pieces of that Renowned Antiquary, Sir Robert Cotton, Knight and Baronet* (London, 1679).
- Crossman, Samuel. *The Young Man's Calling* (London, 1713).
- Crouch, John. *The Muses Tears for the Loss of the Illustrious Princ(e) Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1660).
- Crowne, John. *Calisto, or The Chaste Nymph* (London, 1675).
- D.B. *The Young Man's Golden Pattern; or the Royal Youth's Last Legacy* (Edinburgh, 1703).
- Daniel, Samuel. *The Order and Solemnitie of the Creation of the High and Mightie Prince Henrie* (London, 1610).

- Darcie, Abraham. *The Originall of Idolatries* (London, 1624).
- Davies, John. *The Muses Tears for the Losse of their Hope; Heroick and ne'ere-too-much praised Henry, Prince of Wales* (London, 1613).
- De Beer, E.S. (ed.). *The Diary of John Evelyn*. 6 Vols, Vol. III, Vol. IV, Vol. V (Oxford, 2000).
- de Lainé, Pierre. *The Princely Way to the French Tongue* (London, 1677).
- de Rapin-Thoyras, Paul (N. Tindal trans). *History of England*. 17 Vols, Vol. IX (London, 1725-31).
- Defoe, Daniel. *The Life of that Incomparable Princess, Mary, Late Sovereign Lady* (London, 1695).
- Dent, Giles. *The Character of a Good Prince* (London, 1712).
- Drayton, Michael. *Poly-olbion* (London, 1612).
- Drummond of Hawthornden, William. *Mausoleum, or The Choisest Flowres of the Epitaphs, written on the Death of the never-too-much-lamented Prince Henrie* (Edinburgh, 1613).
- Drummond of Hawthornden, William. *Teares upon the Death of Moeliades* (Edinburgh, 1614).
- Edinburgh Review*. Vol. LXXXIX (April 1849).
- English Post with News Foreign and Domestick*. Issue 1281 (London, 1708).
- Ferguson, James (ed.). *Scots Brigade in Holland*. 3 Vols, Vol. I, Scottish History Society (Edinburgh, 1899).
- Flecknoe, Richard. *Epigrams of all Sorts, Made at Divers Times on Several Occasions* (London, 1670).
- Fleetwood, William. *A Funeral Sermon on his Late Royal Highness, William, Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1700).
- Flying Post*. Issue 817 (London, 1700).
- Foster, Elizabeth Read (ed.). *Proceedings in Parliament 1610* (London and New Haven, 1966).
- Fowler, John. *Carmen Pastorale Lugubre, A Pastorale Elegy upon the Most Lamented Death of His Royal Highness, William, Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1700).
- Fowler, William. *A True Account of the Baptism of the Most High and Mighty Prince, Henry Frederick, by the Grace of God, Prince of Scotland, and since of Wales* (Edinburgh, 1764).
- Fowler, William. *A True Accompt of the Most Triumphant, and Royal Accomplishment of the Baptism of the Most Excellent and Mighty High Prince Henry Frederick* (Edinburgh, 1687).

- Fowler, William. *A True Account of the Most Triumphant and Royal Grandeur, at the Solemnization of the Baptism of His Royal Highness, Henry Prince of Scotland, and afterwards Prince of Wales* (Edinburgh, 1745).
- Fowler, William. *A True Account of the Most Triumphant and Royal Accomplishment of the Most Excellent, Right High, and Mighty Prince Henry Frederick* (Edinburgh, 1703).
- Fowler, William. *A True Reportarie of the Most Triumphant, and Royal Accomplishment of the Baptisme of the Most Excellent, right High and mightie Prince Frederick Henry; By the Grace of God, Prince of Scotland. Solemnized the 30 day of August. Printed by R. Waldegrae, printer to the K. Maiestie. Cum priuilegio regali* (Edinburgh, 1594).
- Fowler, William. *A True Reportarie of the Most Triumphant, and Royal Accomplishment of the Babtisme of the Most Excellent, right High, and Mightie prince, Frederik Henry, By the Grace of God, Prince of Scotland. Solemnized the 30 day of August. 1594. Printed by Peter Short, for the Widdow Butter* (London, 1594).
- Fowler, William. *A True Report of the Most Tryumphant, and Royall Accomplishment of the Baptisme of the Most Excellent, right High, and Mightie Prince, Henry Fredericke, by the Grace of God, Prince of Scotland, and now Prince of Wales as it was solemnized the 30. day of August. 1594. Printed by Thomas Creede for John Browne* (London, 1603).
- Fuller, William. *A Brief Discovery of the True Mother of the Pretended Prince of Wales, Known by the Name of Mary Grey* (London, 1696).
- Graves, Algernon. *The Royal Academy of Arts. A Complete Dictionary of Contributors and their Work from its foundation in 1769 to 1904*. 8 Vols, Vol. 1, Vol. 2, Vol. 4, Vol. 5, (London, 1905-6).
- Green, Mary Anne Everett. *Lives of the Princesses of England from the Norman Conquest* 6 Vols, Vol. VI (London, 1849-55).
- H.D. *The Pourtraiture of His royal Highness, Oliver late Lord Protector* (London, 1659).
- Haile, Martin. *Queen Mary of Modena: Her Life and Letters* (London, 1905).
- Halifax, Marquis of (George Saville). *The Character of a Trimmer* (London, 1688).
- Hamilton, Anthony. *The Memoirs of Count Gramont* (London, 1888).
- Hampshire Advertiser & Salisbury Guardian*. Issue 1774 (Southampton, 1857).
- Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle*. Issue 2860 (Portsmouth, 1854); Issue 2911 (Portsmouth, 1855); Issue 2985 (Portsmouth, 1856).
- Harris, Benjamin. *Suspirium Musarum, The Sighs of the Muses* (London, 1700).
- Hawkins, Edward. *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland to the Death of George II*. 2 Vols, 2 Plates Vols, Vol. I; Plates I (London, 1885).
- Haydon, William. *The True Picture and Relation of Prince Henry* (Heidelberg, 1634).
- Holland, Henry. *Baziliologia, a Booke of Kinges Beeing the True and Lively Effigies of All Our English Kinges from the Conquest untill [sic] this Present* (London, 1618).

- Holland, Henry. *Herōologia Anglica* (Arnhem, 1620).
- Hopkins, John. *The vvhole booke of Psalmes Collected into English meetre* (London, 1595).
- Horace (Colin Sydenham trans.). *The Odes* (London, 2005).
- Howard, Thomas. *An Elegy on the Death of the Most Illustrious Prince Henry Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1660).
- Howe, John. *A Discourse relating to the Much-lamented Death and Solemn Funeral of our incomparable and Most Gracious Queen Mary* (London, 1695).
- Hume, David. *The History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution of 1688*. 8 Vols, Vol. I, Vol. III (Edinburgh and London, 1754-62).
- Hume, David. *The History of England* (folio edition). 10 Vols, Vol. X (1793-1806).
- Isle of Wight Observer*. Issue 104 (Ryde, 1854); Issue 113 (Ryde, 1854); Issue 228 (Ryde, 1857).
- James VI and I. *Basilicon Doron* (Menston, 1969 - facsimile reprint of the first edition of 1599).
- Jansson, Maija (ed.). *Proceedings in Parliament 1614 (House of Commons)* (Philadelphia, 1988).
- Jonson, Ben. *Chloridia. Rites to Chloris and Her Nymphs* (London, 1630).
- Latham, Robert and Matthews, William (eds). *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. 11 Vols, Vol. I; Vol. II; Vol. III; Vol. VIII (London, 1970).
- Lewis, Jenkin. *Memoirs of Prince William Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1789).
- Liverpool Mercury*. Issue 2611 (Liverpool, 1854).
- Lluelyn, Martin. *An Elegie on the Death of the Most Illustrious Prince, Henry Duke of Gloucester* (Oxford, 1660).
- Lodge, Edmund. *Portraits of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain*. 10 Vols, Vol. IV (London, 1831).
- Lombard, Daniel. *A Sermon Preach'd at Hanover Before Her Royal Highness the Late Princess Sophia* (Oxford, 1714).
- The London Gazette*. Issues 1245; 1248; 1249; 1257; 2354; 2362; 2373; 2473; 2475 (London, 1677-89).
- London Post with Intelligence Foreign and Domestic*. Issues 182; 183 (London, 1700).
- Loomie, Albert J. *Ceremonies of Charles I, The Notebooks of John Finet, Master of Ceremonies, 1628-1641* (New York, 1987).

Luttrell, Narcissus. *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714*. 6 Vols, Vol. I, Vol. III, Vol. IV, Vol. V (London, 1857).

McClure, Norman (ed.) *The Letters of John Chamberlain*. 2 Vols, Vol. I, Vol. II (Philadelphia, 1939).

Manley, Thomas. *A Short View of the Lives of those Illustrious Princes, Henry Duke of Gloucester, and Mary Princess of Orange deceased* (London, 1661).

Manuscripts of Le Fleming of Rydal Hall (London, 1890).

Marlborough, Duchess of (Jennings, Sarah). *An Account of the Conduct of the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough, From her first coming to court, to the Year 1710* (London, 1742).

Maxwell, James. *The Laudable Life and Deplorable Death of Our Late Peerelesse Prince Henry* (London, 1612).

Mayer, Jean-Christophe (ed). *Breaking the Silence on the Succession: A Sourcebook of Manuscripts and Rare Elizabethan Texts (c.1587-1603)* (Montpellier, 2003).

Melville, Andrew. *Principis Scoti Britannorum Natalia* (Edinburgh, 1594).

Millais, John Guille. *Life and Letters of Sir Everett Millais, president of the Royal Academy* (London, 1899).

Mornay, Philippe de, Seigneur du Plessis-Marly (Lennard, Samson trans.). *The Mystery of Iniquitie* (London, 1612).

Moysie, David. *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1813).

Niccols, Richard. *The Three Sisters: Teares shed at the Late Solemne Funeralls of the Royall Deceased Henry, Prince of Wales* (Oxford, 1613).

Nichols, John. *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*. 4 Vols, Vol. 2 (London, 1828).

Oldham, John. *Upon the Marriage of the Prince of Orange with the Lady Mary* (London, 1677).

Oliphant, Margaret. "Modern Light Literature – History", *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, Vol. 78 (1855).

Osborn, Francis. *The Works of Francis Osborn* (London, 1701).

Peacham, Henry. *The Compleat Gentleman* (London, 1622).

Peacham, Henry. *Prince Henrie revived Or A poeme vpon the birth, and in honor of the hopefull yong Prince Henrie Frederick* (London, 1615).

Peacham, Henry. *The Period of Mourning* (London, 1613).

Penrose, Elizabeth. *Mrs Markham's History of England* (London, 1867).

Post Boy and Historical Account. Issue 33 (London, 1695); Issue 1204 (London, 1703).

- Postman and the Historical Account*. Issue 792 (London, 1700).
- Price, Daniel. *Prince Henry his First Anniversary* (Oxford 1613).
- Price, Daniel. *Prince Henry his Second Anniversary* (Oxford, 1614).
- Raleigh, Walter. *The History of the World* (London, 1614).
- Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*. 36 Vols, Vol. 5, 1592-99; Vol. 9 1610-13 (Edinburgh, 1882).
- Registrum Magni Sigilli*. 11 Vols, Vol. 9, 1634-51 (Edinburgh, 1882-1904).
- Richardson, George. *Iconology, or a Collection of Emblematic Figures*. 2 Vols, Vol. I; Vol. II (London, 1979 – facsimile reprint of the 1779 edition).
- Rowland, William. *An Elegie upon the Death of the Right Honourable & Most Renowned Robert Devereux Earl of Essex* (London, 1646).
- Royal Cornwall Gazette, Falmouth Packet and General Advertiser*. Issue 2379 (Truro, 1849).
- Rye, William Brenchley. *England as Seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First* (London, 1865).
- Salmon, Thomas. *The History of the Life and Reign of her late Majesty Queen Anne* (London, 1740).
- Sandford, Francis. *A Genealogical History of the Kings and Queens of England, and Monarchs of Great Britain, from the Conquest, Anno 1066. to the year 1707* (London, 1707).
- Sandys, George. *Anglorum Speculum, Or the Worthies of England* (London, 1684).
- Shirley, Evelyn. “An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard K.G. Earl of Northampton, taken on his death in 1614, together with a transcript of his will”, *Archaeologia*, XLII (1869).
- Snape, Andrew. *A Sermon Preach'd Before the Princess Sophia at Hannover* (Cambridge, 1706).
- Speed, John. *The History of Great Britaine* (London, 1611).
- Spencer, Herbert. “What Knowledge is of Most Worth?”, *The Westminster Review*, XVI (1859).
- Stone, Lawrence. “Notes on British Art from the Archives: I”, *Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 96, No. 619 (October 1954).
- Stow, John. *A Survey of London reprinted from the text of 1603* (Oxford, 1971).
- Strickland, Agnes. *Lives of the Queens of England*. 12 Vols, Vol. VIII (London, 1848-9).
- Strickland, Agnes. *Lives of the Last Four Princesses of the Royal House of Stuart* (London, 1872).
- Strickland, Agnes. *Historic Scenes and Poetic Fancies* (London, 1850).

Taubman, Matthew. *London's Great Jubilee containing a description of the several pageants and speeches, together with a song, for the entertainment of Their Majesties, who with Their Royal Highnesses, the Prince and Princess of Denmark, the whole Court, and both Houses of Parliament, honour His Lordship this year with their presence* (London, 1689).

Taylor, John. *Great Britaine all in Blacke for the Incomparable Losse of Henry, Our Late Worthy Prince* (London, 1612).

Term Catalogue. 3 Vols, Vol. III (London, 1903-6).

The Aberdeen Journal. Issue 5562 (Aberdeen, 1854).

The Critic. Vol. 9 (London, 1850).

The Examiner. Issue 2428 (London, 1854); Issue 2463 (London, 1855); Issue 2523 (London, 1856).

The Exhibition of the Royal Academy MDCCCXXXVI (London, 1836).

The Ipswich Journal. Issue 6014 (Ipswich, 1854).

The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland: preserved at Welbeck Abbey, 1891-1931. 10 Vols, Vol. IV (London, 1897).

The Morning Post. Issue 2349 (London, 1849).

Toland, John. *An Account of the Courts of Prussia and Hanover* (London, 1705).

Trewman's Exeter Flying Post or Plymouth and Cornish Advertiser. Issue 4336 (Exeter, 1849).

Vertue, George. *The Heads of the Kings of England proper for Mr. Rapin's History* (London, 1736).

W.B. *An Ode on the Death of William, Duke of Gloucester* (London, 1700).

Waldron, F.G. *The biographical mirrour, comprising a series of ancient and modern English portraits, of eminent and distinguished persons*. 3 Vols, Vol. II (London, 1798).

Walpole, Horace. *Anecdotes of Painting*, London, 1879.

Webster, John. *A Monumental Columne, erected to the living Memory of the ever-glorious Henry, late Prince of Wales* (London, 1613).

Weever, John. *Ancient Funerall Monuments within the united monarchie of Great Britaine, Ireland, and the islands adiacent* (London, 1631).

William, Prince of Orange. *The declaration of His Highnes William Henry, by the grace of God Prince of Orange, &c. of the reasons inducing him, to appear in armes in the kingdome of England, for preserving of the Protestant religion, and for restoring the lawes and liberties of England, Scotland and Ireland* (The Hague, 1688).

Wilkinson, Robert. *A Paire of Sermons Successively Preacht to a Paire of Peerles succeeding Princes. The Former as an Ante-Funerall to the late Prince Henry, Anno Dom.*

1612. October 25. *The first day of his last and fatall sicknesse. The Latter Preacht this present yeere 1614. Januar. 16. To the now living Prince Charles, as a preserver of his life, and life to his soule* (London, 1614).

Willymat, William. *A Prince's Looking Glasse* (Oxford, 1603).

Wither, George. *Prince Henries Obsequies* (London, 1612).

Yalden, Thomas. *The Temple of Fame* (London, 1700).

Secondary Sources:

Adamson, J.S.A. "Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England", Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London, 1994).

Anderson, Alan. *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers A.D. 500 to 1286* (London, 1908).

Auerbach, Erna. *Tudor Artists: A Study of Painters in the Royal Service and of Portraiture on Illuminated Documents from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Elizabeth I* (London, 1954).

Badenhausen, Richard. "Disarming the Infant Warrior: Prince Henry, King James and the Chivalric Revival", *Papers on Language and Literature* (Winter 1995).

Baldwin, Olive and Wilson, Thelma. "Who can from Joy Refraine? Purcell's Birthday Song for the Duke of Gloucester", *Musical Times*. Vol. 122, No. 1663 (September, 1981).

Barnes, Susan J., De Poorter, Nora, Millar, Oliver, Vey, Horst (eds.). *Van Dyck, A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings* (London and New Haven, 2004).

Baxter, B. "William III as Hercules: The Political Implications of Court Culture", Lois G. Schwoerer (ed.), *The Revolution of 1688-89: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 2003).

Beddard, R.A. "Wren's Mausoleum for Charles I and the Cult of the Royal Martyr", *Architectural History*, Vol. 27 (1984).

Bellany, Alastair. *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair* (Cambridge, 2007).

Bergeron, David M. "Harrison, Jonson and Dekker: The Magnificent Entertainment for King James (1604)", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 31 (1968).

Berry, Laura C. *The Child, The State and The Victorian Novel* (Virginia, 2000).

Bertheau, Gilles. "Prince Henry as Chapman's 'Absolute Man'", Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (London, 2007).

Boase, T.S.R. "The Decoration of the New Palace of Westminster, 1841-1863", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 17, No. 3/4 (1954).

- Bowers, Toni. *The Politics of Motherhood: British Writing and Culture, 1680-1760* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Bracken, Susan. "Robert Cecil as Art Collector", Pauline Croft (ed.), *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils* (New Haven and London, 2002).
- Brooke, John. *King George III* (London, 1974).
- Brown, Christopher and Vlieghe, Hans (eds.). *Van Dyck 1599-1641* (London, 1999).
- Burstein, Miriam Elizabeth. "'The Reduced Pretensions of the Historic Muse': Agnes Strickland and the Commerce of Women's History", *The Journal of Narrative Technique*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Fall, 1998).
- Carlton, Charles. *Charles I: The Personal Monarch* (London and New York, 1995).
- Chapel, Jeannie and Hardy, John. "The Millais Cabinet", *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 122, No. 927 (June, 1980).
- Chase, Karen and Levenson, Michael. *The Spectacle of Intimacy: A Public Life for the Victorian Family* (Princeton and Oxford, 2000).
- Christie's, New York. *Important Paintings by Old Masters* (sales catalogue). New York, 11th January, 1979.
- Claydon, Tony. *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Corp, Edward. "The Portraits of the Stuarts and their Courtiers", Edward Corp (ed.), *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France 1689-1718* (Cambridge, 2004).
- Corp, Edward. *The King Over the Water 1688-1706* (Edinburgh, 2001).
- Coward, Barry. *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714* (London, 2003).
- Cressy, David. *Birth, Marriage and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 1997).
- Cressy, David. *Bonfires and Bells* (Stroud, 2004).
- Croft, Pauline. "The Parliamentary Installation of Henry, Prince of Wales", *Historical Research*, Vol. 65, Issue 157 (1992).
- Cunningham, Hugh. *Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500* (Harlow, 2005).
- Cust, Richard. *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow, 2007).
- Daiches, David. *Scotland and the Union* (London, 1977).
- De Jongh, Eddy. "Grape Symbolism in Paintings of the 16th and 17th Centuries", *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art*, Vol. 7, No. 4 (1974).
- Donaldson, Gordon. *Scotland: James V to James VII* (Edinburgh, 1965).

- Evans, Eric J. *The Forging of the Modern State, Early Industrial Britain 1783-1870* (Harlow, 2001).
- Faulkner, Thomas C. "Halifax's The Character of a Trimmer and L'Estrange's Attack on Trimmers in The Observator", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 1, (Nov. 1973).
- Firth, C.H. "Royalist and Cromwellian Armies in Flanders, 1657-1662", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, New Series, Vol. 3 (1903).
- Fritz, Paul. "From 'Public' to 'Private': the Royal Funerals in England, 1500-1830" in Joachim Whaley (ed.), *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death*, (London, 1981).
- Fritz, Paul. "The Trade in Death: Royal Funerals in England 1685-1830", *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (Spring, 1982).
- Gibson, Katharine. *'Best Belov'd of Kings': The Iconography of King Charles II*. PhD Thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art (London, 1997).
- Gittings, Clare. *Death, Burial and the Individual in Early-Modern England* (London, 1984).
- Goldberg, Jonathan. "Fatherly Authority: The Politics of Stuart Family Images", Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, Nancy Vickers (eds), *Rewriting the Renaissance, The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago, 1986).
- Goldring, Elizabeth. "'So just a sorrowe so well expressed': Henry, Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration", Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (London, 2007).
- Graziani, René. "The 'Rainbow Portrait' of Queen Elizabeth and its Religious Symbolism", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 35 (1972).
- Gregg, Edward. *Queen Anne* (New Haven and London, 2001).
- Greenspan, Nicole. "Public Scandal, Political Controversy, and Familial Conflict in the Stuarts Courts in Exile: The Struggle to Convert the Duke of Gloucester in 1654", *Albion, A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Autumn, 2003).
- Griffiths, Antony. *The Print in Stuart Britain 1603-1689* (London, 1998).
- Guild, Jean R. and Law, Alexander (eds). *Edinburgh University Library 1580-1980: a Collection of Historical Essays* (Edinburgh, 1982).
- Haley, K.H.D. "The Anglo Dutch Rapprochement of 1677", *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 73, No. 289 (October, 1958).
- Hall, James. *Hall's Dictionary of Symbols and Subjects in Art* (London, 2001).
- Hamilton, Elizabeth. *William's Mary* (London, 1972).

- Harris, John and Higgott, Gordon. *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings* (London, 1989).
- Haskell, Francis. *Past and Present in Art and Taste* (New Haven and London, 1987).
- Hatton, Ragnhild. *George I, Elector and King* (London, 1978).
- Heilmeyer, Marina. *Language of Flowers: Symbols and Myths* (Munich, London and Prestel, 2006).
- Hind, Arthur M. *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. 4 Vols, Vol. II (Cambridge, 1955).
- Holloway's, Banbury. *Antiques and Fine Art Sales Auction Catalogue* (Banbury, 2011).
- Holmes, Geoffrey. *The Making of a Great Power* (New York, 1993).
- Howarth, David. *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1997).
- Howarth, David. *Lord Arundel and His Circle* (New Haven and London, 1985).
- Howarth, David. "Sir Robert Cotton and the Commemoration of Famous Men", C.J. Wright (ed.), *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector, Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy*, (London, 1997).
- Jenkinson, Matthew. *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II, 1660-1685* (Woodbridge, 2010).
- Jones, Stephen. *Frederick, Prince of Wales and his Circle* (Sudbury, 1981).
- Keay, Anna. *The Magnificent Monarch, Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (New York and London, 2008).
- Keeble, N.H. *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford, 2002).
- Kenyon, J.P. "The Birth of the Old Pretender", *History Today*, 13 (1963).
- Kroll, Maria. *Sophie, Electress of Hanover, A Personal Portrait* (London, 1973).
- Kuus, Saskia. "Children's Costume in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", Jan Baptiste and Rudi Ekkart (eds.) *Pride and Joy, Children's Portraits in the Netherlands 1500-1700* (Ghent, 2000).
- Lang, Timothy. *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage: Interpretations of a Discordant Past* (Cambridge, 1995).
- Le Huray, Peter. *Music and the Reformation in England (1549-1660)* (New York, 1978).
- Levis, Howard Coppuck. *Baziliologia - A Book of Kings: Notes on a Rare Series of Engraved English Royal Portraits from William the Conqueror to James I* (New York and London, 1913).

- Llewellyn, Nigel. "Monuments to the Dead for the Living", Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (eds.) *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture c.1540-1660*, (London, 1995).
- Llewellyn, Nigel. *Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Love, Harold. *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1993).
- Loxley, James. *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars* (Basingstoke and New York, 1997).
- MacLeod, Catharine and Marciari Alexander, Julia (eds). *Painted Ladies, Women at the Court of Charles II* (London, 2001).
- McLynn, Frank. *The Jacobites* (London, 1988).
- McNamara, Gregory. "'Grief was as Clothes to their Backs': Prince Henry's Funeral viewed from the Wardrobe", Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (London, 2007).
- Mackay, Janet. *Catherine of Braganza* (London, 1937).
- Maitzen, Rohan Amanda. "'This Feminine Preserve': Historical Biographies by Victorian Women", Vol. 38, No. 3 (Spring, 1995).
- Millar, Oliver. *The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty The Queen* (London, 1963).
- Miller, John. *James II* (New Haven and London, 2000).
- Miller, John. *James II: A Study in Kingship* (London, 1989).
- Mitchell, Rosemary. *Picturing the Past: English History in Text and Image 1830-1870* (Oxford, 2000).
- Monod, Paul Kleber. *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1988).
- Mullet, Michael A. *James II and English Politics 1678-1688* (London, 1994).
- Murphy, Erin. *Familial Forms: Politics and Genealogy in Seventeenth-Century English Literature* (Newark, 2011).
- Murray, Peter. *Dulwich Picture Gallery, a Catalogue* (London, 1980).
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire", *Representations*, 26 (Spring, 1989).
- Ollard, Richard. *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II* (London, 2000).
- Oman, Carola. *Winter Queen: Elizabeth of Bohemia* (London, 2000).

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. 62 Vols, Vol. 11; Vol. 26; Vol. 36; Vol. 39; Vol. 49; Vol. 53 (Oxford, 2004).

Parry, Graham. *The Golden Age Restor'd* (Manchester, 1981).

Peacock, John. "Inigo Jones' Catafalque for James I", *Architectural History*, Vol. 25 (1982).

Pichbeck, Ivy and Hewitt, Margaret. *Children in English Society*. 2 Vols, Vol. 2 (London, 1973).

Pollnitz, Aysha. "Humanism and the Education of Henry, Prince of Wales", Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (London, 2007).

Renson, Roland. "The Flemish Archery Guilds, From Defense Mechanisms to Sport Institution", Roland Renson, P.P. de Nayer and Michel Ostyn (eds.), *The History, The Evolution and and Diffusion of Sports and Games in Different Cultures* (Brussels, 1976).

Robertson, David. *Sir Charles Eastlake and the Victorian Art World* (Princeton, 1978).

Rogers, Charles. *History of the Chapel Royal of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1882).

Rose, Craig. *England in the 1690s* (Oxford, 1999).

Rubinstein, W.D. *Britain's Century, A Political and Social History 1815-1905* (London, 1998).

Russell, Conrad. *The Addled Parliament of 1614: The Limits of Revision. The Stenton Lecture, 1991* (Reading, 1992).

Schama, Simon. *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (London, 2004).

Schama, Simon. "The Domestication of Majesty: Royal Family Portraiture 1500-1850", *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Summer, 1986).

Schwoerer, Lois G. "Images of Queen Mary II, 1689-95", *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 4 (Winter, 1989).

Sharp, Richard. *The Engraved Record of the Jacobite Movement* (Aldershot and Vermont, 1996).

Sharpe, Kevin. *Remapping Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000).

Sharpe, Kevin. *Image Wars, Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England 1603-1660* (New Haven and London, 2010).

Sharpe, Kevin. *Selling the Tudor Monarchy, Authority and Image in Sixteenth Century England* (New Haven and London, 2009).

Sharpe, Kevin. *Sir Robert Cotton 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England*. (Oxford, 1979).

Sharpe, Kevin. "So Hard a Text"? Images of Charles I, 1612-1700", *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (2000).

Sherlock, Peter. *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Aldershot and Burlington, 2008).

Smuts, R. Malcolm. "Art and the Material Culture of Majesty in Early Stuart England", Smuts, R. Malcolm (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1996).

Smuts, Malcolm. *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 1987).

Smuts, Malcolm. "Religion, European Politics and Henrietta Maria's Circle 1625-41", Erin Griffey (ed), *Henrietta Maria: Piety Politics and Patronage* (Aldershot and Burlington, 2008).

Smuts, Malcolm. "Review", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 104, No. 2 (April, 1999).

Smuts, Malcolm. "The Making of Rex Pacificus: James VI and I and the Concept of Peace in an Age of Religious War, Daniel Fischlin, Mark Fortier, Kevin Sharpe (eds), *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I* (Detroit, 2002).

Snow, Vernon F. "Essex and the Aristocratic Opposition to the Early Stuarts", *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (September, 1960).

Solkin, David H. "Isaac Fuller's Escape of Charles II: A Restoration Tragicomedy", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 62 (1999).

Strong, Roy. *And When Did You Last See Your Father?: The Victorian Painter and British History* (London, 1978).

Strong, Roy. *Artists of the Tudor Court: The Portrait Miniature Rediscovered 1520-1620*. London, 1983.

Strong, Roy. *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London, 1986).

Taylor, D.A.H.B. "A Rediscovered Portrait of Queen Anne, when a Child, by Sir Peter Lely", *Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 145, No. 1204 (July 2003).

Thomas, Julia. *Pictorial Victorians: The Inscription of Values in Word and Image* (Athens, Ohio, 2004).

Thomas, K. "English Protestantism and Classical Art", Lucy Gent (ed.) *Albion's Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain 1550-1660* (New Haven and London, 1995).

Thrupp, George Athelstane. *The History of Coaches* (London and New York, 1877).

Thrush, Andrew. "The French Marriage and the Origins of the 1614 Parliament", Stephen Clucas and Rosalind Davies (eds), *The Crisis of 1614 and the Addled Parliament* (Aldershot and Burlington, 2003).

- Tite, Colin. *The Manuscript Library of Sir Robert Cotton* (London, 1994).
- Turbet, Richard. "Joyful Singing: Byrd's Music at a Royal Christening", *The Musical Times* (Spring, 2004).
- Ullyot, Michael. "James's Reception and Henry's Receptivity: Reading Basilicon Doron after 1603", Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (London, 2007).
- Ullyot, Michael. *Venerable Reader, Vulnerable Exemplar: Prince Henry and the Genres of Exemplarity*. PhD Thesis, University of Toronto (Toronto, 2005).
- University of Oxford. *Horti Carolini Rosa Altera* (Oxford, 1640).
- Van der Kiste, John. *William and Mary* (Stroud, 2003).
- Van der Zee, Henri and Van der Zee, Barbara. *William and Mary* (London, 1973).
- Waller, Maureen. *Ungrateful Daughters: The Stuart Princesses who Stole their Father's Crown* (London, 2002).
- Ward, A.M. "The Electress Sophia and the Hanoverian Succession", *English Historical Review*, Vol. 1, No. 3, (July 1886).
- Ward-Jackson, Philip. "Expiatory Monuments by Carlo Marochetti in Dorset and the Isle of Wight", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 53 (1990).
- Watson, John N.P. *Captain-General and Rebel Chief: The Life of James, Duke of Monmouth* (London, 1979).
- Webster, Tom. "Religion in Early Stuart Britain 1603-1642", Barry Coward (ed.), *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (Malden and Oxford, 2003).
- Weil, Rachel J. "The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the Warming-pan Scandal", Lois G. Schworer (ed.), *The Revolution of 1688-89* (Cambridge, 1992).
- Wells, Robin Headlam. "'Manhood and Chevalrie': Coriolanus, Prince Henry and the Chivalric Revival", *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 51, No. 203 (2000).
- Whateley, Christopher A. and Patrick, Derek J. *The Scots and the Union* (Edinburgh, 2006).
- Whinney, Margaret and Millar, Oliver. *English Art 1625-1714* (Oxford, 1957)
- White, Bryan. "'Music for a 'brave livlylike boy': the Duke of Gloucester, Purcell and 'The noise of foreign wars'", *The Musical Times* (Winter, 2007).
- Wieseman, Marjorie E. *Caspar Netscher and late Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting* (Doornspijk, 2002).
- Wilks, Timothy. "Henry, Prince of Wales, on Horseback: A Note on Patronage and Provenance", Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (London, 2007).

Wilks, Timothy. "The Pike Charged", Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived* (London, 2007).

Williamson, J.W. *The Myth of the Conqueror, Prince Henry Stuart: A Study of 17th Century Personation* (New York, 1978).

Wohl, Anthony S. *The Victorian Family, Structure and Stresses* (London, 1978).

Woolf, Noel. *The Medallic Record of the Jacobite Movement* (London, 1988).

Wood, Julia K. "'A Flowing Harmony': Music on the Thames in Restoration London", *Early Music*, Vol. 23, No. 4, Nov., 1995.

Woodward, Jennifer. *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England, 1570-1625* (Woodbridge, 1997).

Wynne, Sonya. "'The Brightest Glories of the British Sphere': Women at the Court of Charles II", Catharine MacLeod and Julia Marciari Alexander (eds), *Painted Ladies, Women at the Court of Charles II* (London, 2001).

Young, Alan. *Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments* (London, 1987).