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Abstract

This dissertation argues that during the reign of Charles I (1625-42), a powerful and long-lasting nationalist discourse emerged that embodied a conflicted nostalgia and located a primary source of English national identity in the Elizabethan era, rooted in the works of William Shakespeare, Sir Philip Sidney, John Lyly, and Ben Jonson. This Elizabethanism attempted to reconcile increasingly hostile conflicts between Catholics and Protestants, court and country, and elite and commoners. Remarkably, as I show by examining several Caroline texts in which Elizabethan ghosts appear, Caroline authors often resurrect long-dead Elizabethan figures to articulate not only Puritan views but also Arminian and Catholic ones. This tendency to complicate associations between the Elizabethan era and militant Protestantism also appears in Caroline plays by Thomas Heywood, Philip Massinger, and William Sampson that figure Queen Elizabeth as both ideally Protestant and dangerously ambiguous.

Furthermore, Caroline Elizabethanism included reprintings and adaptations of Elizabethan literature that reshape the ideological significance of the Elizabethan era. The 1630s quarto editions of Shakespeare’s Elizabethan comedies The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Taming of the Shrew, and Love’s Labour’s Lost represent the Elizabethan era as the source of a native English wit that bridges social divides and negotiates the
roles of powerful women (a renewed concern as Queen Henrietta Maria became more conspicuous at court). Similarly, poetic and dramatic adaptations of Sidney’s *Arcadia* by Francis Quarles, Henry Glapthorne, and James Shirley rewrite the romance’s politics to engage with contemporary debates about foreign policy. This dissertation ultimately contributes to early modern literary studies in three ways: first, it reclaims and nuances the literary and political sophistication of Caroline literature; second, it contests the narrative that casts the Elizabethan era as perennially opposed to the decadence of the Stuarts, instead showing how Caroline Elizabethanism sanctioned a proto-royalist literary and political culture and ideology that extended well beyond the court; and third, it reveals how Caroline writers and publishers began the process of literary canon formation as a way to negotiate what it meant to be English, linking nationalism with England’s literary heritage in debates that continue to resonate today.
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Introduction
Elizabethanism and Nostalgia

Philippa Gregory’s mawkish historical novel *The Virgin’s Lover* (2004) depicts the early ascension of Robert Dudley, not yet earl of Leicester, at the court of a childishly flirtatious and cunning Elizabeth I. In Gregory’s version of the scandals surrounding Dudley and the death of his first wife in 1560, Elizabeth’s greatest favorite becomes a complicated bad-boy hero, working against the conniving William Cecil for influence with the queen. Dudley wants to be free to love Elizabeth, with whom he has a sexual relationship and for whom he will sacrifice almost anything. Although ambitious, Gregory’s Dudley remains honorable, horrified at the end by his wife’s death and the queen’s involvement in it, struggling to believe that Elizabeth had the murder done for love of him, crushed to learn that, in fact, she had it done so he can never marry her. Cecil delivers the chilling last lines of the novel, which instruct the innocently honorable Dudley in the art of strategic forgetfulness, both of his plans to marry Elizabeth and of any possibility that his wife’s death was murder.

Gregory’s novel enters into a long line of books and films that practice their own forms of strategic forgetfulness by focusing on a romantic relationship between Elizabeth and Leicester or one of her other favorites. By choosing to focus only on limited (and
thoroughly fictionalized) aspects of Elizabeth’s life, Gregory and others practice a calculated balance between memory and forgetfulness that negotiates the meanings of the past. The particular fashioning of memory that *The Virgin’s Lover* embodies dates back at least to the late-seventeenth-century fascination with Elizabeth’s love life\(^1\)—itself only another form of the same posthumous rumor-mongering that characterized even earlier seventeenth-century responses to her memory. Elizabeth died in 1603; in 1619 the poet and playwright Ben Jonson told William Drummond of Hawthornden that Elizabeth “had a Membrana on her which made her uncapable of man, though for her delight she tryed many.”\(^2\) In 1659, William Cavendish, then earl of Newcastle, imagined the astonishment with which Elizabeth’s subjects might react to her physical presence: “[O]f a Sunday when shee opend the window, the people would Cry, oh Lord I saw her hand, I saw her hand, & a woman, cryed out oh Lord Sayd shee, the Queens a woman.”\(^3\) Modern historical fiction, of course, loves to imagine the queen as a woman, but it also embodies a range of responses to the past, from nostalgic to condemnatory. In this sense, it has much in common with early modern representations of the Elizabethan past, which stretch across a similarly wide spectrum.


\(^3\) William Cavendish, duke of Newcastle, *Ideology and Politics on the Eve of Restoration: Newcastle’s Advice to Charles II*, ed. Thomas P. Slaughter, American Philosophical Society *Memoirs* Series 159 (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1984), 45. Slaughter points out that the letter was presented to Charles II in spring 1659, but may have been written in late 1658 (xi).
Yet—to begin with a sort of case study—how different from Gregory’s schmaltzy melodrama is the balance between memory and forgetfulness that characterizes the texts about Dudley that circulated in 1641, on the brink of the English Civil War (1642-1651)! Rather than depicting a tragically romantic hero duped by the cunning schemes of Cecil and Elizabeth, several texts about the earl of Leicester that were published in 1641 construct him as a Machiavellian manipulator. These include a reprint of the scurrilous 1584 tract commonly known as *Leicester’s Commonwealth*¹, a prose epitome of the *Commonwealth*, and the first printing of *Leicester’s Ghost* (a long poem based on the *Commonwealth* that I discuss at length in Chapter 1), all of which strategically draw on the worst rumors about Leicester that circulated during his lifetime. In this case, historical memory maliciously and relentlessly exposes the negative in a way that seems to be the precise opposite of nostalgia: rather than selectively choosing the best aspects of the past, these texts selectively present the worst. When first published in 1584, the *Commonwealth* had caused an uproar within governmental circles and had been heavily suppressed. Although it spread nasty rumors about Leicester, the libel alone was hardly news enough for such an extensive suppression of the book.² However, as a religious and political attack, it was a different matter. Leicester was strongly associated with one of

---


² Leicester had frequently (if more or less obliquely) been accused of murder, adultery, and general Machiavellianism ever since 1560, when, in the series of events that Gregory fictionalizes, his wife Amy Robsart had been discovered dead at the bottom of a flight of stairs. An inquest cleared him of involvement in her death, but (then as now) could not stop the conspiracy theories.
the “hotter” Protestant cohorts at the Elizabethan court.\textsuperscript{6} In 1584, the more troubling aspect of the book was its attack on the Elizabethan regime by defending the Roman Catholic Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots—still imprisoned in England—as a legitimate successor to the English throne.\textsuperscript{7}

By 1641, the thirty-ninth year of Stuart rule in England, the question of the Scottish claim to the throne clearly no longer posed the threat that it did in 1584. Still, the scandalous stories and overblown rhetoric vilifying Leicester remained just as compelling. In 1641, the conservative platform of the Long Parliament urged constitutional reform and especially condemned “the ‘evil counsellors’ who had subverted fundamental laws and misled the king”—namely, “Laud, Strafford, the bishops, monopolists and corrupt judges who were lampooned over and over again in the pamphlets of 1640-41,” as Martin Butler notes.\textsuperscript{8} Curtis Perry has likewise argued convincingly that in 1641, texts that focused on Leicester embody a persistent debate about royal favoritism, especially as it relates to the increasingly centralized governments and royal patronage networks of Tudor and Stuart England.\textsuperscript{9} In this sense, ancient gossip about Leicester resurrects memories of the Elizabethan era in order to join contemporary discussions about the role of favorites—and, indeed, the role of kings—in the English

\textsuperscript{6} See Simon Adams, \textit{Leicester and the Court: Essays on Elizabethan Politics} (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), esp. ch. 3.


state. In 1641, this debate was dominated by the parliament that demanded Strafford’s execution, but the topic of favorites had formed a flashpoint in English politics ever since the 1560s.

Both Elizabeth I (1558-1603) and her successor James I (1603-1625) famously relied on favorites. Elizabeth’s greatest favorite was Leicester, whom she had known since childhood and whose death in 1588—a few short months after the Spanish Armada—had devastated her. She also lavished attention, offices, lands, and wealth on three other great favorites: Sir Christopher Hatton, Sir Walter Ralegh, and, finally, the hotheaded Robert Devereux, second earl of Essex, Leicester’s stepson. Hatton, who remained a bachelor, was the only one of these men to avoid falling from favor; the others all suffered banishment from court or even imprisonment at various points in their lives, often related to their secret marriages. And, of course, in 1601 Essex committed the greatest offense of all by attempting a coup d’état to displace Sir Robert Cecil, Elizabeth’s chief minister. Essex was beheaded for treason as a result, and no favorite took his place between his fall and Elizabeth’s death in 1603.

Like Elizabeth, James I also displayed a marked fondness for handsome young men who danced well. His first great favorite was Robert Kerr, earl of Somerset, who is most famous for his involvement in the 1615 poisoning of Sir Thomas Overbury. After Somerset’s fall from favor, the king turned to George Villiers, whom he advanced quickly through the ranks of the nobility. James finally created him duke of Buckingham in 1623. Buckingham exerted enormous influence over James, and that influence extended to James’s heir, Charles I (1625-1649), as well. Charles seems to have looked
up to Buckingham as a sort of replacement for the splendid older brother who died in 1613, Prince Henry. It was Buckingham who in 1623 accompanied Charles on an incognito trip to the Spanish court to woo the Infanta. After the trip failed dismally, Buckingham joined Charles in encouraging James and Parliament to go to war with Spain. When James died suddenly in 1625, some whispered that Buckingham had poisoned him. During the Caroline wars with Spain and France in the late 1620s, Buckingham led ill-fated expeditions to Cadiz (1625) and Rhé (1627). Neither of these failures could shake Charles’s faith in him, though, and neither could the enormous parliamentary opposition. However, in August 1628, a disgruntled army officer named John Felton put an end to Buckingham’s ascendancy by stabbing him to death in his parlor.

For nearly seventy years, then—almost from Elizabeth’s accession in 1558 to the death of Buckingham in 1628—the English monarchy had been characterized by a reliance on favorites. Even after Buckingham’s death, although no single person ever achieved the same level of power, Charles relied on a few above all others: his wife, Henrietta Maria of France; William Laud, whom he made bishop of London (1628) and then archbishop of Canterbury (1633); and Thomas Wentworth, whom he made Lord Deputy of Ireland from 1632-1639 and earl of Strafford in 1640. However, as Simon Adams points out, by the time of Buckingham’s assassination, the debate over the role of favorites had long dominated English political controversy. Furthermore, Curtis Perry


11 Adams, *Leicester and the Court*, 46.
argues, “Even after Buckingham’s death royal favorites continued to loom large in the English political imagination, providing a convenient shorthand for corruption and tyranny in numerous plays, poems, and polemics composed and circulated during the personal rule of Charles I.”

Favorites became such a pressing issue in the years 1629-1640 because Charles I summoned no parliaments during that time. During Charles’s “personal rule,” the traditional modes of governance were suspended: instead of asking Parliament to levy taxes, Charles found extraparliamentary ways to fill the Crown’s coffers. The most notable of these was “ship money,” a practice dating back to medieval times in which coastal towns during times of war would contribute ships (or their monetary equivalent) to the defense effort. In 1634, Charles began collecting ship money from both coastal and inland counties, although England was at peace. However, even while the commons had no official parliamentary avenue for their opposition and no direct voice in the national government, Charles’s favorites and courtiers did. Favorites thus exposed the frustrations of the early modern patronage system, based on the inconsistent and random quirks of personal intimacy. The persistence of favoritism from the Elizabethan age through the Caroline characterizes a significant thread of the Elizabethanist discourse I examine in this dissertation, especially in chapters 1 and 2.

Yet in addition to highlighting the corruption that a too-powerful favorite might bring to the royal court, Leicester’s Commonwealth also espouses religious toleration for Catholics, advocating precisely the kind of popish innovations against which puritans and

---

12 Perry, Literature and Favoritism, 1.
Parliament were traditionally supposed to have fought. Indeed, in the text, the Lawyer (associated with Catholicism) states that neither “busy Papists” nor “hot Puritans” should be considered traitors unless they “break forth” into “some actual attempt or treaty against the life of the prince or state.” This urge for a relatively liberal religious toleration works against the conservative agenda that Parliament by and large seems to have been pushing in 1641. Furthermore, it complicates typical readings of early Stuart invocations of the Elizabeth past as simply a reactionary nostalgia for Good Queen Bess.

Indeed, the legacy of the Elizabethan religious settlement—i.e., the acts of Parliament that re-established the Protestant Church of England after the reign of Elizabeth’s older half-sister, the Roman Catholic Queen Mary I—modeled moderation, if not toleration, for at least one seventeenth-century Englishman. In a detailed study of the reading practices of Sir William Drake, an MP from Buckinghamshire, Kevin Sharpe suggests that Drake “admired Queen Elizabeth for her politic sense of the need for a comprehensive religious settlement and valued the Church of England for its political as well as religious role,” especially in contrast with Laud and other divisive religious figures of the 1630s, both puritan and Arminian. Of course, even after the Elizabethan religious settlement, religious conflict persisted; for early modern English subjects, there was no such thing as religious toleration in any modern sense of the term. Even before

---

13 *Leicester’s Commonwealth*, 67-68.


war broke out, however, Catholics, nonconforming Protestants, and other “recusants,” called so because they recused themselves from attending Church of England services, could be fined for each absence.

More worrying to many early modern English Protestants were the so-called “church papists,” crypto-Catholics who outwardly conformed but secretly maintained their Catholic faith. In fact, because of the Church of England’s relatively lax requirements for conformity and its preservation of certain characteristics of Roman Catholicism, church papistry provided the best option for many English Catholics.16 “Symbolic of Elizabeth’s vaunted reluctance to molest consciences, to make windows into men’s souls,” writes Alexandra Walsham, “the eucharist never became the legal standard for creedal consent in her reign. Churchgoing remained the sole test of what Catholic polemicists dubbed ‘Parliamentarie Religion.’”17 This insistence on outward conformity to the state church both allowed a certain limited religious toleration and bred a wide variety of intense theological debates about church doctrines and practices. By 1616, as Anthony Milton points out, the Venetian ambassador could identify “twelve different religious parties in England—three of Catholics, three of the merely indifferent, ‘four of the religion of his Majesty, and two Puritan parties.’”18 In other words, the

16 Not all, though; see Christopher Highley, Catholics Writing the Nation in Early Modern Britain and Ireland (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), esp. ch. 2.

17 Alexandra Walsham, Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999), 12.

18 Milton, Catholic and Reformed, 7. The quote from Foscarini comes from the Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1617-19, 387.
religious conflicts in England were never as simple as Protestant vs. Catholic or even puritan vs. Arminian. However, as Milton notes, many works of religious controversy nevertheless tended to articulate their arguments as if there were only two opposing positions, right and wrong. In this polarizing religious context, the demands in *Leicester’s Commonwealth* for religious toleration contribute an unexpected complexity to the text’s invocation of the Elizabethan era. This complexity, I argue, characterizes many Elizabethanist texts of the 1620s and 1630s.

While our modern fascination with Elizabeth’s reign tends to focus explicitly on the queen or to give her scene-stealing cameos, as in the 1998 film *Shakespeare in Love*, seventeenth-century writers and publishers played up a much wider range of her famous subjects, including courtiers, privateers, and cultural figures, as well as resurrecting Elizabethan texts by reprinting and adapting them. When I use the word “Eliz...anism,” I refer to this widespread and wide-ranging cultural phenomenon. However, scholarly interest in Elizabeth—so remarkable as a (debatably) proto-feminist icon and, indeed, deserving of such attention—has narrowed the focus of the criticism on seventeenth-century Elizabethanism. Most scholars examine Elizabeth’s own seventeenth-century afterlives, tending to neglect two key aspects of Elizabethanism: first, its prominence during the reign of Charles I (most scholars, with the notable exception of John Watkins, focus on representations of Elizabeth during the Jacobean era and the Restoration, while skipping over the thirty-five intervening years); and second, the proliferation of multiple Elizabethan figures and texts that engage with issues across

---

the social, political, and religious spectra, from favoritism to religion to foreign policy to
the growing influence of Queen Henrietta Maria.

Furthermore, those who do acknowledge seventeenth-century representations of
Elizabeth, if not her subjects, tend to refer to the phenomenon as simplistic nostalgia. A
sampling: for Georgianna Ziegler, representations of Elizabeth “invoked the conservatism
of the past, the glorious reign of Elizabeth when the Church of England came into its
own”; for Richard Helgerson, “an intensely patriotic attachment to the land and its
depiction and an equally intense nostalgia for the age of Elizabeth went hand in hand
with a disdain for the Stuart monarch and his court”; for Michael Dobson and Nicola
Watson, an “uninflected Protestant nostalgia […] characterized much of [Elizabeth’s]
mythos in the seventeenth [century].”20 Anne Barton, who argues the most influential
case for Ben Jonson’s Elizabethan nostalgia in the 1630s, claims that “Elizabethanism
[…] became increasingly identified with the opposition, with those critics of Charles and
his court whose voices were to gather strength throughout the decade of the 1630s.”21
Similarly, Martin Butler argues in Theatre and Crisis that Stuart absolutism provoked the
reinvigoration of the Cult of Elizabeth. Elizabeth was “enthusiastically reverenced”
because she stood against Spain and the Pope and for international Protestantism, militant
foreign policy, and conformity of religion—all of which represent “the values of the old
national myth of England’s greatness which Elizabeth was supposed to have been

20 Georgianna Ziegler, “England’s Savior: Elizabeth I in the Writings of Thomas Heywood,” Renaissance
Papers 1980: 29-37, 36; Richard Helgerson, Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England

furthering and which Charles certainly was not, and which cast suspicion on the whole
tendency of Stuart government.”

However, as the 1641 reprintings of Leicester’s *Commonwealth* attest, resurrections of the Elizabethan era—even when they do reflect “disdain” for the Caroline court—embody an enormously complex range of meanings, including not only the dangers of favoritism but also the importance of religious
toleration and other innovations: a range of meanings wide enough to counter the
supposed simplicity of nostalgia.

Furthermore, these texts entered a literary marketplace that laid the groundwork
for a canon of English literature based in that of Elizabethan England. In addition to the
Elizabethanist texts I discuss, many other works of Elizabethan literature were revived in
print between 1625 and 1642. Shakespeare’s Second Folio, for example, was published in
1632. The same year saw a compilation of John Lyly’s courtly plays, *Sixe Court
Comedies Often Presented and Acted before Queen Elizabeth*, none of which had been
printed since 1598. John Donne’s *Poems* were printed for the first time in 1633, after
circulating in manuscript for decades. Sir Philip Sidney’s immensely influential prose
romance *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia* was published in 1628, 1629, 1633, and
1638. Meanwhile, Ben Jonson was returning to Elizabethan forms in his plays of the
early 1630s: he modeled *The Welbeck Entertainment* (1633) on the famous entertainment
that Leicester presented to Elizabeth at Kenilworth in 1575, and *A Tale of a Tub* (also


23 Lyly’s reputation remained current through repeated printings of his most influential work, the prose
romance *Euphues*, which inaugurated a brief vogue in the 1580s for a mannered prose style. *Euphues* was
first published in 1578 and went through a number of sixteenth-century editions. It was also printed in
1607, 1613, 1617, [1623], and 1631. Its sequel *Euphues and His England* was printed in 1606 and 1609.
1633) and *The Sad Shepherd* (left unfinished when he died in 1637) similarly hearken back to Shakespeare’s green-world comedies of the 1590s.\(^{24}\) This dissertation examines the development of an Elizabethan literary canon alongside many previously understudied texts that likewise revive the Elizabethan era in the popular print culture of early modern London. Moreover, I argue, by analyzing texts that were printed between 1625 and 1642, we can better understand how the canon began to take shape around continually negotiated structures of nostalgia, nationhood, and cultural memory.

**Jacobean and Caroline Elizabethanisms**

Representations of the Elizabethan age in the decade after the accession of James I focus primarily on the queen herself. Many writers, dating back to the mid-seventeenth century, have assumed that that this nostalgia for Elizabeth stems from dissatisfaction with James.\(^{25}\) Godfrey Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, wrote in the 1650s that although “the people were very generally weary of an old woman’s government” by the time of Elizabeth’s death, James’s accession proved even more irksome:

> But after a few years, when we had experience of the Scottish government, then in disparagement of the Scots, and in hate and detestation of them, the Queen did seem to revive; then was her memory much magnified,—such ringing of bells, such public joy and sermons in commemoration of her, the picture of her tomb painted in many churches, and in effect more


\(^{25}\) Modern scholars have often reproduced this assumption; see above, 11-12.
solemnity and joy in memory of her coronation than was for the coming in of King James.26

In The Making of Jacobean Culture, Curtis Perry works against this traditional assumption that nostalgia for Elizabeth always or only reflected opposition to the Stuarts.27 Instead, he contends, the image of Elizabeth was appropriated in different ways for different segments of the population, and even for different members of the royal family. For King James, Elizabeth was constructed as peace-loving and moderate, and he became her heir in policy. For Queen Anna, queenship was defined by the same female and imperial virtues as it was for Elizabeth, but those virtues tended to be subjected to the king. On the other hand, a conscious appeal to the military values of Elizabethan England reinforced Prince Henry’s position as the heir to English chivalry. Finally, Perry argues, portrayals of Elizabeth directed toward a citizen audience via both the public stage and printed texts depicted her as the loving princess to her non-noble subjects that she always claimed to be, as in Thomas Heywood’s two-part If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody (1604-05, printed 1605-06) and Thomas Dekker’s The Whore of Babylon (1606, printed 1607). Such widely different representations of Elizabeth highlight the early flexibility of her memory, which Perry points out “is available for both radicalizing and conservative readings.”28


28 Ibid., 166.
John Watkins posits a similar argument about representations of Elizabeth in Jacobean England, but he focuses more on the complicated familial rhetoric that links Elizabeth and James as metaphorical mother and son—in spite of the tensions between the two over the execution of James’s actual mother, Mary, Queen of Scots. Watkins suggests that the trope of the phoenix connected Elizabeth and James in the metaphorical vocabulary of early Jacobean England; associating James with the phoenix figured him as the son of the virgin queen and elided dynastic differences by promoting him as the reincarnation of English Protestant greatness. This emphasis on Elizabeth’s militarism grew even more important after the Gunpowder Plot (1605), as propagandists associated it with the providential victory over the Spanish Armada. Watkins focuses on what Perry identifies as the most dominant trend in the representations of Elizabeth: the militant Protestant figure associated primarily with Prince Henry. Indeed, as Watkins indicates, *The Whore of Babylon* (performed, significantly, by Prince Henry’s Men) stages the Armada conflict as a forerunner of the Gunpowder Plot and emphasizes the militarism of Titania/Elizabeth in the face of a foreign Catholic threat.\(^{29}\)

As both Perry and Watkins demonstrate, the warlike Elizabeth promoted during James’s reign paved the way for similar representations during the reign of Charles. Instrumental in this continuity are the works of Thomas Heywood, whose theatrical career—like Jonson’s—began in the 1590s and stretched through the 1630s. Heywood’s Elizabethanist mythmaking included not only both parts of *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, which continued to be popular through the 1630s, but also prose works

such as *Englands Elizabeth* (1631). This hagiographical account of the queen’s early years overlaps with material from Foxe’s *Actes and Monuments*, known colloquially as the *Book of Martyrs*, one of the foundational texts of English Protestantism (it was supposed to be chained to the lectern in every English church, alongside the English Bible). However, in contrast to Foxe’s tome, or even Heywood’s earlier work in *If You Know Not Me*, *Englands Elizabeth* clearly situates her within a family history dating back more than thirty years before her birth. By starting with the marriage of Catherine of Aragon to Henry VIII’s older brother Prince Arthur, Heywood highlights both the providential twists and turns that eventually placed Elizabeth on the throne and the ways in which Elizabeth existed as part of a familial network, no matter how dysfunctional. Moreover, Heywood positions Elizabeth as the heir of a Tudor *religious* heritage even more than a purely patrilineal one, tracing the development of English Protestantism from Elizabeth’s mother Anne Boleyn through Elizabeth’s half-brother Edward VI to Elizabeth herself.

This depiction of Elizabeth as a product of her lineage, both familial and religious, corresponds with other Caroline portrayals of Elizabeth as part of her society—the central part, certainly, but still only one aspect of what made the Elizabethan age so compelling. The Elizabethanism of Caroline England, while naturally maintaining an interest in the queen, broadened its focus to incorporate representations of a larger segment of Elizabethan society, highlighting the importance of her subjects. Watkins suggests that the histories and memoirs circulating during the reign of Charles I that were written by William Camden, Sir Fulke Greville, and Sir Robert Naunton—all of whom,
like Heywood and Jonson, reached adulthood in the Elizabethan era—construct Elizabeth I as a monarch more acted upon than acting. The Tacitean mode in which these authors write, Watkins argues, de-idealizes Elizabeth. It reveals her as a hesitant, fickle, and passive monarch, heavily influenced by her councilors and advisors.

For example, Naunton’s *Fragmenta Regalia* (written ca. 1631) provides the clearest example of the Caroline focus on the agency of Elizabethan subjects. Published in 1641 (like the Leicester texts), Naunton’s memoirs offer a gossipy, personal account of Elizabeth’s relationships with her chief courtiers and councilors. In fact, although it begins by focusing on Elizabeth, *Fragmenta Regalia* devotes far more attention to the men surrounding her than it does to the queen; its very structure—a series of profiles of Elizabeth’s courtiers—reflects this attention. Watkins suggests that like Camden, Naunton depicts the Elizabethan court as the site of factional power struggles. However, by portraying Elizabeth “as a brilliant arbiter who not only rose above factional intrigue but orchestrated it to her advantage,” Naunton “inadvertently” enables future interpretations of her as a limited monarch willing to respect the advice of her councilors and especially members of Parliament.

“The more these lesser figures emerge as central protagonists and as the driving force behind the reign’s achievements,” Watkins writes, “the more the generalized glory of the Elizabethan age threatens to eclipse the particular glory of Elizabeth.” Precisely. While certainly still invoking the figure of the queen—as Chapter 2 examines—the Elizabethanism that surfaced during the reign of Charles I is
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32 Ibid., 58.
distinguished from that of Jacobean England by its increased attention to and more complicated attitude toward figures other than the queen. By considering those texts, this dissertation builds on the work that scholars like Watkins and Perry have done so well for representations of Elizabeth, ultimately expanding knowledge of how other Elizabethan texts and figures contributed to conversations about Englishness in the period.

**Nationalism in Early Modern England**

Nationalism, many scholars would argue, could not have existed in the seventeenth century. Benedict Anderson, for example, dates the origins of the phenomenon to the end of the eighteenth century and defines “the nation” as “an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.”³³ For him, the concept of sovereignty is really what dates the development of nationalism to the late eighteenth century: “the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm.”³⁴ This implicit contrast with Stuart philosophies of kingship—so insistent on divine right, hierarchy, and dynasty—suggests that any pre-Enlightenment sense of nationalism could not exist except as loyalty to the monarch. Likewise, Krishan Kumar describes Tudor England as a “patrimonial” state in which power “flow[s] as much from the feudal notion of royal suzerainty as from the modern notion of state sovereignty,” although he acknowledges that in the sixteenth century,
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³⁴ Ibid., 7.
these two notions were beginning to merge. Still, because political power was concentrated so narrowly in only approximately 4% of the population, he argues that Gloriana, ‘Good Queen Bess’, ‘England’s forgotten worthies’, the supposed popular rejoicing at the exploits of Drake, Frobisher, Hawkins and Raleigh as they singed the Spaniard’s beard, all have the usual mixture of myth and truth, of spontaneous and staged expression, of genuine patriotism and age-old xenophobia. What they cannot be allowed to do is paint a picture of English nationalism, of a nation linked by the horizontal ties of nationhood rising above the ties of class, region and religion.

This concept of a nationhood that triumphs over “class, region, and religion” is supposed to separate modern nationalism from its early modern instantiations as mere patriotism, loyalty, and/or religious fervor.

However, in influential works of literary criticism, Richard Helgerson and Claire McEachern have shown that Elizabethan and early Jacobean literature shaped the nation as an imaginative identity separate from the monarch. McEachern, in particular, takes up arms against the idea that English nationalism could not have existed in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Indeed, she writes, the Tudor-Stuart English
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36 Ibid., 103.

nation “is a performative ideal of social unity founded in the ideological affiliation of crown, church and land, imagined not in opposition to state power, but rather as a projection of the state’s own ideality.” In other words, she claims, “What matters for the presence of an English nation is not that its political form is or isn’t monarchy (or democracy, or oligarchy), but that monarchy is imagined to be the most appropriate form of English government.”

Christopher Highley, building on this critical conversation, argues that English nationalism was not as tightly interwoven with Protestantism as scholars have typically suggested. Instead, Catholics in England (and in exile in Europe) hotly debated how to be both English and Catholic. Thus, although the nationalism of early modern England may not have exhibited the same democratic concerns that it did in the nineteenth century, Englishness already existed as a concept linked not only to the monarch or individual regions or even religion, but to the combination thereof in a continually negotiated process. Furthermore, I argue, Caroline Elizabethanism added a key component to McEachern’s triad of “crown, church, and land”: the shared national past, as filtered through the lenses of cultural memory and nostalgia.

Theorizing Nostalgia

The word “nostalgia” would not be coined until 1688, when the physician Johannes Hofer needed to name the literal homesickness that plagued Swiss mercenaries
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40 Christopher Highley, Catholics Writing the Nation in Early Modern Britain and Ireland (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
However, just because the word had not been invented does not mean that the experience of nostalgia did not exist; after all, scholars of the Middle Ages have written about nostalgia in the literature and art of the period. Nicholas Dames defines nostalgia as the inverse of “pure memory”: whereas pure memory records the details of the past, nostalgia is “a memory that is enacted only in the light of an end, of death; a memory that is always only the necessary prehistory of the present.”

He elaborates:

Nostalgia is as much self-definition as memory; it consists of the stories about one’s past that explain and consolidate memory rather than dispersing it into a series of vivid, relinquished moments, and it can only survive by eradicating the ‘pure memory,’ that enormous field of vanished detail, that threatens it.

Because Dames examines the nineteenth-century novel, his focus remains on individual nostalgia: the analepses and elisions in the memories of specific characters, he argues, contribute to the novelistic construction of “amnesiac selves” that base identity on strategic forgetfulness. In this sense, the nostalgia that he discusses is inextricably linked with the interiority that the novel privileges and, by extension, with Victorian
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psychology. Nostalgia only becomes a cultural phenomenon, he argues, as a result of the novel, which transforms it from ailment to sentiment.

Judith Broome and Aaron Santesso pin the origins of cultural nostalgia in the eighteenth century. Broome suggests that “[t]he cultural nostalgia that pervaded the eighteenth century—a nameless longing—manifested itself in cultural constructions of body and landscape, specifically sentimental bodies and picturesque landscapes.”

Here, two characteristic eighteenth-century modes—the sentimental and the picturesque—emphasize aesthetic over historical experience. For Santesso, too, the nostalgia of the eighteenth century is primarily aesthetic; he defines nostalgia “as an impersonal, highly literary mode of idealization responding first and foremost to the concerns of the present.” For Broome and Santesso, as for Dames, nostalgia represents an inherently conservative process by which an individual or culture chooses which memories to prefer and which to forget in order to justify (as opposed to changing or reforming) the present.

Indeed, an exploration of the processes of selective memorializing lies at the heart of this dissertation. However, not all nostalgia is inherently conservative, backward-looking, and reactionary. Svetlana Boym—building on Frederic Jameson and Linda Hutcheon—argues that nostalgia exists in two distinct forms. “Regressive” nostalgia dangerously tries to substitute “emotional bonding” for critical thinking. “In extreme cases,” Boym writes, regressive nostalgia “can create a phantom homeland, for the sake


of which one is ready to die or kill.”48 Nevertheless, nostalgia can also serve a critical function by evoking “collective frameworks of memory” and by working “through play that points to the future.”49 In this sense, nostalgia can even fulfill a utopian role by lifting up memories of the past as a goal for which to aim. The delicate balance between these “collective frameworks of memory”—cultural memory, the accumulation of stories and legends and texts that together construct the Elizabethan age in the 1630s—and the “play” that points to the future is negotiated and renegotiated in Caroline texts. Although this “reflective” nostalgia shares with regressive nostalgia a disdain for the present, it serves as a vehicle for critical thought and social change.

If the nostalgia of the nineteenth-century novel creates “amnesiac selves” and eighteenth-century nostalgia works with idealized literary forms, the nostalgic tropes that characterize Caroline Elizabethanism are linked much more closely with historical figures and texts. This nostalgia is a simulacrum of history, a clone which has no real progenitor but only an imagined one. Many of the texts I discuss here share with Jameson’s analysis of modern nostalgia films like American Graffiti an interest not in constructing “some old-fashioned ‘representation’ of historical content, but instead [in] approach[ing] the ‘past’ through stylistic connotation, conveying ‘pastness’ by the glossy qualities of the image, and ‘1930s-ness’ or ‘1950s-ness’ by the attributes of fashion.”50


49 Ibid., 55.

50 Fredric Jameson, Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism (Raleigh: Duke University Press, 1991), 21. In other words, they create a simulacrum of a past that never really existed. For Jameson, of course, nostalgia becomes intricately embedded in late capitalist systems of production and
This postmodern “pastness” also characterizes early modern nostalgia, which is often conveyed through the “stylistic connotations” of typography, woodcut images, and literary form. Not every Elizabethanist text that I discuss is nostalgic, but the ones that are primarily evoke the Elizabethan era by representing historical figures or resurrecting Elizabethan texts (either reprinting or adapting them).

Ultimately, I argue, the intersections between nostalgia, nationalism, and the formation of the literary canon during the reign of Charles I reveal that Caroline writers and publishers used the Elizabethan past, surprisingly, to reconcile divergent religious and political views in the years leading up to the English Civil Wars. From 1625 to 1642, Elizabethanism evolved into an essential strategy by which writers, publishers, and readers negotiated what it meant to be English. The nostalgia that had frequently aligned with militant Protestantism during James’s reign became far more complex during Charles’s, more often promoting religious ecumenicalism and political unity than scholars have generally noted. Elizabethanism in Caroline England questioned the mythologizing of Elizabeth and her contemporaries as well as nostalgically invoking them; it represented both Catholic and Protestant positions; it argued for both peace and war; and it canonized and revised Shakespeare’s early plays and Sidney’s Arcadia to comment on contemporary politics.

The chapters that follow examine representations of Elizabethan figures and reprintings and adaptations of Elizabethan texts. By focusing on Elizabethanism in London’s print culture, I attempt to recover a more popular phenomenon than previous consumption, but the literature of the seventeenth century shows that conveying “pastness” via “stylistic connotation” characterizes early modern proto-capitalism as well.
scholars have accounted for. This project builds not only on the excellent studies by Perry and Watkins, but also on the set of methodologies known as the New Textualism, or, as David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass call it (more or less tongue-in-cheek), “The New Boredom.” 51 The material history of the books I analyze here frequently contributes as much to their Elizabethanism as the content does. Throughout this study, I examine how format, paratextual materials, typographic features, and publication contexts provide a rich and specific field of inquiry that enables more precise analyses of literary works “in the world of lived history.” 52 Indeed, this phrase of Kastan’s bears special relevance as we plunge into the world of revived history in Caroline England, examining the resurrections of the Elizabethan past in books printed from 1625-1642.

Along the same lines, and in Chapter 4 especially, I take up Zachary Lesser’s call for further analysis of the “politics of publication,” i.e., the ways in which early modern publishers “transformed” the meanings of plays by publishing them and selling them as part of a specialized and local catalogue. 53 In many cases, however, the books I examine list no publisher or were unlicensed, circulating in a “gray” market of dubious legality. Due to both the absence of important contextual knowledge and the multimodality of Caroline Elizabethanism, the multiple versions of the Elizabethan past—textual, material, representational—demand that we reconsider the uses and purposes of nostalgia, and


52 Kastan, Shakespeare After Theory, 18.

specifically how nostalgia intersects with a burgeoning sense of national identity in the 1620s and 1630s. This dissertation investigates how Elizabethanist texts in Caroline England evince both regressive and reflective nostalgia, in addition to other ways of interacting with the national past, by pinning the texts as carefully as possible to the historical moment, place, and agency of their publication.

My first chapter examines books and pamphlets published from 1624-1642 that feature Elizabethan “ghosts,” tracing the developing uses of Elizabethanism in the years leading up to the Civil War. These ghost narratives resurrect not only courtiers and military figures such as Sir Francis Drake, Sir Walter Ralegh, and the earl of Leicester, but also cultural figures, including Thomas Nashe, Robert Greene, and Richard Tarlton. The ghost narratives appear more frequently around the times when Parliament is in session, and I argue that the texts’ frequent impetus to sponsor parliamentary compromise suggests a nuanced interest in active subjects in the English commonwealth. Interestingly, however, not all of the ghost narratives align with Protestantism or with parliamentary compromise. For example, Ralegh’s ghost introduces and sanctions a Catholic religious treatise in 1631, suggesting that the Elizabethans could also be deployed as a legitimating move for divergent religious and political opinions. Although the ghost narratives do not necessarily champion ideological populism (such as that later espoused by the Levellers), they do manifest an overall view that Elizabeth’s reign was characterized by the importance of individual subjects, including favorites at court, members of parliament, and cultural figures. In this sense, they construct an “imagined community” of active and loyal English subjects. The ghost narratives also demonstrate
that Elizabethanism could authorize more views than merely militant Protestantism. Furthermore, they explode the notion that Elizabethanism equated to “oppositional” ideas, since the narratives fall along the entire range of political and religious positions.

The next chapter turns to representations of Queen Elizabeth on the Caroline stage, focusing on four plays first performed or published between 1630 and 1636: Thomas Heywood’s two-part play *The Fair Maid of the West*, Philip Massinger’s *The Emperour of the East*, and William Sampson’s *The Vow Breaker*. In each of these plays, an Elizabeth-figure becomes a legitimating force powerful and flexible enough to represent not only critique of Charles but also a moderate and cautious support for him—or, at least, for certain aspects of his policies—yet without becoming part of a propaganda machine. Furthermore, the plays all pin Elizabethanism to English localities even while exhibiting national concerns. From Cornwall to Nottinghamshire, the plays suggest that Englishness in the peaceful years of the 1630s could be conceived of as both local and national. Although these texts indicate that the unique loyalty, love, and virtue of English subjects constituted a national identity rooted in the virtues of the Elizabethan age, they also suggest ambivalent attitudes toward Elizabeth and her reign that prevent them from falling into any simplistic version of patriotic nostalgia. By invoking figures of Elizabeth, Heywood, Massinger, and Sampson produced complex reflections on what it means to be English, how to govern well, and how to celebrate an irenic foreign policy when the most prominent English “golden age” was so frequently associated with militarism.

The third chapter examines Caroline adaptations of Sir Philip Sidney’s *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia*: two plays and one long narrative poem. These three
texts—Francis Quarles’s poem *Argalus and Parthenia*, Henry Glapthorne’s play of the same title, and James Shirley’s play *A Pastorall Called the Arcadia*—share connections with the courts of Charles I and his French Catholic queen, Henrietta Maria. All three illustrate the triumph of the courtly over the violent and militaristic. Furthermore, they employ the specifically English pastoral setting of Arcadia as a safe and potent space to discuss complex political questions. These texts foster a discussion of ideal governance and bring Elizabethan literary discourses of political love and rebellion into conversation with the Neoplatonic ideals that characterized the Caroline court. Quarles in particular revises the *Arcadia* to emphasize a politically powerful vision of the mutually loving royal marriage, a vision that would soon take hold in the literature and iconography of the 1630s. These revisions of the *Arcadia* take Sidney’s politically ambiguous text and reverse some of its previous appropriations (such as John Day’s scandalously satirical play *The Isle of Gulls*, which borrows its plot from the *Arcadia* and mocks the Jacobean court).  

Thus, the adaptations of Sidney’s *Arcadia* show how integral Elizabethanism was to the development of a proto-royalist culture and ideology that circulated both at and beyond the court, employing literary nostalgia to reflect the Anglo-French politics of the Caroline court.

The final chapter reads three early Shakespearean comedies—*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, and *The Taming of the Shrew*—in the context of their quarto publication in 1630-1631 by stationers who sold from shops near the Inns of
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54 Alan Sinfield, for example, argues that the *Arcadia* reflects Sidney’s oppositional position at court, especially in regards to the proposed marriage between Elizabeth and the French duc d’Alençon. See *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), ch. 4.
Court. I argue that all three “wittie and pleasant comedies” evince a dual nationalizing move: first, by focusing on strong women, they connect concerns about Henrietta Maria’s power at court with similar Elizabethan discourses; second, by connecting Shakespeare with the Inns of Court clientele and their emphasis on wit, these plays explore Shakespeare’s burgeoning reputation as a national literary hero. Furthermore, the plays’ often explicit evocation of Elizabethan literary culture (for example, the sonnets in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* and the references to *Doctor Faustus* in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*) pins the origins of Shakespeare’s wit firmly in that era. Shakespeare’s early plays that are published in quarto in the 1630s not only help establish the building blocks of the modern literary canon, but also achieve new historical resonance and begin to emphasize his form of “English wit” as an essential and politically unifying aspect of the national literature.

Ultimately, I argue that in Caroline England, Elizabethanism became a capacious and multivalent cultural phenomenon that linked English nationalism with the foundations of the English literary canon. While a strand of the militantly Protestant, Jacobean version of Elizabethanism persisted in the literature, Caroline writers and publishers evoked Elizabethan figures and texts to promote political unity, religious ecumenicalism, social amity, and royal love—a proto-royalist courtly ideology that circulated beyond the court. Instead of assuming that Caroline Elizabethanism only represented a reactionary nostalgia that went hand in hand with oppositional politics, we need to recognize that it also represented reflective nostalgia that worked toward religious and political reconciliation and moderation. During the reign of Charles I, English subjects across the social, political, and religious spectra published, disseminated, read,
interpreted, and appropriated Elizabethan texts and figures to negotiate what it meant to be English. By linking nationalist discourses with the formation of the literary canon, the textual ghosts of the Elizabethan past came to define the political and religious boundaries of the national present, setting the terms of a debate about Englishness that would persist for centuries.
Chapter 1
Elizabethan Ghosts in Caroline England

In 1631, the ghost of Sir Walter Ralegh materialized in print as an advertising gimmick for a piece of Catholic propaganda. In that year, a new edition of the Jesuit Leonardus Lessius’s *De providentia numinis et animi immortalitate* was published under the title *Rawleigh His Ghost.*\(^1\) The subtitle notes that this book is actually a translation of Lessius, while describing Ralegh’s ghost as merely “A Feigned Apparition.” Although the text has no relevance to Ralegh, the translator invokes him because “in regard to his eminency in the world while he was aliue, I am the more easily persuwaded, that the very Name of him (by way of this feigned Apparition, and the like answerable Title of the Translation) may beget in many an earnest desire of perusing this Booke; and so become the more profitable” (*4v). Since *Rawleigh His Ghost* circulated in a “gray” market, unlicensed and illegal, the profit that the translator expected must have been more religious than monetary. He trades on Ralegh’s reputation as an atheist to entice readers who might question Protestant orthodoxies. Thus, Ralegh—the sea-dog and privateer famous for fighting against Catholic Spain—becomes a marketing tool to advertise the translation of an explicitly Catholic text.

---
\(^1\) A.B. [i.e., Edward Knott, a pseudonym for Matthew Wilson], trans., *Rawleigh His Ghost* ([Saint-Omer: G. Seutin?], 1631; STC 15523). Cited parenthetically hereafter.
Yet five years before, Ralegh had appeared as England’s Protestant champion against Spain in *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost, or Englands Forewarner.*\(^2\) Between 1624 and 1642, Elizabethan ghosts appeared in more than a dozen different pamphlets, falling along the entire spectrum of political views. These ghosts represent a wide range of Elizabethan figures, including not only Ralegh but also the earl of Leicester, Sir Francis Drake, Thomas Nashe, Robert Greene, and Richard Tarlton, a diverse group that includes courtiers, sea-dogs, writers, and a clown. In some cases, the ghost narratives nostalgically exalt militant Protestantism and parliamentarianism; others voice Catholic and, later, proto-royalist opinions. The appeals to the past in these texts, therefore, remind us that invocations of the Elizabethan era serve more complicated purposes than mere nostalgia. Indeed, as the ghost pamphlets demonstrate, Caroline Elizabethanism helped to forge an English national identity based on an imagined community of active subjects, for which the Elizabethans served as a key precedent.

**1624: Prince Charles, *Vox Coeli*, and Essex’s Ghost**

Although ghost narratives had appeared in earlier Elizabethan pamphlets—indeed, I discuss two below—the 1620s popularized the polemical ghost narrative. Elizabethan ghosts began haunting polemical texts as the controversy over the Spanish match rekindled anti-Spanish attitudes in the early and mid-1620s. These didactically and dogmatically charged narratives harmonize with the political climate of the English court.

---

\(^2\) Thomas Scott, *Sir Walter Rawleighs ghost, or Englands forewarner. Discovering a secret consultation, newly holden in the Court of Spaine. Together, with his tormenting of Count de Gondomar; and his strange affrightment, confession and publique recantation: laying open many treacheries intended for the subuersion of England* (Utrecht [i.e. London?]: John Schellem, 1626; STC 22085).
When Prince Charles and the duke of Buckingham returned from their ill-advised trip to Spain in 1623, they did so, as Simon Adams argues, to a court culture split roughly into two factions. One, which he calls the “Spanish party,” adhered to the socially conservative, monarchical values represented by the Habsburgs. The other faction, which Adams calls “the puritan party,” traced its roots, “both lineal and ideological, [to] the puritan coalition of Elizabeth’s reign.” This faction was composed of several discrete groups. Significantly for my analysis here, one of the groups formed around the literal descendants of Elizabeth’s puritan courtiers, including the third earl of Southampton and the third earl of Essex, among others. According to Adams, this group still preserved ideological ties with the second earl of Essex and became known for their radical politics. These associations with the militant Protestant courtiers of the past would provide important rhetorical strategies to incite national fervor against Spain.

In 1624, Charles and Buckingham made an impassioned plea before Parliament, playing on the nationalistic and religious zeal of English Protestants to win a £300,000 subsidy for war. Tensions with Spain rose to a new peak: the final collapse of the marriage negotiations between Charles and the Infanta piled even more hostility on top of
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4 Ibid., 142-3.

the already tense diplomatic situation, while the Princess Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine still remained exiled from Frederick’s lands. Although English Catholics embraced the Spanish match, widespread anti-Spanish sentiments created the remarkable demand for repeated performances of Thomas Middleton’s *A Game at Chess.* In spite of popular opinion, and although many courtiers and members of Parliament agitated for war, James refused to intervene officially against an emperor. Even when he allowed Sir Horace Vere and Lord Vaux to gather volunteer forces to fight on the Continent, he hedged his bets: Vere fought for Frederick and Vaux for Spain. By 1624, Frederick had been dispossessed of his lands for two years, and hopes of regaining them, as Kevin Sharpe points out, rested on either victory in battle or a tricky negotiation among Spain, Bavaria, and Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II.

While James wanted to navigate the complex diplomatic route to help his daughter and son-in-law, Charles tried to convince him to take the opposite path. In the Parliament of 1624, which poet and MP Christopher Brooke called “the Prince’s Parliament,” Charles and Buckingham united in visible and vocal opposition to James’s pacifist policies. In fact, one aspect of the conflicts facing the Parliament of 1624 resulted from “a clash of generations in the royal family, which the opportunity of a
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Parliament allowed to spill over into public debate.”\(^{10}\) Although certainly not the only conflict characterizing this Parliament, the generational clash played an important role in the early Caroline revivals of the Elizabethan age: wanting to distinguish Charles from his father, the prince’s supporters turned to Elizabeth, whom they associated with militarism, Protestantism, and productive relationships between monarch and Parliament. Indeed, as Thomas Cogswell points out, “when Brooke congratulated Buckingham on leading ‘this greate revolution’ [of 1623-4], he was praising the favorite for leading England back to the heroic days of Elizabeth, back to a Spanish war and Protestant unity.”\(^{11}\) James’s affinity for pacifism and willingness to ally with Catholic nations thus contrasted unflatteringly with the staunch militarism of both his predecessor and his heir.

Consequently, the publication in 1624 of two pamphlets that claim to represent great voices of the Elizabethan past taps into the conflict between James and Charles to paint flattering portraits of Charles as Elizabeth’s heir. Both John Reynolds’s *Vox Coeli; or, Newes from heaven* and Thomas Scott’s *Robert Earle of Essex, His Ghost* bear otherworldly imprints that wink at Elizabeth’s name: *Vox Coeli* claims to have been printed in “Elisiun,” and *Robert Earle of Essex, His Ghost* claims to have been “sent from Elizian.”\(^{12}\) Moreover, as Elizabeth Pentland points out, both owe a debt to the
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\(^{10}\) Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics*, 145. Russell claims here that the conflict between Charles and James overshadowed all other conflicts in the 1624 Parliament, a position that the very structure of Cogswell’s *Blessed Revolution*—with its careful attention to the years between 1621 and 1624 and to wider political conflicts—argues against.


\(^{12}\) John Reynolds, *Vox coeli, or Newes from heauen. Of a consultation there held by the high and mighty princes, King Hen. 8. King Edw. 6. Prince Henry, Queene Mary, Queene Elizabeth, and Queene Anne, wherein Spaines ambition and treacheries to most kingdoms and free estates of Europe, are vnmasked and truly represented, but more particularly toward England, and now more especially under the pretended*
Apologie of the Earl of Essex, which Essex wrote c. 1598 to refute claims that he was a warmonger. Significantly, Pentland remarks, “For Reynolds and Scott, intent on protesting Jacobean censorship and foreign policy, Elizabethan texts like [the Apologie] help to figure forth an ideal commonwealth or ‘Paradise’ based on the political culture of Elizabeth’s England.”14 Pentland is interested here in the “ghostly ‘afterimage’” of Elizabeth—a topic I address in Chapter 2—but I want to draw attention to the “ideal commonwealth” that Reynolds and Scott associate with Elizabethan political culture.15 As I argue, this emphasis on the commonwealth and the many members of the Elizabethan polity provides a line of continuity between the early ghost narratives, which were written in response to the increasingly heightened Anglo-Spanish tensions of the early 1620s, and later ghost narratives, which branched out into other points of contention and divergent political viewpoints.

John Reynolds’s Vox Coeli resurrests all of the Tudor monarchs since Henry VIII, with the addition of Anna of Denmark and Henry, Prince of Wales, who are included in the narrative because they can provide uniquely intimate knowledge about James I.

match of Prince Charles with the Infanta Dona Maria. Whereunto is annexed two letters written by Queene Mary from Heauen, the one to Count Gondomar, the ambassador of Spaine, the other to all the Romane Catholiques of England (Elisium [i.e. London], 1624; STC 20946.4); Thomas Scott, Robert Earle of Essex his ghost, sent from Elizian: to the nobility, gentry, and communaltie of England (Paradise [i.e. London: John Beale?], 1624; STC 22084). Both of these pamphlets appeared, in spite of their different authorship, in a collection of Thomas Scott’s works published in 1624 (see notes 20 and 24 below). Robert Earle of Essex, His Ghost was reprinted in 1642.

13 The Apologie was printed in two early editions: one possibly unauthorized edition c. 1600, possibly with a letter by Lady Penelope Rich, and a second authorized edition in 1603.


15 Ibid.
Indeed, Prince Henry frequently plays an important intermediary role because of his reputation as a spiritual heir to the Protestant Tudor monarchs, interested in reviving the militant Protestantism of the Elizabethan past. Together the English royals of the past century form a sort of ghostly Privy Council, discussing history and debating policy from “the golden Star-chamber of Heaven.” Elizabeth figures prominently in this pamphlet as the voice of authority and Protestant reason; she is the one who notices Spain’s “projects and resolutions,” specifically the proposed match between Charles and the Infanta (B1v).

If we are to imagine the conversation as a discussion among justices on a bench, then Elizabeth plays the chief justice, the most vocal organizer of the debate.

In Vox Coeli, England’s Protestant royals not only demonstrate interest in contemporary affairs, but also take a strong stance against James’s pacifist policies. Reynolds notes in the preface, “I was enforced to see (O that I had beene so happy as not to haue seen) the perfidious Progresse of Spaines new treacheries, and vsurpation vpon many Countries of Europe,” highlighting Philip IV’s conquest of the Palatinate in 1621-1622, “wherein the honour of our King, and of his three famous Kingdome, doe most extreamely suffer” (¶1r). Not surprisingly, England’s Protestant royals agree. Henry VIII claims that religion is merely “the pretext, and cloke of [Spain’s] bloody Vsurpation, when Heauen & Earth knowes and sees, that it is first gold, then a greedy desire of Dominion and Empire, which is the true cause, and sole obiect thereof” (C1r). Using
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17 Reynolds, *Vox Coeli*, B3r. Cited parenthetically hereafter.
nearly identical language, Edward VI suggests that Spain’s imperial ambitions provided the sole foundation for their alliance with France: “The least child in France knowes that Religion was onely the pretext, but Empire and Dominion the obiect of that League” (E2v). Spain’s duplicity serves as a major theme of the text, the deceitful empire contrasted to the honest English commonwealth—a theme to which Scott later returns in *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost*.

While Spain serves as an example of duplicitous warmongering, Reynolds places the Netherlands in opposition to Spain as the militant Protestant force that England should strive to become. Elizabeth praises the Netherlands for “seeking to preserue their libertie, liues, and Consciences from the cruell Tyranny and Inquisition of Spaine” (G2r). Similarly, Edward notes a reversal in the roles of England and the Netherlands over the past forty years: “Heretofore England taught the Hollanders wit and valour, and now they resolue to shew England the way to those two Vertues” (G3r). In several excerpts that completely disregard her historical reluctance to go to war, Elizabeth explicitly claims alignment with the martial policies of the Netherlands. “I protected the Netherlands in despight of Spaine,” she says (G3v). For Reynolds, if England has taught the Hollanders wit and valor, then Elizabeth served as the exemplar in that lesson.

In *Vox Coeli*, the manly, warlike vigor of Elizabethan England stands in stark contrast to the interest in the arts that characterizes Jacobean England. Indeed, Reynolds portrays this Jacobean penchant for the arts as so effeminate that even the pro-Spanish Mary I condemns it: “But then [i.e., during Elizabeth’s reign] England was delighted in Combats, Warres and Victories, and now in Stage-Playes, Maskes, Reuels and Carousing,
so as their courages are become as rustie as their Swords and Muskets” (H3r). Edward VI confirms this opinion, in one of the only moments of consensus in the entire narrative.

English tradition, as represented by the Protestant royals, revolves around the militarism not only of its rulers—as in the case of Henry VIII, who boasts of his personal victories—but also of its people, and in particular its Elizabethan heroes. “Spaine felt that English were Souldiers,” Elizabeth claims, “when my Drake beate them on my Seas, and Coast in 88[,] my Norris at Croyden in 94[,] my Essex at Calez [i.e., Cadiz] in 96[,] and my Montjoy at Kingsale in 1600” (H3r). She goes on to mourn the loss of her great seafaring captains:

Where is my Drake, where my Cumberland, my Forbisher [sic], my Grinuille, my Cauendish, my Hawkins, my Rawleigh, and the rest; Alas, they want me, and King Iames and England wants them; for when they liued, and I raigned, our Valour could stop the Progression of Spaine.

(H3v)

Whereas Reynolds associates military might with the person of Henry VIII and militaristic valor with the person of Prince Henry, Elizabeth’s military success always depends on her network of commanders and captains. This clearly results in part from the fact that she never led troops into battle, but it also in effect constructs an image of the Elizabethan past that foregrounds the achievements of subjects—and not just the aristocratic ones, but also men like Drake and Ralegh, “mushrumps” who rose to prominence from humble origins.
Indeed, Reynolds attempts to draw connections with the great Elizabethan favorites by setting up Buckingham as their worthy successor. “Grieue no more deere Aunt for the Nauy Royall of England,” Prince Henry tells Elizabeth; “for although Nottingham was remisse and careless herein, yet braue Buckingham hath of late years set a new face on that Fleet; and makes it not onely his delight, but his glory to re-edifie and reforme them” (H4r). Although Buckingham would later fail to live up to these praises with spectacular failures at Cadiz and Rhé, in 1624 Reynolds depicts him as England’s next best hope, the heir to Drake, Ralegh, Frobisher, and Essex.\(^\text{18}\) In this light, it is significant that Reynolds dedicates the volume to Parliament; the ghosts of the past that he creates emphasize a militaristic Protestantism that relies heavily on English subjects, rather than on the monarch. In other words, Reynolds aligns himself with Charles and Buckingham on the side of popular anti-Spanish militarism and against James’s interest in diplomacy. By placing this emphasis on Elizabethan counselors and heroes, Reynolds joins a burgeoning parliamentarian discourse that would continue to evolve throughout the 1620s as Charles struggled to obtain the money to fund the war with Spain.

By 1624, the concern over the Spanish match that the pamphlet expresses had already passed; in October 1623, people all across England had lit bonfires and rung bells to celebrate the return of Charles and Buckingham from Spain.\(^\text{19}\) Yet from 1624-1626

\(^\text{18}\) This portrayal suggests that even if Reynolds wrote the skeleton of the pamphlet in 1620-1, he may have revised it before its publication in 1624; certainly the pro-Spanish Buckingham of a few years before looked very different to the new, warmongering Buckingham, who worked with Charles to persuade James to call a parliament and gather money for war.

Reynolds languished in prison for writing this pamphlet and one other, *Votivae Angliae*, which both offended the king.\(^{20}\) As Cyndia Clegg points out, both of these works blamed James for the plight of Frederick and Elizabeth, and *Vox Coeli* lauds Parliament over the king, “for it is to parliament that God looks for his Glory, that the King looks for ‘honour and safety,’ and that the Church and Commonweal look for ‘their flourishing welfare and prosperity.’”\(^{21}\) Even though the Spanish match was a question of the past, clearly the elevation of Parliament combined with the anti-Spanish, anti-Catholic sentiments expressed in the pamphlet to retain an unwelcome and inflammatory edge in the prickly political climate of 1624. The anti-Catholicism must have struck a particularly sour note, since the king had already empowered Buckingham to begin new marriage negotiations with the French.\(^ {22}\)

Similarly anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic sentiments characterize Thomas Scott’s *Robert Earle of Essex His Ghost*,\(^ {23}\) which follows immediately after *Vox Coeli* in the 1624 *Workes of the Most Famous and Reverend Divine Mr. Thomas Scot*.\(^ {24}\) Essex’s ghost

\(^{20}\) Jerry Bryant points out three entries in the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic* that relate to John Reynolds; of these three, the most pertinent here is that of 14 August 1624: “Mr. Reynolds, Visct. Fielding’s tutor, is imprisoned for writing two pamphlets, *Vox Coeli* and *Votiva [sic] Angliae*, with which the King is much displeased” (*CSPD* 1623-5, 327). An undated entry from sometime in 1626 confirms that Reynolds was imprisoned for two full years (*CSPD* 1625-6, 528). See Bryant, “John Reynolds of Exeter and His Canon: A Footnote,” *Library* 18.4 (December 1963): 299-303.


\(^{23}\) Anonymous [i.e., Thomas Scott], *Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost, Sent from Elizian: To the Nobility, Gentry, and Communaltie of England* (“Paradise” [i.e. London: by John Beale?], 1624; STC 22084). Cited parenthetically hereafter.

\(^{24}\) Confusingly, and for unknown reasons, Reynolds’s *Vox Coeli* was included in this collection of Scott’s works. Scott was also the author of *Vox Populi*, which Middleton reworked for *A Game at Chess*, and
appears in this 1624 pamphlet as the representative of a militant anti-Spanish past. Like that of *Vox Coeli*, the title page of *Robert Earle of Essex, His Ghost* claims an otherworldly and punningly Elizabethan origin; this one claims to be “Sent from Elizian.” Also like *Vox Coeli*, it sets the following discussion “in the most High Starre Chamber Court of Heauen,” signaling a conflation of English national authority and the providential enactment of justice (A2r). But instead of presenting a conversation, *Robert Earle of Essex, His Ghost* presents a monologue: the voice of Essex, based on the *Apologie of the Earl of Essex* (ca. 1598).25 Essex’s ghost castigates the Jacobean policy of peace with Spain that followed the “long Summers day of Queene Elizabeths Reigne” (A3v). After rehearsing his own career, the ghost turns to a discussion of the Spanish Match, calling it “directly against the reuealed Will of God in Holy Writ,” and pointing to the Protestant marriage that James himself made, as well as the marriage of Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine (B3v-B4r). Most significantly, he makes an impassioned plea to his imagined audience—England’s “Nobles, Gentlemen, Commons” (A2r)—to advise James against the match:

I feare, I feare, you of his Nobility, and Councell (vnto whom it belongs)

are not so faithfull, true hearted, and stout, as religiously to aduise, and

---

Counsell your King, as you ought, not to suffer himselfe to be so abused, his Kingdome to be wel-nigh ruined, and his subiects impouerished. (B4r)

Responsibility for the match lies with the council as much as with the king—a familiar trope, but one that would increasingly become associated with the Elizabethan era.26 According to Scott, the nobles, gentlemen, and commons are duty-bound to participate in government by advising the king, lest disastrous consequences ensue.

Scott certainly continues to emphasize the importance of individual subjects. Essex’s ghost draws on Spenser to contrast the state of the kingdom under James to “the flourishing State of your Faery-Land, in the days of yore, whiles I liued on earth, vnder the Gouernment of that glorious Queene, of eter[nal] memory” (B4r). To return to that flourishing state, Scott urges the nobility to action. In fact, he extends his challenge to every English subject. Suffer a bit of personal privation, he tells them; sacrifice your luxurious clothes and wine, and donate your extra money to the war effort. “If your sumptuous Buildings, your surfetting Diets, your Prodigality in Garments, your infinite Plate, and costly furniture in your Houses, and the pride of your Wiuues (especially) be considered, England cannot be though[t] so poore,” he writes (B4v). By being frugal in their expenditures and contributing money to the war, Scott suggests that the English subjects as well as the king could model themselves on Elizabeth’s pattern: “You had a Queene, in my time on earth, who was euuer open handed to men of desert, yet neuer wastfull in her priuate expenses; but maintained Armies and Garrisons, not a few; a well-

rigged Naup, assisted and lent money to her Neighbouring States” (C1r). Scott connects the Elizabethan era with a cluster of balanced patriotic values: frugality mixed with generosity to the deserving, militarism mixed with peaceful interventionism. By hearkening back to the ideal precedent that Elizabeth was supposed to have set during her conflicts with Spain, Scott lauds an image of Elizabethan England that depends on balanced involvement from a range of subjects. The upshot of this for readers in 1624 is that not only the king but every Englishman or Englishwoman with money or goods to spare could follow in Elizabeth’s footsteps.

These pamphlets establish the tone that Elizabethan ghost narratives would take during the first years of Charles’s reign. Although the war promised during the Parliament of 1624 did not come to fruition until after James died, the ghost pamphlets of 1624 laid the foundation for later representations of ghostly Elizabethans as ideal representatives of both militant Protestantism and mutually beneficial relationships between monarch and parliament. These pamphlets also suggested that England could recapture its glory days—with the help of individual subjects playing to England’s strengths. Moreover, the ghost narratives also construct an imagined community of English men and women, royalty and subjects, all of whom are so devoted to the nation that they continue to work for its benefit from beyond the grave.

1626: Charles, Parliament, and Financing the War(s)

By focusing on the courtiers surrounding Elizabeth, particularly the most militaristic ones, several of the ghost pamphlets of the early years of Charles’s reign exalt
the Elizabethan age as a valuable model for the new king. Over the next few years, as the campaigns on Cadiz (1625) and Rhé (1627) resonated with the inherited ideology and patriotism of previous Elizabethan expeditions, English military failures and increasing tensions between the Crown and the House of Commons would change the political dialogue. In 1626, the Elizabethan privateers and their escapades took on new significance. In order to understand this significance, we need to look at Charles’s disintegrating relationship with Parliament between 1624 and 1626.

When Charles succeeded to the throne in 1625, he demonstrated a commitment to the war he had agitated his father to begin. He summoned his first parliament almost immediately: within two months of Charles’s accession, members of Parliament gathered in London to wait for the king. Unfortunately, a number of factors combined to create a less than ideal atmosphere for Charles’s first parliament: a virulent outbreak of plague; the increasing fragmentation within the Church of England; a renewed surge of anti-Catholicism in the wake of Charles’s marriage to Louis XIII’s sister, Henrietta Maria, and the attendant relaxing of penal laws against Catholics; opposition to Buckingham; and mixed feelings about the war on the Continent.27 In 1624, as Richard Cust points out, Charles and Buckingham had proposed a “blue water” policy that would play to England’s strengths by fighting the Spanish in both naval battles and privateering expeditions.28 In this way, although the path to victory looked far more circuitous,


28 Cust, Charles I, 2.
England could use its naval strength and long history of privateering to decided advantage. Not only would England profit from the ships they took, but they would also place double the stress on Spain’s coffers. To many MPs, this seemed far more effective than becoming embroiled in a land war on the Continent.

By the time Parliament opened in June 1625, the 12,000 troops that Count Mansfeld had led to the Palatinate in May had already been completely decimated: only 600 remained.29 As a result, Cogswell argues, “Parliament-men and their constituents were distressed, not with the domestic burden of a war, but rather the war that Buckingham presented them.”30 Most MPs disliked Buckingham’s proposed alliances with continental powers, in which England would fight at sea while providing monetary support to foreign armies fighting on land.31 Famously, the 1625 Commons granted Charles tonnage and poundage for only one year, instead of for life, as was customary—indicating the incipient tensions between Crown and Parliament.

Moreover, although Charles seemed to enjoy a post-accession approval bump, many members of Parliament still disapproved heartily of Buckingham. Together, Charles and Buckingham were unable to persuade the Commons to grant the necessary money to pursue war in the Palatinate. In August, Charles dissolved Parliament as attacks against Buckingham gained momentum. Unfortunately, the actualities of war proved even less popular than the expectation of it. In October 1625, the English fleet sailed to


31 Lockyer, *Buckingham*, 244.
Cadiz in an expedition mimicking the legendary raids of Drake (1587) and Essex (1596). The attack failed miserably, fizzling out under disastrous leadership and widespread drunkenness. The fleet returned with only about half the number of ships that had departed. Charles thus found himself in an impossible Catch-22. The war with Spain was mismanaged, in part because of terrible military leadership, but also because it was “disastrously underfinanced.”  

Then, because the war was mismanaged, he could not convince Parliament to provide more finances—even while war with France became inevitable.

The shadow of conflict with France loomed over the 1626 Parliament, as Conrad Russell and Thomas Cogswell argue. Caught between James’s promise to loan ships to Louis XIII to cement an Anglo-French league—ships that Louis used to attack the Huguenots, much to English chagrin—and English desire to support the French Protestants against their Catholic persecutors, Charles found himself in a nearly untenable position as Parliament assembled in February 1626. Unfortunately for Charles, as the Crown occupied itself with the French situation, the anti-Buckingham factions in Parliament gained momentum toward impeaching the favorite. On March 27, the Commons voted to grant Charles supply for the war—conditional on the trial of

---

32 Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics*, 262. Russell describes the complete shambles that was the Cadiz expedition: “when the troops reached the walls, they found they had neither pickaxes to begin the work of attacking them, nor food to continue it, and so were forced to leave the town for impregnable. [...] [T]he troops blamed Edward Cecil, the commander, calling him ‘Viscount Sit-Still,’ but [...] most people blamed the Duke of Buckingham” (262). For a more detailed account, see Roger Manning, *An Apprenticeship in Arms: The Origins of the British Army, 1585-1702* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 110-5.

Buckingham. Furthermore, the amount they approved only added up to about a third of what Charles needed for that year, creating the funding gap that the Forced Loan would eventually fill.\(^{34}\) The king finally dissolved Parliament after the Commons voted to present their Remonstrance against the Duke of Buckingham.\(^{35}\) The dissolution, of course, proved widely unpopular, drawing dismay from Londoners, country gentlemen, and others—except Buckingham’s followers.\(^{36}\)

After the messy conflicts of the 1625 and 1626 Parliaments, and given the financial difficulties that England faced, it is no wonder that the ghost pamphlets of 1626 had as much to say about economic well-being as about nationalism and religious fervor. Charles dissolved Parliament in June 1626; that summer, the Privy Council made serious military preparations in response to reports that the Spanish were amassing yet another armada in Flanders.\(^{37}\) Anglo-French tensions continued to build. By October, Charles would become so desperate for money that he would institute the Forced Loan to fund the biggest war since 1588. In this highly fraught political climate, three more ghost pamphlets emerged in the London market. Two were first editions, *Sir Francis Drake Revived* and *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost*, but one was a second edition of an Elizabethan text, *Greenes Ghost Haunting Cony-Catchers*. These pamphlets construct imagined communities of English nationhood that are rooted in the Elizabethan past by invoking Elizabethan subjects as sort of patron saints not only of English victories (in the cases of


\(^{35}\) Cust, *Forced Loan*, 16.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., 14.

\(^{37}\) Cust, *Charles I*, 63.
Drake and Ralegh) but also of heteroglossic English urban subjectivities (in the case of Greene).

Allegedly printed in Utrecht, Thomas Scott’s *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost* presents an enormously entertaining narrative in which Ralegh haunts Gondomar, takes his confession, and recounts all of the wrongs that Spain has committed against England from the days of Henry III to the present. Like Scott’s earlier ghost pamphlet, *Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost*, *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost* also idealizes an Elizabethan courtier who developed a militant reputation. In the context of Anglo-Spanish tensions in the 1620s—for which Raelgh’s 1618 execution serves as a touchstone—this text demonstrates both a fairly straightforward nostalgia for the militant Protestantism that Ralegh’s ghost represents and a more complicated attitude toward the possibilities of Charles’s still new reign.

Scott constructs the haunting as the hallucinations of Gondomar’s guilty conscience, and he chooses particularly vivid terms to contrast Gondomar with Ralegh. When Ralegh appears to Gondomar’s eye in a blaze of “most glorious and extraordinary light,” Gondomar is so frightened that, cartoon-like, “his night-cap throwes his hat in the dust, and his haire makes his cap fly into the aire like a feather.”38 In contrast with Gondomar’s undignified state of undress, Ralegh appears “armed at all peeces” (B2v). Ralegh carries his sword in his right hand and a golden cup filled with blood in his left. Sprinkling the blood on Gondomar and the ground in a strangely parodic conflation of baptism and the Eucharist, Ralegh then quotes the first lines of the anonymous 1594 play

The True Tragedy of Richard the Third: “Cresce Cruor, Sanguis satietur sanguine
Cresce, quod spero Sitio, ah Sitio, Sitio” (“Let gore arise, blood satisfies blood[;] arise, that for which I hope[;] I thirst, ah I thirst, I thirst”; B3r).39 In the play’s induction, the ghost of George, Duke of Clarence, declaims these lines to Truth and Poetry. Scott thus invokes an Elizabethan version of Clarence—a ghostly version, no less—to claim a similar political victimhood for Ralegh: the innocent nobleman, killed by the machinations of a cowardly, Machiavellian, and monstrous would-be tyrant.

Indeed, throughout the text Scott insinuates that Gondomar’s physical monstrosity signifies his Machiavellian political schemes. Gondomar has “the whole course of [his] life labourd continually in the deep myne of pollicie” toward “the building vp of the King [his] masters Vniuersal Monarchy” (B4v). In keeping with this sinister political agenda, Gondomar’s diseased and effeminate body exemplifies Spanish corruption. The text is obsessed with the outward markers of Gondomar’s anal fistula—Scott frequently refers to the count’s chair of ease40—and even the metaphors Scott uses emphasize bodily disorder. For Scott, Gondomar is “the very Nose of the Spanish State, through which hath beeene voided all the excrements both of the head and the whole body,” which suggests

39 There is no record of The True Tragedy of Richard the Third having been printed or performed in London after 1594. The ghost’s version here corrects errors in the lines that actually appear in The True Tragedy of Richard the Third (STC 21009): “Cresse cruor sanguinis, satietur sanguine cresse, / Quod spero scitio, O scitio, scitio, vendicta” (A3r). Interestingly, the play’s ghost seems to have arisen from the revenge tradition; he finishes with “vendicta,” but Scott elides the demand for revenge.

40 Scott’s obsession with the chair of ease is reflected in the title page of another of his pamphlets, which features an engraving of Gondomar standing in front of his chair of ease, while in the background he is depicted riding in his litter. See Scott, The Second Part of Vox Populi, or Gondomar appearing in the likenes of Matchiauell in a Spanish Parliament, wherein are discouered his treacherous & subtile Practises To the ruine as all of England, as the Netherlandes. Faithfully Transtated [sic] out of the Spanish Coppie by a well-willer to England and Holland ([Goricom [Gorinchem, i.e. London] : A. Janss [i.e. N. Okes], 1624]; STC 22103.7).
that he somehow reverses the biology of a healthy body (and, therefore, that of a healthy body politic) in particularly nasty ways (B3v). Furthermore, Gondomar seeks to “make a glorious passage for the huge and monstrous bodie of mischief where withal he was that day in labour” (B1r). Repeatedly using metaphors related to bodily passages, Scott turns Gondomar into a conduit of filth and a feminized leaky vessel of corruption. Gondomar’s schemes become unnatural children: he lays and broods over them like “new and vnnaturall Cocks-egges,” mythical objects from which hatch cockatrices, monstrous serpents that kill with a glance (A4v). Scott demonizes Gondomar as the grotesque mother of unnatural words and deeds that can only prove deadly to England. As the Machiavellian advisor to the Spanish crown, Gondomar is not only marked off as culturally, religiously, physically, and morally inferior to the English, but also actively dangerous to the categories that construct social order.

Yet Gondomar still acknowledges the inherent worthiness and military might of England. In her analysis of Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost, Anna Beer suggests that ghost pamphlets “offer a heady mixture of godly religion, militarist nationalism and nostalgia for the Elizabethan era, which form a challenge to the Arminian, pacifist, Stuart state, and provide a vocabulary for later dissent.” Indeed, the Elizabethanism of this and other ghost pamphlets indicates a certain amount of dissent from James’s policies. However, Beer goes on to suggest that Ralegh in 1626 becomes a model for “a nation of red-blooded Protestant Englishmen in opposition to their pacifist and effeminate Catholic-

sympathiser King." Only if she is talking about the pamphlets circulating at the end of James’s reign does this interpretation hold true. In August 1625, Charles took the meager amount of money Parliament had granted him and began preparations in earnest to send troops to war. The Privy Council dispatched new orders and drill books; professional soldiers began serving as drill instructors; and Charles urged his lord lieutenants to prioritize the training of the militias. In 1626, Charles still wanted to pursue war with Spain, while Parliament refused to finance it. Beer’s conflation of the stipulations of the French marriage treaty with pacifism highlights the necessity of looking more closely at the immediate context of each ghost narrative’s publication.

Indeed, the version of Charles that appears in Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost looks anything but pacifist and effeminate. Like Reynolds does in the earlier Vox Coeli, Scott lauds Charles for his revival of Elizabethan militarism. Here English virtues and military might are so praiseworthy that even the Spanish have to acknowledge them, and both Gondomar and Olivares praise Charles as the heir to Elizabethan military success:

[S]ince the death of King James, of euer-liuing and famous memorie, the Englishmen, who for the space of twenty two yeares before, had but as it were dallied and plaid with Armes, rather seeking to affect it for nouelty then necessity, were now in one yeares deliberate and materiall exercise, become so singular and exquisite, that the Netherlands blusht to see themselves ouergone in a moment. (A3v)

---


For Scott, Charles’s accession to the throne represents a return to the military ideals associated with the Elizabethan era. The text praises “old Irish Commander[s],” veterans of the Elizabethan Nine Years’ War, “who neuer beheld an enemie but he [i.e., the enemy] felt his [i.e., the commander’s] Sword and knew his Target” (A4r). After James’s pacifism, Charles’s pursuit of war instills the nation with new discipline and military fervor. Olivares tells Gondomar that Great Britain is “nothing now but a Nurcery of excellent and exquisite Souldiers” (A3v). *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost* indicates that in 1626, Charles could be Stuart and yet warlike, Arminian-leaning and yet Protestant enough to combat the insidious threats of Spain and Rome together.

Nevertheless, as the second half of the pamphlet indicates, not every style of war is created equal. Scott’s Ralegh embodies English nationalist and Protestant virtues, but he also represents the success of a “blue water” policy: a naval war against Spain in both European and American waters. Gondomar acknowledges Ralegh’s heroism on the sea and confesses that those voyages to the West Indies terrified Spain: “I dare not (for the honour of my Nation) vnfolde the woefull perplexitie in which Spaine stood during this tedious voyage, how she quaked to thinke of the generall viewe which thou hadst taken without impeachement of all the West Indies” (C1v). Moreover, Gondomar claims, if the English had continued down the path that Ralegh blazed, “we had not at this day acknowledged one foote of earth for ours in all the West Indies: O the miserable estate of Spaine if these things had proceeded! she had then, which now threatens all, begd of all” (C1v-C2r). In other words, to stop Spain’s march toward universal monarchy, English should pursue the sort of blue water policy that Parliament had agreed to in 1624.
In this sense, the pamphlet mirrors popular sentiment among members of Parliament, as Lockyer points out: “Most members would have preferred to leave the continent to look after itself, while they concentrated on a sea war against Spain, for they clung to their belief that this had been the policy of England in the great days of Elizabeth.” As Ralegh delivers his rebuttal to Gondomar, he discusses the losing battles that Continental Protestants had fought against Spain, with special attention to the loss of the Palatinate. Indeed, according to the ghost, only England has succeeded entirely in fending off Spain’s advances; the Protestant nations that fought land wars have all fallen. Finally, “waving his sword about,” Ralegh swears to keep watch over England and continue to fight Gondomar even from beyond the grave (F1v-F2r). God may have “made Royall King CHARLES and his Throne precious in his sight,” but Ralegh and the naval policies he represents will keep them so (F1v)—if only Parliament will fund the effort.

The ghostly preoccupations of Thomas Scott’s pamphlets took on alarming and, indeed, fatal implications when he was murdered in Utrecht on 18 June 1626 by an apparently mentally ill English soldier named John Lambert. Appropriately for a pamphleteer like Scott, the tale of his murder circulated, like so many others, in a pamphlet: *A Briefe and Trve Relation of the Mvrther of Mr. Thomas Scott*. Although the

---

44 Lockyer, *Buckingham*, 243. Of course, as Lockyer goes on to note, Elizabeth’s actual policies bore little resemblance to English memories; “keeping the Netherlands free from Spanish control and maintaining the anti-Spanish elements in France” characterized Elizabeth’s foreign policy, while her reliance on privateering always remained secondary to those primary aims (244).

only surviving copy was printed in 1628, the pamphlet claims to have been written within a week of the murder. On the fateful day, Scott was traveling with his brother and nephew to church. As they were walking, Lambert (who was waiting for them) jumped up from his seat and tried to run Scott through the heart, although Scott’s brother was able to deflect the blow downward. The abdominal wound Scott suffered still killed him, but not instantly, as Lambert’s intended strike to the heart would have; he was able to ask Lambert who he was and why he had done this deed. According to the pamphlet, Lambert replied “that he [i.e., Scott] was a Traitor to his Soueraigne, and had injured him by hindring his preferment to the Queene of Bohemia” (2). However, the tale only grows stranger from there: Lambert claimed “that hee knew they all could not hurt him; For, saith he, my heauens, my Mistris, the spirits of my Soueraigne in the Queene of Bohemia will free me presently” (3). Racked twice before his execution, he detailed precisely who these “spirits” were and how they related to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia:

[T]he spirit his Mistris, the heauens elect, the favorite to Q[ueen]
Elizabeth the late Queene of England, whose spirit transmigrated into her Maiesty the Queene of Bohemia, which Q[ueen] of Bohemia so fauored him, that she entended to receiue him into her seruice. And considering with himself why he was not entertained into her service, a spirit suggested to him, that M. Scott had hindred him, and vntill such time as the said M. Scott was killed, he should not bee entertained into his Maiesties seruice. (9-10)

The account is somewhat confusing, but the implication seems to be that Lambert believed himself to possess the transmigrated spirit of one of Elizabeth I’s favorites, while Elizabeth of Bohemia possessed that of Elizabeth I. From Lambert’s perspective, the connection between their transmigrated souls meant that he was destined to serve Elizabeth, and the fact that he had not been taken into her service could only result from interference by someone else.

Why Lambert settled on Scott must remain a mystery, but it is tempting to speculate that Scott’s pamphlets played a role. After all, Scott dedicated The Second Part of Vox Populi (1624) to the exiled king and queen of Bohemia, claiming to have “passe[d] (without leaue) [their] guardes” and to have “presse[d] into [their] Presence.”

This pamphlet, like Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost, focuses on the Machiavellian evils of Gondomar. In both pamphlets, Scott uses a particular insult: in The Second Part of Vox Populi, Gondomar refers to Ralegh as a “Boutefeu and Cendiarie of the world” (C1v) and in Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost, Scott calls Gondomar “the Butte-slaue [i.e., boutefeu] or Incendiarie of Christendome” (A2v). Moreover, The Second Part of Vox Populi provides an even clearer forerunner of Lambert’s particular delusion when Gondomar calls Ralegh “a Darling of our late deadliest enemy Queen Elizabeth, and one of the last men to be borne of those great Spirits, and experienced Captaines the time of her raigne

---

46 Thomas Scott, The second part of Vox Populi, or Gondomar appearing in the likenes of Matchiauell in a Spanish Parliament, wherein are discovered his treacherous & subtile practices to the ruine as well of England as the Netherlandes. Faithfully transtated [sic] out of the Spanish coppie by a well-willer to England and Holland. The second edition (Goricom [Gorinchem, i.e. London]: A. Janss [i.e. N. Okes], 1624; STC 22103.7), A1r. Cited parenthetically hereafter.

produced” (C1v). For Lambert, the “spirits” of the Elizabethan age were reincarnated in himself and Elizabeth of Bohemia, and Scott’s pamphlets (possibly even Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost, although it is impossible to know when in 1626 it was published), with their emphasis on the active role of subjects in English domestic and foreign politics, may have contributed to Lambert’s delusions. In any case, the pamphlets certainly connect memories of the Elizabethan era with subjects’ participation in the commonwealth.

While Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost imagines Ralegh’s specter returned from beyond the grave to chastise Gondomar and inspire Parliament to vote more subsidies to fund a naval war against Spain, Sir Francis Drake Revived describes the economic profit that derived from one of Drake’s early voyages to the West Indies. The subtitle of Sir Francis Drake Revived is instructive: “Sir Francis Drake Reuied: Calling vpon this Dull or Effeminate Age, to folowe his Noble Steps for Golde & Siluer.”48 Given the conflicts between Charles and Parliament over funding for the wars with Spain and France, this emphasis on reviving Drake for the specific purpose of gaining more resources looks like a transparent piece of advice: by encouraging colonial expansion on the model of the Elizabethan privateers, England would be able to pay for the wars while simultaneously depleting the coffers of her enemies. In other words, a blue water policy, although less direct, would be worth the money Parliament would spend to equip the fleet sufficiently.
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48 Philip Nichols, Sir Francis Drake reviued: calling vpon this dull or effeminate age, to folowe his noble steps for golde & siluer, by this memorabel relation, of the rare occurrances (neuer yet declared to the world) in a third voyage, made by him into the West-Indies, in the yeares 72. & 73. when Nombre de Dios was by him and 52. others only in his company, surprised. Faithfully taken out of the reporte of Mr. Christofer Ceely, Ellis Hixon, and others, who were in the same voyage with him. By Philip Nichols, preacher. Reviewed also by Sr. Francis Drake himselfe before his death, & much holpen and enlarged, by diuers notes, with his owne hand here and there inserted. Set forth by Sr Francis Drake Baronet (his nephew) now liuing (London: E[dward] A[llde] for Nicholas Bourne, 1626; STC 18544). Cited parenthetically hereafter.
More than that, Francis Drake the younger—the Elizabethan Sir Francis’s nephew, under whose auspices *Sir Francis Drake Revived* was published—aligns himself here with his fellow members of the 1626 Parliament who supported the creation of a West India Company. Soon after Parliament returned from their Easter break on 13 April 1626, the Commons handled the proposal to create a West India Company, patterned after the Dutch West India Company and intended to fund the war without increasing taxes. Like *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost*, then, this pamphlet also supports a funding scheme based on naval prowess, but it adds the monetary benefits of commerce to that scheme. Indeed, Mark Netzloff points out the connections between Drake’s plundering of Spanish ships and the establishment of the East India Company: “The profits of Drake’s voyages are, of course, legendary: in addition to yielding Queen Elizabeth a return of 47 times her investment, these profits were even seen as contributing to the capital that enabled the founding of the East India Company in 1600.” Likewise, in *The Annals or the History of the most renowned and victorious Princess Elizabeth*, William Camden connects Drake with the establishment of the East India Company. Camden writes about Drake’s seizure of the Spanish ship *Saint Philip*, which kicked off a series of privateering victories for the English. As a result, notes Camden, the English “so fully understood by the Merchants Papers the rich value of the
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Indian Merchandizes, and the Manner of Trading in that Eastern World, that they afterwards set up a gainfull Trade and Traffick thither, establishing a Company of East-India Merchants.” This part of the Annals had been available in Latin since 1615, and an English translation had just been published in 1625. The younger Drake, who (along with the rest of his countrymen and -women) seems to have held his uncle in naturally high regard, certainly would have been familiar with the connection between Sir Francis Drake and the establishment of the East India Company; Camden’s Annals ensured that many of Drake’s readers in 1626 could have been, as well.

The title page of Sir Francis Drake Revived provides a great deal of detail about the tangled collaborative authorship of the text. The account, it claims, is “faithfully taken out of the Reporte of Mr. Christopher Ceely, Ellis Hixon, and others, who were in the same Voyage with him,” by Philip Nichols, who was Drake’s chaplain. The title page also notes that the text was reviewed and “much holpen and enlarged” by Sir Francis Drake before his death. Finally, it says, this version of the narrative was “set forth by S[r.] Francis Drake Baronet (his Nephew) now liuing.”

The title page is dominated by the custom woodcut at the bottom, which depicts Drake leaning on a table or desk with navigational instruments. His coat of arms and motto appear on the right: “A vxiilio divino,” his motto, means “by divine aid,” and the “Sic parvis magna” of his coat of arms means “Greatness out of small things,” a clear reference to Drake’s humble origins. Both


53 Although the text clearly resulted from a complex collaboration, I follow other scholars’ lead in referring to the author simply as Nichols, who seems to have played the largest role in shaping the text.
of these mottos become important themes in the text as emblems for the English nation, the small kingdom challenging Spain at the height of its power.

The book opens with two dedications that highlight the intersections between the results of Drake’s voyages and England’s needs in 1626. The first dedication, addressed to Charles I by the younger Drake, notes that “glancing on former actions and the obseruation of passed adventures”—such as the ones described in this book, naturally—“may probably aduantage future imployments” (A2r). The juxtaposition of “advantage” with “imployment” (i.e., “employment”) highlights the economic aspects of the adventures. Thus, the dedication makes it clear that Drake’s privateering escapades can serve as a model for the financially beleaguered nation. Here and throughout the text, the economic motives for equipping a fleet of privateers come to the foreground, unlike in Sir Walter Rawleigh’s Ghost, which highlights military motives. The second dedication, addressed to Elizabeth, is dated January 1, 1592 (i.e., 1593), twenty years after the voyage that the text describes, and claims to have been “Written by Sir. Francis Drake, deceased” (A3r). The word “deceased” not only draws a distinction between uncle and nephew, but also reminds the reader that this dedication “revives” Drake’s heroic and long-dead voice in service of his monarch. John Hampden suggests that the 1592 date indicates that Drake “refurbished” the narrative in an attempt to regain the queen’s good graces after his failure at Lisbon in 1589.54 Indeed, Drake writes that he hopes that the text “will be a pleasing remembrance” to Elizabeth of the “seruice done […] against [her] great enemy” (A3v). This dedication provides our only evidence of Drake’s intentions;

54 John Hampden, Francis Drake, Privateer: Contemporary Narratives and Documents (University, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1972), 47.
admittedly, it could have been fabricated. Ultimately, though, whether Elizabeth ever saw this dedication or Drake actually wrote it in its present form is a moot point. What matters is that by preserving (or at least representing) Drake’s voice in the dedication, the younger Drake revives his uncle as the spokesman of a bygone era and sets up a parallel between Charles and Elizabeth, the beneficiaries of a blue water policy.

The preface to the reader then builds up Drake’s mythic appeal by reproducing the legend of his providential upbringing, the precursor of his heroism. The nephew includes here the story that his uncle was born and bred in the hull of a ship, where Edmund Drake (the Elizabethan Drake’s father) was supposedly forced to take up residence as a result of persecution. Although the tale is pure fiction, the poetic aptness of such a childhood casts Drake in a providential light: his father the clergyman supposedly found sanctuary from persecution in a ship, and Drake would grow up to use his naval genius to save England from Spanish persecution. The preface to the reader goes on to provide a brief and laudatory biography and concludes on a pious note, in which the younger Drake claims to “intend not his praise” (i.e., Drake the elder’s) but only that of “his and our good God” (A4v). After all, how better to praise God, whose providential hand favored the English, than by recounting tales of piracy against Spain?

In order to demonstrate God’s favor toward Drake and his men, *Sir Francis Drake Revived* provides a detailed account of the English successes against the Spanish during the 1572 Nombre de Dios expedition. Many of the details concern the wonders of the
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55 Although Drake did go to sea at an early age, the idea that his family actually had to “inhabit in the Hull of a Shippe,” as Drake the younger writes, is mere legend (A4r). Edmund Drake, a clergyman, did have to flee Devon in 1548, but he became curate at Upchurch in Kent, where he was theologically moderate enough to retain his position under both Mary and Elizabeth. See Harry Kelsey, *Sir Francis Drake: The Queen’s Pirate* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 10.
New World and its peoples. Like other authors of New World travelogues, Nichols describes American flora and fauna in the context of their suitability for English domination. For example, the English put in at a place that Drake, on a previous voyage, had named Port Pheasant, “by reason of the great store of those goodly Fowles, which he and his Company did then daily kill, and feed on, in that place” (B2v). Naming as domination here goes hand in hand with predatory behavior, and the fruitfulness of the New World illustrates its potential profitability. Nichols also mentions the “Symerons” (i.e., Cimarrons), groups of escaped African slaves who had “fled from the Spaniards their Masters, by reason of their cruelty, and are since growne to a nation, vnder two Kings of their owne” (B4v). Again, however, Nichols mentions them not out of any interest in them for their own sake, but because Drake was “willing to vse those Negroes well” (B4v). It seems clear that both senses of “use” are appropriate here: Drake is willing to treat the Cimarrons better than the Spanish do (or to believe that he does), but he also wants to utilize them as guides and resources for his men. New World lands and peoples appear in *Sir Francis Drake Revived* as sources of profit, thereby making an implicit case for the value of a West India Company.

While the people, plants, and animals of the New World serve as resources, Drake actually makes most of his profit by stealing Spanish gold and silver. In the first major skirmish of the voyage, the English plan to steal a heaping pile of silver from the governor’s house. Drake instructs them to leave it behind so that they can instead seize the maximum amount of gold and jewels from the king’s treasure house. Drake’s gamble does not pay off this time; they are unable to loot the treasure house because the town is
too well garrisoned. Still, Drake does not allow this failure to discourage him. He compensates for the loss by pillaging almost every other ship they come across. None of them at first carry the gold and silver that he is looking for, so he steals what cargo they have and then attempts to trade merchandise for gold and silver. Finally, Drake and his men ambush a convoy carrying gold and silver. They take what gold they can carry and bury a quantity of other treasure. After ten months in the West Indies and Panama looting scores of ships (some repeatedly), Drake is finally able to steal the gold and silver for which he came. In the end, the text reads any profit as success, and plundering Spanish ships turns Drake into a sort of seafaring Robin Hood, stealing from the wealthy Spanish to give to the comparatively impoverished English crown (with, of course, a substantial commission for Drake himself). By focusing on the fruitfulness of the New World and the wild success of Drake’s privateering victories against the Spanish, the text emphasizes the long-term economic and nationalistic payoff for an initial investment in a strong English fleet.

In addition to the economic success of the expedition, the text also notes Drake’s victories in the warfare of religious ideology, albeit with considerably more ambivalence. Although the prefatory material appears to emphasize Drake’s piety, the text includes a much more ambiguous view of Drake’s religious actions. On the one hand, when Drake discovers that the Cimarrons follow a form of Christianity that seems to him troublingly papist, Nichols claims that Drake persuades them “to leaue their Crosses, and to learne

56 Nichols writes that in the area at that time there were “aboue two hundred Fregates, some of a hundred and twenty Tunnes, other but of tenne or twelue Tunne, but the most of thirty or forty Tunne, [...] the most of which, during our abode in those parts wee tooke, and some of them twice or thrice each” (N3r).
the Lords prayer, and to bee instructed in some measure concerning Gods true worship” (H4v). On the other hand, he causes great scandal by having an autopsy performed on his brother Joseph’s body after Joseph dies of a mysterious illness. Furthermore, until the second half of the text, Nichols makes very little mention of God at all. Yet in the end, Nichols comes down firmly on the side of Protestantism, portraying Drake as the Protestant champion against the Catholic powers of Spain and France. Nichols makes careful note when they hear news of the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre from a French captain they encounter. In the wake of the massacre, Nichols writes that the French captain “thought those French-men the happiest which were farthest from France, now no longer France but Frensie, even as if all Gaul were turned into Worme-wood and Gall: Italian practices having ouer-mastred the French simplicity” (L4v). This reminder of French violence toward Protestants must have taken on special resonance for Drake’s readers in 1626, when tensions ran high over Louis XIII’s use of English loan ships against the Huguenots.

Sir Francis Drake Revived, then, invokes the figure of Sir Francis Drake as a model of naval and economic success against Spain, winning a vast amount of gold and silver to enrich the Crown’s coffers. As Netzloff points out, “this effort to revive Drake’s reputation correlated a resuscitation of national honor with a revival of a martial paradigm of masculinity”—a revival aligned with “English military intervention on the continent.” 57 In the end, the Parliament of 1626 never went forward with the plan to create a West India Company; the proposal floundered amidst the foreign policy

discussions and further accusations brought against Buckingham in the following days.

Still, although Parliament never voted to create the company, the debates ensured that Sir Francis Drake Revived would be associated with a potentially lucrative spin on a maritime-only policy, for which the major sticking point for most MPs appeared to be the cost. ⁵⁸ If the English were unwilling to take this advice, Cardinal Richelieu was not: by the early summer of 1626, as Lockyer points out, he had set up a company that “was given the right to build ships and cast its own guns [and] was also granted extensive powers to develop trade with the East and West Indies, North America and the Levant.” ⁵⁹ France, it seems, was preparing to beat England at its own game.

However, Sir Francis Drake’s resurrection as an English hero would prove more multivalent than his nephew might have anticipated. During Buckingham’s ill-fated 1627 expedition to the Isle of Rhé, a libel commonly attributed to William Drummond drew sharp contrast between Buckingham and the repopularized Drake: “Charles would yee Prevaile your foes, thine better Lucke / Send forth some Drake and keep at home the Ducke.” ⁶⁰ For the Drake who, in the Parliament of 1626, supported “proposals to increase the King’s estate,” this particular invocation of his heroic pirate of an uncle might have

⁵⁸ Lockyer points out that the Commons voted supply but made no policy decisions. “This function, by long tradition, was reserved to the crown, and even when they were called on for their advice—as in 1624—they were given no assurance that it would be taken” (Buckingham, 244).

⁵⁹ Lockyer, Buckingham, 338.

seemed more controversial than he might prefer. Still, when Parliament convened again in 1628—this time at war with both France and Spain—*Sir Francis Drake Revived* appeared in a new edition to make the case once more for a blue water policy based on privateering.

A likewise complicated version of the Elizabethan era appears in the 1626 re-publication of Samuel Rowlands’s *Greene’s Ghost Haunting Cony-Catchers*, originally published in 1602. Although cony-catching pamphlets had continued to circulate during the first two decades of the seventeenth century, the genre was in many ways peculiarly Elizabethan, having been born in the early 1560s and reached its golden age in the early 1590s. Combining paranoid warnings against the tricks of early modern con artists with catalogues of rogues and the tone and tropes of the jestbook, cony-catching pamphlets occupy a liminal space even among other cheap print genres. They simultaneously demonstrate, laugh at, and profit from the fear of an increasingly chaotic urban society in which social networks fall vulnerable to the unscrupulous. The most famous author of cony-catching pamphlets was Robert Greene, one of the most prominent literary voices of the 1580s. In 1591 and 1592, just before his death, Greene wrote half a dozen famous

---


cony-catching pamphlets. By the end of Elizabeth’s reign, Greene’s ghost had appeared in another half-dozen pamphlets.

Yet Greene’s pamphlets, not to mention those invoking Greene’s ghost, fell out of print during the Jacobean era, while Thomas Dekker’s “Belman” series, featuring more literate and learned rogues, became more popular from about 1608 to the early 1620s. Greene’s only cony-catching pamphlet to be printed during James’s reign was *A Disputation between a Hee-Conny-Catcher and a Shee-Conny-Catcher* in 1615 and 1617, and even it was retitled *Theeues falling out, true-men come by their goods: or, The belman wanted a clapper*. The new title removes the old-fashioned word “cony-catcher” from the title and instead suggests a link with Dekker’s Belman pamphlets. In both Jacobean editions, all mentions of Greene were edited out of the text. By 1626, Greene’s name had not appeared on a cony-catching pamphlet since the 1602 edition of *Greenes Ghost Haunting Cony-catchers*.

The elision of Greene’s identity during James’s reign meant that when *Greenes Ghost* advertised itself in 1626 using both Greene’s name and the word “cony-catchers,”
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64 A notable discovery of coonsoage (1591; STC 12279.4); The second part of conny-catching (1591; STC 12281); The third and last part of conny-catching (1592; STC 12283); A disputation, betweene a hee conny-catcher, and a shee conny-catcher (1592; STC 12234); The defence of conny-catching (1592; STC 5654.5)[NB: although the author is listed as “Cuthbert Cunny-Catcher,” the pamphlet is generally attributed to Robert Greene]; The blacke bookes messenger (1592; STC 12223).

65 “Robert Greene” [i.e., Anonymous], Greenes Vision: Written at the Instant of his Death (1592; STC 12261); Barnabe Rich, Greenes Newes Both from Heauen and Hell (1593; STC 12259); R[ichard] B[arnfield and Nicholas Breton], Greenes Funeralls (1594; STC 1487); J[ohn] D[ickinson], Greene in Conceipt, New Raised from his Graue (1598; STC 6819); S[amuel] R[owlands], Greenes Ghost Haunting Conie-Catchers (1602; STC 12243).

66 R[obert] G[reeene], Theeues falling out, true men come by their goods: or, The bellman wanted a clapper (London: [W. White and another?] for T. G[ubbin], 1615; STC 12235).
it was purposely evoking the Elizabethan past. The black-letter font used in the body of the text similarly reminds the reader of its Elizabethan origins. Zachary Lesser has argued that black letter combines connotations of “Englishness (the ‘English letter’) and past-ness (the ‘antiquated’ appearance of black letter by the seventeenth century)” into what he calls “typographic nostalgia.” This nostalgia specifically “evoke[s] the traditional English community”; in the case of *Greenes Ghost*, the traditional English community takes the unusual form of the seamy underbelly of Elizabethan London. The text also highlights its own antiquity by referring to Greene’s previous cony-catching pamphlets, “*long agoe* set forth concerning Cony-catching and crosse-biting” (A3r, emphasis mine). According to Rowlands, Greene’s cony-catching pamphlets demonstrate not only his “experience” with cony-catchers but also “his loue to his Countrey” (B1r). Indeed, as Steve Mentz points out, the Latin tag on the title pages of Greene’s cony-catching pamphlets accentuates his patriotic motives. “Nascimur pro patria,” it reads: “We are born for our country.” In 1626, the combination of black letter with the patriotic tag positions *Greenes Ghost* as a specific revival of Elizabethan nationalism—in spite of its
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69 Ibid.

focus not on English heroes or national glories but on a cross-slice of London’s urban legends, ca. 1602.

As a result, *Greene’s Ghost* indicates that not every patriotic Elizabethan ghost must be a courtier, as *Tarlton’s Newes out of Purgatory* (1630) and *Tom Nash his Ghost* (1642) will also prove. Instead, *Greene’s Ghost* sets up a contrast between “carefull Princes” who implement “good lawes, for the rooting out of vice in the common wealth” and the “euill disposed persons” who subvert those laws and “fleece the plaine dealing man” (A3r). It becomes a service to the state to expose the practices of these criminals; Rowlands claims to have been “inforced (*amore patria*)” to illuminate cony-catching practices “for the good of the common wealth” (A3v). In fact, Rowlands calls these rogues “the very causes of all the plagues that happen to this flourishing commonwealth”:

> Would it please the honourable and worshipfull of the land to take order for the cutting off of these coseners and consuming cankers of this common wealth, they shold not only cause a blessing to be powred on this flourishing state, but haue the prayers of euery good subiect for their prosperous healths and welfare. (A4r)

All this emphasis on the commonwealth, threatened from within by a burgeoning urban criminal class, connects surprisingly closely with the commonwealth concerns of other ghost pamphlets of the 1620s, even though this one was written twenty-five years earlier. Throughout the text, the narratives focus on threats to the gentry and emerging middle class: Rowlands’s tales feature the “wealthy Retailer, Citizen, Merchant, Gentleman or young nouice” who does business in St. Paul’s Cathedral, along with the merchants at the
Exchange, cheesemongers, scriveners, carriers, goldsmiths, and their apprentices (B4r). These accounts invariably depict the inherent dangers of the burgeoning city and the breakdown of traditional small-town social networks.

Several stories accentuate the precariousness of city life by illustrating the dangers of false claims of kinship or friendship. “Faunguests,” for example, base their cons on fake friendship.71 In one story, a group of faunguests sees an apprentice carrying a heavy purse; he has just picked up £100 that he is taking to his master. Pretending to be his friends, they surround him and joke with him, growing increasingly violent. Finally they put him in a chokehold, steal the purse, and run off, laughing as if it is merely a prank. The apprentice lies on the ground, unconscious, while passersby think only that his friends have gone a bit too far. When he finally regains consciousness and tells what happened, the culprits have disappeared into London’s crowds (C1r-v). Such stories may not convey Jack-the-Ripper style horror, but the easy anonymity of the city still enables these con artists to pose a real and dangerous threat that mirrors the problems posed by the rampant hypocrisy and dishonesty of the supposedly virtuous members of urban society. Indeed, Lawrence Manley suggests that by drawing parallels between the “in-law and outlaw worlds,” cony-catching pamphlets evince “a kind of totalizing anthropology,” investigating “the systematic ways in which aggression and acquisitiveness can generate an entire social structure.”72 The derisive glee of the cony-catching pamphlets springs from their skewering of both rogues and gulls as endemic to urban life.

71 According to the OED, the etymology of “faunguest” is unknown. See OED, “fawnguest.”

*Greenes Ghost*, then, disseminates rumors of a deceitful criminal class that preys on citizens who are foolish, hypocritical, or both. It does not glorify the Elizabethan past; instead, it maps anxiety about changing social structures onto Elizabethan London. St. Paul’s, the Exchange, Westminster, the roads to Oxford and Cambridge and Canterbury—all the locations that emblematize commerce, religion, government, and knowledge become vulnerable because social networks in London can be easily penetrated and falsified. However, the representation of urban vulnerability becomes associated in 1626 with a process of negotiation between the legends of the criminal underworld and the savvy street skills that city-dwellers must develop—a process linked here with the particularly Elizabethan genre of cony-catching pamphlets.

Indeed, Mentz suggests that these pamphlets serve a valuable purpose because in them “the social anxiety produced by London’s voracious underworld gets balanced [...] by the education of individual readers through the accommodation of urban experience to fictional form.”\(^{73}\) In fact, cony-catching pamphlets accommodate not only urban but also national experience. Manley argues that “the language, style, and morals of the nation and the self were to be fashioned not simply in the traditional discursive arenas—the pulpit, the schoolroom, the aristocratic household, and the court—but in the streets of London, in its theater and its popular press.”\(^{74}\) In other words, unlike other ghost pamphlets of the 1620s, the 1626 edition of *Greenes Ghost Haunting Conycatchers* works to fashion Englishness by painting lurid pictures of the lowest social orders of the

\(^{73}\) Mentz, “Magic Books,” 244.

Elizabethan era. The emphasis on the commonwealth, though, suggests that national order depends on appropriately coded social stratification. Like modern urban legends, cony-catching pamphlets exercise fears about the transgression of traditional social categories. By invoking old-fashioned “Englishness” in title, typography, and content and illustrating the seamy underbelly of a supposed golden age, *Greene’s Ghost Haunting Conycatchers* complicates the assumption that Elizabethanism embodies unreflective nostalgia—foreshadowing the revival of the earl of Leicester in 1641.

Considered together, the ghost pamphlets of 1626 indicate that writers, printers, and publishers were already beginning to deploy representations of the Elizabethan era in service of more politically nuanced positions than in 1624. *Vox Coeli* and *Robert Earle of Essex His Ghost* lamented Jacobean effeminacy and looked back longingly at the militant Protestantism of the Elizabethan era. However, *Sir Walter Rawleigh’s Ghost* and *Sir Francis Drake Revived* resurrect the Elizabethan privateers to cast Charles as a new Elizabeth, a militaristic monarch who could enjoy equal success against the Spanish by following a maritime-only policy. Neither text implies, as other scholars have suggested, that Charles’s goals differed substantially from Parliament’s—i.e., that he wanted peace while they wanted war. Rather, the narratives make it clear that both Charles and Parliament favored war with Spain; the debates concerned the most effective military and economic strategies. Meanwhile, by exposing cony-catchers, reinforcing the need to maintain traditional kinship networks, and using a mixture of mockery and paranoia to shape appropriate citizen behavior, *Greene’s Ghost* highlights a form of English nationalism in which the local concerns of urban life—crime, anonymity, social
mobility—provide opportunities for citizens to serve the commonwealth. In this way, the text demonstrates how the fate of the commonwealth lies in the hands of English subjects, whose national duty is to take action against social transgression in all its forms. In all three cases, the Elizabethan ghosts of 1626 not only accentuate the role of active subjects in the commonwealth, but also begin to exhibit the complex negotiations with memories of the Elizabethan past that would also characterize the later ghost pamphlets. As Charles moved into the era of personal rule (1629-1640), Elizabethan ghosts would rise again, this time more in the model of *Greene's Ghost* than the privateering ghost pamphlets.

**Catholicism, Anti-Catholicism, and the Ghosts of the 1630s**

Between 1626 and 1630, several major changes reshaped the political landscape to which Elizabethan ghost narratives responded. First, the Forced Loan of 1626-1627 increased tensions between Charles and his subjects by essentially imposing an extraparliamentary tax on the subsidymen. In the absence of guaranteed annual income from tonnage and poundage, the Crown desperately needed to raise money to fund the wars. The Parliament of 1626 had agreed to grant Charles four subsidies, but their attacks on the Duke of Buckingham caused Charles to dissolve Parliament before the subsidies could be voted into effect. Afraid to summon a new parliament, Charles had to find another way to fund the wars with Spain and France. The strategy that the Privy Council settled on was a loan, based on the precedent of earlier Privy Seal Loans, but diverging from earlier practice by (1) addressing all of the subsidymen instead of a few individuals,
and (2) making only the vaguest of gestures toward repayment.\textsuperscript{75} This strategy (“Rummage and Scroungeage,” per \textit{1066 and All That}\textsuperscript{76}) proved a financial success but a political disaster.\textsuperscript{77} Many protested the illegality of the loan, including the Lord Chief Justice and the bench of Judges. Charles only exacerbated the conflict by approaching refusers in the most high-handed way possible, imprisoning many who refused to grant him the requested moneys. The tensions between the Crown and the gentry refusers came to a head in the Five Knights Case of 1627, which caused widespread uproar over the question of whether Charles was ignoring the right of habeas corpus.\textsuperscript{78} In the end, the court decided in favor of the Crown, but this decision would play a central role in the Parliament of 1628.

The second major change involves Charles’s increasingly tense relationship with Parliament, which further entrenched the divisions between the king and his subjects. As a result of the Five Knights Case, when Parliament assembled in 1628 the Commons seized the opportunity to present Charles with the Petition of Right, which delineates subjects’ rights of habeas corpus and taxation only by Parliamentary levy, among others. The conflicts of the 1628 Parliament seem to have made Charles paranoid about his subjects. At the beginning of the session, when the Commons had just voted to grant him five subsidies, he expressed his gratitude in particularly effusive terms: “At the first I

\textsuperscript{75} Cust, \textit{Forced Loan}, 2.


\textsuperscript{77} Cust, \textit{Forced Loan}, Ch. 3.

liked parliaments, but since (I know not how) I was grown to distaste of them. But I am now where I was. I love parliaments. I shall rejoice to meet with my people often.”

By May, however, as Richard Cust notes, a draft of an unissued declaration explaining Charles’s reasons for dissolving Parliament suggests that “he was now willing to accept that the House of Commons was in the grip of a group of populist MPs whose aim was to destroy monarchy itself.” In the end, Charles did not dissolve Parliament in 1628; instead, he prorogued it, initially planning to reconvene in October. By then, however, everything had changed.

The Duke of Buckingham’s assassination in August 1628 permanently altered the power structure of the Caroline court. The king was devastated. In the wake of this personal tragedy, Charles found comfort in the arms of Henrietta Maria; their strong and loving relationship would provide the political and emotional center of the court throughout the rest of Charles’s reign. Her own court slowly became an important “alternative home for those whose policies or persons were not in favour.” To the general populace her Catholicism had always been suspect; she furnished English
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81 On Henrietta Maria’s active role after 1628, see Caroline Hibbard, “Henrietta Maria in the 1630s: perspectives on the role of consort queens in Ancien Régime courts,” The 1630s: Interdisciplinary essays on culture and politics in the Caroline era, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (New York: Manchester University Press, 2006), 92-110; Michelle Anne White, “The Queen Ascendant (1625-35),” Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006), 11-29; Erin Griffey, ed., Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008).

82 Sharpe, Personal Rule, 173.
Catholics with a haven, and her influence over Charles became a matter of fevered speculation and accusation among English Protestants. Caroline Hibbard suggests that although “Henrietta Maria conformed to a positive model for queens consort” in three key respects, “fecundity, mediation and generosity,” these positive qualities were twisted by the queen’s opponents into their negative mirrors: “wantonness, foreign betrayal and arrogation of power.” Most significantly, her newfound closeness with the king after Buckingham’s death changed the politics of religious representation. Both Charles and Henrietta Maria shared a passion for the arts, and several scholars have analyzed the sophisticated literary, dramatic, musical, and artistic works that blossomed along with the royal marriage. As the queen grew closer to the king, representations of Catholics took on more sharply political valences.

Meanwhile, courtiers found themselves negotiating a new political milieu that began to resemble the jockeying factions at the Elizabethan court. No other courtier replaced Buckingham; instead, Charles threw himself into the business of ruling, seizing control of many of the functions that Buckingham used to perform. As Richard Cust notes, “This opened up what, for many, was the enticing prospect of a return to an Elizabethan style of court politics,” one which provided “opportunities for different interest groups to push alternative policies with Charles as supreme arbiter.” Charles also demonstrated a willingness to prepare concessions for another session of Parliament.
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84 See Erica Veevers, Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and court entertainments (New York: Cambridge, 1989); Karen Britland, Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria (New York: Cambridge, 2006); Griffey, Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage.
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In autumn 1628, he created a committee to generate solutions to Parliament’s anticipated concerns with Catholics and Arminians. This dramatic change from his previous reluctance to compromise with Parliament aligned him with Elizabeth’s reputation for productive relationships with her parliaments. Indeed, in or around 1628 Elizabeth’s speech to her last parliament circulated in a new print edition, in which her famous claim, “[T]hough you haue had and may haue many mightier and wiser Princes sitting in this Seat, yet you neuer had nor shall haue any that will loue you better,” models an ideal version of the relationship between Crown and Commons. In any case, the events of the months leading up to the 1629 session of Parliament signaled a new approach to the relationship between Parliament and the Crown, with the Crown indicating more flexibility and willingness to compromise than before.

In the end, however, Charles did not sustain these efforts due to conflicts in the Church of England. Tensions between Calvinists and Arminians came to a head just before Parliament convened in January 1629. Charles’s committee produced a declaration, penned mainly by William Laud and attached to a new edition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, that preserved Arminian interests while appearing to at least attempt to conciliate the Calvinists. As the Arminians gained power both at court and in the prelacy, religious tensions within the Church of England began playing a more prominent role than they had in decades. The 1628 advancement of Arminian bishops William Laud (London), Richard Montagu (Chichester), and George Montaigne and his successor

86 Cust, Charles I, 109-10.

87 Queene Elizabeths speech to her last parliament (n.p.: n.d.; STC 7579), A4r. Although this edition is undated, STC places it in 1628. Of course, my argument may be circular if the STC chose to date this edition to 1628 because of the parliamentary resonances.
Samuel Harsnett (Archbishops of York) made it clear where the king’s sympathies fell. The appointments of Montaigne and Harsnett rankled especially harshly since the previous Archbishop of York, Tobie Matthew, had been a staunch Calvinist. In the parliamentary session of 1629, the anti-Arminian coalition tried to make Charles recant his Arminian positions in order to win the grant of tonnage and poundage. On March 2, the Commons’ displeasure turned into near revolt when MPs refused the Crown’s direction to adjourn for a week. Sir John Eliot read out a statement that attacked two of the king’s ministers and proposed three resolutions that “declared favourers of Arminianism, and collectors or payers of Tonnage and Poundage to be capital enemies of King and kingdom.” Unsurprisingly, Charles did not take this open challenge lightly; he dissolved the session and issued a declaration that made it clear that he would not be summoning another parliament soon.

These changes in the political landscape—the Forced Loan and its aftermath, the contentious parliaments of 1628 and 1629, Henrietta Maria’s increasing centrality at court, and heightened tensions between Calvinists and Arminians within the Church of England—all contributed to the very different ghost narratives that we see in the 1630s. By November 1630 England had made peace with both France and Spain; for the first time since before Charles took the throne, England had no war to fight and no promise of a parliament in the near future. Together these events changed the print dialogues for

---


Ibid., 416, emphasis Russell’s.

which Elizabethan ghosts were repurposed, especially with no parliamentary flashpoint around which to organize political sides.

The ghost pamphlets of the 1630s thus invoke Elizabethan figures in service of debates over matters of religion, rather than topics related to parliamentary affairs. *Tarltons Newes out of Purgatory* and *Rawleigh his Ghost* resurrect Richard Tarlton and Sir Walter Ralegh, respectively, to present texts related to Catholicism. As I have already noted, *Rawleigh his Ghost* actually prefaces a Catholic text, the “learned Iesuit” Leonardus Lessius’ *De providentia numinis*. The 1630 edition of *Tarltons Newes out of Purgatory*, on the other hand, presents a populist version of anti-Catholic satire; this anti-Catholicism took on even sharper relevance in Caroline England than it had in the Elizabethan era. In both cases, the writers invoke Elizabethan figures better known for their secular accomplishments to frame religious controversy. Despite their differing goals, both texts approach Catholicism via obviously fictional ghosts who reinforce the rhetorical power of individual subjects.

*Tarltons Newes out of Purgatory*, first printed in 1590, shares many similarities with the 1626 edition of *Greenes Ghost Haunting Cony-catchers*. Both books reprint Elizabethan texts that even when first printed revived the recently deceased. Both books feature black-letter font, emphasizing their own antiquity through both typography and content. Both participate in popular print genres: the cony-catching pamphlet was rooted in the Elizabethan era, and the “news from hell” genre arose in the Middle Ages.91 And

both demonstrate the fresh relevance that the popular print of the Elizabethan era could hold when republished in Caroline England: an emphasis on the role of subjects in the commonwealth.

Richard Tarlton, the first and most famous English clown on the public professional stage, made his reputation as a combination of Vice figure, court fool, minstrel, and lord of misrule. He catapulted to early modern superstardom by not only playing popular comic figures onstage but also “parod[y]ing Catholicism, Puritanism, and legal and religious ceremonies” in the jigs that followed play performances. Tarlton’s Newes out of Purgatory capitalizes on this reputation by foregrounding religious controversy in both the framing narrative and the Boccaccian fabliaux recounted by Tarlton’s ghost. Indeed, the framing narrative provides a clear send-up of debates over the existence of ghosts and Purgatory, while firmly establishing an Elizabethan setting.

Goodfellow” [i.e. Anonymous], Tarltons nevves out of purgatory. Onely such a iest as his iigge, fit for gentlemen to laugh at an houre, &c. Published by an old companion of his, Robin Goodfellow (London: George Purslowe for Francis Grove, 1630; STC 23686).


94 Belfield points out that four of the tales in the pamphlet are based on tales from Boccaccio’s Il Decamerone (118).

95 For outlines of various early modern theories about ghosts and types of folkloric and literary ghosts, see Marjorie Garber, Shakespeare’s Ghost Writers: Literature as Uncanny Causality (New York: Methuen, 1987); Stephen Greenblatt, Hamlet in Purgatory (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Phoebe
In the beginning, the narrator mourns Tarlton, who died in 1588. Having lost interest in going to plays, the narrator finally goes to the Theatre, where the ghost of Richard Tarlton descends on him when he falls asleep under a tree. The notion that Tarlton’s ghost might be triggered by proximity to the Theatre connects with other versions of Purgatory, which, as Stephen Greenblatt points out, often “have a theatrical character.” The narrator is frightened by the apparition, but Tarlton teases him before confirming that he, Tarlton, is “here in the likenes of a spirite.” Like a good Protestant, the narrator refuses to believe this. “In nomine Iesu,” he cries, “avoid Sathan for Ghost thou art none, but a very divel (for the soules of them which are departed) if the sacred principles of Theologie bee true never returne into the world again until the general resurrection” (110-2). In scholarly style, with frequent Latin tags, the narrator points out that according to Protestant theology, the souls of the dead go either to heaven or hell. As a result, Tarlton immediately recognizes the narrator’s religious affiliation: “I see no sooner a rispe at the howse end or a Maipole before the doore, but I cry there is, a paltrie Alehowse: and as soone as I heare the principles of your religion, I can say, oh there is a Calvinist” (127-30). Condemning Calvinist orthodoxy for being too limited, Tarlton claims personal authority on the doctrine of Purgatory:

And yet if thou wert so incredulous that thou wouldest neither beleve our olde beldames, nor the good Bishops: yet take Dicke Tarlton, once for
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thine Author, who is nowe come from Purgatorie, and if any upstart Protestant deny, if thou hast no place of scripture ready to confirme it, say as Pithagoras schollers did (Ipse dixit) and to all bon companions it shall stand for a principle. (144-150)

The narrator treats Tarlton’s Purgatory as a joke; indeed, he cannot “but smile at the madde merry doctrine of my friend Richard” (150-1). In this way, the framing narrative sympathizes with the narrator’s Calvinism over the broadly comic Catholic Purgatory that Tarlton’s ghost describes.

Tarlton’s reputation as a clown serves here to defuse a potentially volatile response to his mockery; clearly he is not meant to be taken seriously. He may never outright abuse Calvinist beliefs, but he does suggest that Calvinists hold a reductive and morally bifurcated view of the world: they set heaven and hell in opposition such “that there is no meane betwixt them” (131). This view, he suggests, reduces the complexities of the afterlife. However, he defends this claim by drawing on sources that Calvinist readers would hardly privilege. In addition to heaven and hell, Tarlton declares, “there is Quoddam tertium[,] a third place that all our great grandmothers have talkt of, that Dant [i.e., Dante] hath so learnedly writ of, and that is Purgatorie” (134-6). Tarlton’s defense of Purgatory rests on three sources of historical authority: first, “our forefathers”; second, “our olde beldames,” the women of the pre-Reformation generations; and third, the church hierarchy, “the good Bishops” and the “many Popes and holy Bishops of Rome, whose Cannons cannot erre” (136-45). This attempt to persuade Protestants by appealing to Catholic authorities and, later, his own supposedly eyewitness experiences in a
strongly Boccaccian Purgatory indicates how farcical Tarlton’s ghost is. By 1630, however, the anti-Catholicism takes on far more subversive implications. Since Henrietta Maria had created a safe space for English Catholics at court, Tarlton’s appeals to Catholic authority exhibit a polemical form of satire that would have read very differently than the same passages did during Elizabeth’s reign.

Similarly, the ghost’s description of Purgatory, while technically aligning with orthodox Roman Catholic doctrine that Purgatory is a place of penitential torment, clearly marks itself as satire. The Purgatory-bound soul, now freed from the “vile prison” of the body, must cross a bridge lined with needles—while barefoot (157). Tarlton then passes over a meadow “that is all overgrown with Ave maries and creedes”; whoever can say “our Ladies Psalter” 150 times before crossing it will get to skip over a field of “hot burning ploughshares” and go straight to the whipping at the gate to Purgatory (168-72). In other words, even rote prayers cannot entirely ameliorate the punishment, and indeed the meadow seems to consist of those prayers that purportedly help provide absolution through penance. From one angle, this seems like a perfectly logical conflation: Purgatory itself, after all, is an extended form of penance. However, the idea that one only enters Purgatory after walking over a field of Catholic prayers is particularly anti-Catholic; notably, the road to heaven is not paved with Catholic prayers.

The anti-Catholicism takes on its sharpest edge in the story about the Painter of Doncaster. Tarlton’s ghost begins this tale by referring explicitly to the English Reformation: “I know you are not ignorant, how in king Edward the sixts days all popery and superstition was banished, and the light of the Gossip puld from under the Bushell
where it was covered, and to the sight and comfort of all set upon a hill” (1046-9). Then, says the ghost, Calvinist iconoclasm “cleansed” the English church “from the dregs of such an Antichrist” by pulling down shrines, rood-screens, altars, and images of saints (1051-2). The tale’s punch line relies on the religious changes between Edward and Mary’s reigns. When Mary issues a proclamation that churches should set up roods again, the people of Doncaster commission a local painter to create a new crucifix. However, since he had fallen out of practice during Edward’s reign, the rood he creates turns out to be so ugly that it makes children cry. In the end, the mayor of the town, who “favor[s] king Edwards religion as far as he durst,” tells the painter to turn the image of Christ into an image of the devil (1079-80). Then the vicar of Doncaster excommunicates the painter for having made such an ugly version of Christ, and as a result, the painter sits in Purgatory being beaten with a bell-rope (1098). In 1590, the execution of Mary Stuart was only three years past, and the possibility of yet another change of religion after Elizabeth’s death loomed on the horizon. Forty years later, in the wake of the religious controversy of the 1629 Parliament, this tale’s emphasis on the regime change from a Protestant monarch to a Catholic one might seem equally worrying to many Calvinists. England might not have converted back to Catholicism when the Stuarts took the throne, but Charles’s new intimacy with and reliance on Henrietta Maria seemed to threaten that possibility even before Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury and instituted sweeping and supposedly “papist” reforms in the Church of England.

Throughout Tarltons Newes out of Purgatory, the emphasis on commoners—including tailors, bakers, painters, and other representatives of the “middling sorts”—
links this text, like other “news from hell,” with a populist literary tradition dating back for centuries. Furthermore, the commoners often win out over the wealthier and more powerful. For example, a baker’s apprentice named Myles becomes, through his wittiness, Pope Boniface IV; then, because he later pretends not to know his former master, he must wear a miller’s cap in Purgatory (195-400). Just as Tarlton’s ghost associates Purgatory more with misrule and mockery than with punishment and spiritual purification, so moments throughout the 1630 edition of Tarltons Newes out of Purgatory reflect on contemporary events in a way that privileges the Calvinist commons—whose point of view the text accepts—over the members of the social elite who have joined the queen’s Catholic party at court. In this sense, the text’s anti-Catholic satire likewise challenges the power structures of Caroline England in a way that it would not have in 1590.

A year later, however, someone signing him- or herself A.B. resurrected a Catholic-leaning version of Sir Walter Ralegh in the preface to the 1631 Sir Walter Rawleigh his Ghost, a translation of Leonardus Lessius’s De providentia numinis, et animi immortalitate. This Catholic treatise on the existence and nature of God and the soul seems an unusual context in which to invoke Ralegh, given his previous ghostly incarnation as the champion of English Protestantism and his complicated religious reputation while alive. In fact, A.B. trades on the reader’s remembering the accusations of atheism leveled against Ralegh. The volume’s paratextual material opens with a letter,

98 The STC attributes this work to Matthew Wilson, but A.F. Allison and D.M. Rogers note that there is no evidence for this identification. See The Contemporary Printed Literature of the English Counter-Reformation between 1558 and 1640, 2 vols. (Aldershot: Scolar, 1989), 2.10 (entry 32).
“The Apparition to His Friend,” in which Ralegh’s ghost addresses an unnamed friend (presumably a fictionalized version of A.B.): “Thou well knowest, that the World [...] hath at sundry tymes, cast a foule, & most vniust aspersion vpon Me, for my presumed denial of a Deity. From which abhominable and horrid crime, I was euer most free.”

Indeed, claims the ghost of Ralegh, no man living knows better than his friend just how false those claims are. As proof, the ghost reminds his friend how Ralegh, while living, “was often accustomed highly to praise and esteeme the Booke of Lessius” (*2v).

Therefore, the ghost begs his friend to translate the book from Latin to English and to “let the Title beare [Ralegh’s] Name, that so the Readers, may acknowledge it, as done by my sollicitation” (*3r). Because of Ralegh’s status in the 1620s as a touchstone for puritan opposition to James’s pacifism and parliamentary opposition to Charles’s plans to finance a land war, A.B.’s decision to begin the text with a preface in Ralegh’s voice indicates that he is playing to a broader audience than Lessius’s text would ordinarily attract. Indeed, this choice suggests that A.B. intended the treatise as religious propaganda through which to secure the consideration and possibly even the conversion of readers who might be discontented with the Church of England.


100 On Ralegh’s posthumous role in the debates surrounding the 1628 and 1629 parliaments with the publication of The Prerogative of Parliaments, see Beer, Sir Walter Ralegh and His Readers in the Seventeenth Century, ch. 5; and Christopher Hill, Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution Revisited (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), ch. 4, esp. 134-8. Beer also points out the enormous popularity of Ralegh’s Instructions to his Son in the 1630s: eight editions from 1632-1636 (125). She suggests that “The popularity of the Instructions should be viewed as a further stage in the establishment of Ralegh as an authority figure, in negotiation with, but not necessarily in opposition to, the patriarchal authority of Charles I” (129). It is striking that A.B. invokes Ralegh in service of a Catholic text the year before the Instructions are published, which, as Beer notes, “indulge in minimal religiosity” (126); this suggests that Ralegh’s Protestantism waned after the parliaments of 1628 and 1629.
A.B., in fact, somewhat charmingly makes his own propagandistic strategies transparent in his preface to the reader. He actually seems to be playing to the atheist crowd, among others—to those who “liue as though there were neither God, Heanen [sic], Hell, or any Immortality of the soule” (*3v). He then confesses that he pretended that the reason behind his translation was the apparition of Ralegh’s ghost “because it is well knowne, that Syr Walter, was a man of great Naturall Parts, and yet was suspected of the most foule and execrable crime of Atheisme” (*4r). Hence the appeal of publishing Lessius’s text under Ralegh’s ghostly aegis: his reputation includes not only the resonances of Elizabethan empire-building and anti-Spanish Protestantism, but also the scandalous frisson of atheism.

Ralegh’s status as a multivalent signifier means that A.B. can appropriate him—and draw attention to his own appropriation. A.B. chooses Ralegh because he hopes that “the very Name of him (by way of this feigned Apparition, and the like answerable Title of the Translation) may beget in many an earnest desire of perusing this Booke; and so become the more profitable” (*4v). In 1626 the reputed atheist became a militant Protestant; in 1631 he becomes the voice of an explicitly Catholic text. A.B., in fact, draws attention to the text’s Catholicism by noting that it is “written by the most learned Iesuite Leonard Lessius” (*3v). By appropriating Ralegh’s name for the title, the translator subordinates its Catholicism to its Englishness. What matters is not a cardinal’s or the Pope’s endorsement of the treatise—since presumably neither of those would endear the text to the English reading public—but Ralegh’s. Significantly, this treatise concerns two broad topics on which both Protestants and Catholics could agree: that God
exists and that the soul is immortal. Although dogmatic details may still divide them, Wilson here accentuates what theological ground they share, however basic. Using Ralegh to grab readers’ attention might enable them to see that common ground. Given Henrietta Maria’s increasing influence with Charles and over many of his courtiers, this gesture toward an English Catholicism highlights the new power structures at court and provides an early glimpse of how English Catholics might reclaim Elizabethan heroes to capitalize on the chance for toleration as an important aspect of the common weal—a theme to which we return in Chapters 2 and 3.

The Elizabethan ghosts of the early 1630s thus connect in complex ways with English religious controversies. While previous Elizabethan ghosts were invoked in relation to parliamentary debates and usually voice Protestant views, Tarlton and Ralegh here embody anti-Catholic religious satire and moderate Catholic theology, respectively. In the first years of Charles’s personal rule and the first months of England’s years of peace between 1630 and 1637, these invocations of Elizabethan figures still address controversial issues that threaten the commonwealth. As I have been arguing, the Elizabethanism of Caroline England imbues historical figures with distinct political and religious meanings, and not always the same ones. Tarltons Newes out of Purgatory mocks Catholicism and presents fantasies of misrule in which the middling sorts tend to win out over the social elite. Rawleigh his Ghost, on the other hand, focuses on condemning atheism while embracing Catholic doctrines that Protestants can generally also agree with, thereby hoping to bridge the gaps between the two religious poles. 101 In

101 The title page of Rawleigh his Ghost advertises De providentia numinis as “written against Atheists.”
the highly fraught religious atmosphere of the 1630s, this was no small task. As we will see, the religious and political divides became insurmountable in the years that followed, and the complicated religious legacy of the Elizabethan ghost narratives of the 1630s would persist into the years immediately preceding the outbreak of civil war.

Ghosts and Revolution: 1641 and 1642

In April 1640, Charles convened the first parliament in eleven years. Then—dismayed that it picked up where the 1629 Parliament had left off—dissolved it only three weeks later. For two weeks after the “Short Parliament,” London erupted into chaos, a violent preview of the civil wars to come. Parliament’s dissolution coincided with traditional Maytide festive misrule, and apprentices and artisans in Lambeth marched in protest. As David Cressy suggests, this episode would prove an important development in English political culture, the first stirrings of the type of widespread civil unrest that within two years exploded into the English Civil Wars. Laud fled the city; troops were augmented; a rumor circulated that the army currently deployed against Scotland would be summoned back to the capital. When some of the protesters were imprisoned at the White Lion, their compatriots returned and broke them out. Kevin Sharpe calls the events of May 1640 “the most widespread and publicly reported acts of violence since the Wars of the Roses.” In the end, two of the escaped prisoners were
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tortured, and the drum-beating apprentice who led the protesters, a teenager named Thomas Bensted, was hanged and quartered at Laud’s insistence.

This episode quietened the violence in London, as Cressy writes, but rumors raged through the country, most of them centered on Laud’s imagined alliances with various groups of armed and dangerous Catholics. Although the Crown handled the Lambeth uprising relatively efficiently and restored order, “the events of May 1640 demonstrated that the political domain now encompassed the streets of the metropolis, suburban taverns, country churchyards, toll booths, and markets, where commoners took issue with the affairs of the kingdom.”

Furthermore, the public widening of the political sphere did not stop at the London city walls. English subjects from Cornwall to the Fens demonstrated loudly and sometimes violently that they demanded voices in the governance of the commonwealth. Indeed, as part of a desperate compromise with the Long Parliament of 1641, Charles’s favorites Laud and Wentworth, now earl of Strafford, were thrown into prison, and Strafford was beheaded. By the end of 1641, the most powerful members of the Privy Council and the episcopacy had fallen spectacularly into disgrace, exile, imprisonment, and death.

In this tumultuous environment, print culture exploded in a proliferation of texts that resonated with the volatile political atmosphere. Among the various libels, ballads, and broadsheets condemning or defending Charles and his favorites appeared two ghosts of the Elizabethan past: Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester, Queen Elizabeth’s greatest and
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most controversial favorite, and the sharp-tongued satirical writer Thomas Nashe. Although both texts connect explicitly with contemporary conflicts between Crown and Parliament, they resurrect the Elizabethan era in service of strikingly different goals: *Leicester’s Ghost* protests the power of court favorites, while *Tom Nash his Ghost* takes up rhetorical arms against religious dissenters in service of the Church of England. Together they epitomize the ways in which English subjects of all stripes—including both proto-royalists and proto-parliamentarians—deployed Elizabethanism as both literary trope and political strategy during the reign of Charles I. These Elizabethan ghosts embody the power of cultural memory to justify both sides of the debate over England’s political and religious identity—a debate which had not yet deteriorated into civil war, but soon would. In the vexed political atmosphere of 1641, the ghosts of Leicester and Nashe revive similar Elizabethan debates, appealing to the past in order to shape the future of the English nation.

Three texts were published in 1641 that resurrect the earl of Leicester: a second English edition of *Leicester’s Commonwealth*, the scurrilous libel that Elizabeth had had suppressed in 1584; a prose epitome of the *Commonwealth*, summarizing its essential details in relation to current events; and—most interestingly in this context—*Leicester’s Ghost*, a rhyme royal version of the events in the *Commonwealth*, written by Thomas Rogers at the beginning of James’s reign and narrated by the ghost of Leicester.107 Like
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107 *Leyecters common-wealth: conceived, spoken, and published with most earnest protestation of all dutifull good will and affection towards this realme; for whose good onely it is made common to many* ([s.l.: s.n.], 1641; Wing L969aA); *Leicester’s commonwealth fully epitomiz’d. Conceived, spoken, and published with most earnest protestation of all dutifull good will, and affection towards this realme, for whose good onely it is made common to many. Contracted in a most breife, exact, and compendious way with the full sense and whole meaning of the former booke, every fragment of sence being interposed. With
the 1641 editions of *Leicester’s Commonwealth*, *Leicester’s Ghost* appeared in both quarto and octavo formats, and frequently the *Ghost* and the *Commonwealth* were bound together. The most self-consciously literary of the *Leicester’s Commonwealth* publications, *Leicester’s Ghost* provides a more antagonistic view of the Elizabethan era than we see in previous Caroline pamphlets that revive Elizabethan ghosts, which range from transparently nostalgic to satiric to earnestly religious (and several combinations thereof). Indeed, the *Ghost’s* intense and conflicted focus on Leicester’s Machiavellian scheming locates a source of political corruption in Elizabeth’s court, as opposed to previous Caroline ghost narratives, which tend to invoke Elizabethan figures encomiastically, or at least affectionately (as we see in the Ralegh narratives, *Sir Francis Drake Revived*, and *Tarlton’s Newes out of Purgatory*). Instead, *Leicester’s Ghost*
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109 Thomas Rogers, *Leicester’s Ghost* ([London: n.p.], 1641), Wing R1937A. Thomas Rogers wrote the poem sometime between 1602 and 1604; an early manuscript names him as the author and includes the longest version of the text. Other manuscripts circulated between 1605 and 1641, and the poem was cut significantly for the 1641 edition. For a complete textual history, see Franklin B. Williams, Jr., ed., *Leicester’s Ghost* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), xvii-xxi.
emphasizes not only Leicester’s devotion to Elizabeth but also his ambition and
treachery. In this case, resurrecting Elizabeth’s greatest favorite becomes a strategy by
which to condemn Charles’s favorites.

Indeed, in a superb study on favoritism, Curtis Perry has provided a compelling
analysis of the 1641 edition of Leicester’s Commonwealth, although he does not
specifically consider the 1641 edition of Leicester’s Ghost. Perry argues that revivals of
Leicester in 1641 participate in a renewed debate over favoritism occasioned by the
imprisonment, trial, and execution of the earl of Strafford. As Perry points out,
Strafford may not have fit into the classic mold of the royal favorite—Charles sent him to
Ireland for much of the 1630s—but the dialogues surrounding his trial and execution
nevertheless deployed much the same rhetoric used against Buckingham, and the
Leicester narratives fit into that dialogue. Although the broad strokes of this argument
are convincing, the analysis of Leicester’s Ghost, in particular, accounts only for its
original Jacobean context and not for its Caroline revival.

The political implications of Leicester’s Ghost play out differently in 1641 than at
the beginning of James’s reign in large part due to the textual variations between the
manuscript and the 1641 print editions. The 1641 quarto and octavo excise long passages
that appear in the earlier manuscript. For example, while arguing that Rogers maintains a

110 Curtis Perry, “Leicester and his Ghosts,” in Literature and Favoritism in Early Modern England (New
York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 22-54. Terence Kilburn and Anthony Milton have pointed out
that Strafford’s death precipitated “a flood of popular anti-Strafford pamphlets”; see “The Public Context
of the Trial and Execution of Strafford,” The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford,
analyzes other representations of Leicester in 1641: Leicester’s Commonwealth and William Cavendish’s
play The Variety, in which Leicester serves as the symbol of Elizabethan nobility.

111 Perry, Literature and Favoritism, 39-40.
more moderate stance toward Leicester than that of the Commonwealth, Perry cites the epistle to the reader, which claims that “if [Leicester’s] heroicall vertues had not beene ouerwhelmed with insatiable ambition, he might haue beene worthely reputed one of the most excellent Courtiers in the World”—but this epistle to the reader does not appear in 1641. Instead, Leicester’s Ghost is frequently (although not always) appended to Leicester’s Commonwealth, the very libel that, according to the epistle, “too bitterly publishe[d] [Leicester’s life] in prose.”

112 Thus, the readers who came to the Ghost from the Commonwealth in 1641 would experience a very different introduction to the poem than those who had seen Rogers’s epistle.

In this sense, the 1641 editions of Leicester’s Ghost highlight the legend of the corrupt, Machiavellian Leicester who murdered people whom he saw as obstacles (as in Leicester’s Commonwealth).

113 The Ghost is willing to do anything to achieve his own ends, and he brags about his use of religion for political benefit:

Of sound Religion I did make a showe,
And by pretence of hott and fervent Zeale
In welth and faction I more stronge did growe,
For by this practize I did playnly know,
That men are apt to yeald to any motion
Made by a man that is of pure devotion. (149-54)

112 Rogers, Leicester’s Ghost, l. 3. Cited parenthetically hereafter by line number.

113 Perry, Literature and Favoritism, 44.
Such a blatant confession of religious hypocrisy does not seem calculated to endear the Ghost to any early modern audience. Similarly, in the next stanza, the Ghost says that he “favourd Papists” when it seemed profitable, and “soe indeed / Some held me for a Newter, and I graunt, / To serue my tourne, I could turne Puritant” (157-9). The term “neuter” provides a particularly striking image of Leicester as religious eunuch, sacrificing his own manhood (associated here with firmness of principle) for political gain.

Rogers takes up the theme of Leicester’s emasculation later in the poem, when the ghost confesses that in addition to other magical practices, he also remedied his impotence by sorcerous means: “I vsd strange drinks and Oyntments of good prise, / Whose tast or touch might make dead flesh to rise” (524-5). Relying on magic, playing religious beliefs for political gain, defending his own ambition: none of this behavior suggests that the ghost nostalgically evokes the “heroic, Essex-like representative of lost Elizabethan greatness.”Furthermore, when the ghost finally does talk about his role at Tilbury, his account hardly links him with Elizabethan victory:

For when the Campe at Tilburie did lie,
Some shrewdly did suspect that I was bent
To ayd the Spanish hoast, if happily,
They had arriud on th’ English continent,
I lovd them not, though as an Instrument
I might haue vsd them to bringe forces in,

\[114\] Perry, *Literature and Favoritism*, 46.
That to my selfe great honor I might winne. (1604-10)

Leicester does not defend any of these actions by suggesting that he does them in service of the queen, but throughout the poem highlights his own ambition, so overweening that he would even find a way to profit from Spanish invasion. The Ghost tries to rationalize his hypocrisy: “Was I the only man that haue offended / In making holynes a cloake for sinne?” (169-70) The emphasis here rests on Leicester’s personal duplicity, not on his loyalty to Elizabeth. In this sense, Rogers’s treatment of Leicester parallels earlier claims about Gondomar’s ruthless ambition in Sir Walter Rawleigh his Ghost. Moreover, Leicester’s emphasis on his own hypocrisy casts doubts on the genuineness of his claims of devotion to the queen. Because of the Ghost’s strangely boastful confessions, the rest of his catalogue of (relative) virtues and good deeds also seems potentially untrustworthy.

In addition to eliminating the recuperative prefatory epistle, the 1641 edition also excises long passages tracing Leicester’s historical precedents, both familial and royal.115 Despite a few remaining comparisons between Leicester and historical favorites (including both Mortimer and Gaveston), this version of the Ghost portrays Leicester as the paradigmatic manipulative royal favorite, rather than the latest instantiation of a historical type dating back to the Middle Ages. Distancing Leicester from his other historical forbears casts the problem of the ambitious favorite as a peculiarly recent one, implying that the modern variety of court favorite was born at the Elizabethan court. In contrast with the ghost narratives of the 1620s, the Elizabethan era appears in the 1641 editions of Leicester’s Ghost not as an idyllic age of glorious English valor, but rather as

115 Several other passages directed explicitly to James were also excised.
a period of Machiavellian scheming, characterized by Leicester’s political machinations.

The ghost’s shocking confessions paint an ugly portrait of intrigue and murder at the Elizabethan court. Although the narrative never implicates Elizabeth herself in Leicester’s corruption (in fact, several times it praises her), it still casts her as an unknowing pawn in Leicester’s power plays. Rogers, of course, is caught in the same trap that snares so many writers depicting relationships between monarchs and their unpopular favorites. Unwilling to represent Elizabeth consciously relying on an advisor as corrupt as Leicester, Rogers instead implies that she was too naïve to recognize Leicester’s manipulations. Although *Leicester’s Ghost* aligns with negative parliamentary views of court favorites, it does not present the Elizabethan era as a positive model. Instead, it suggests that Leicester foreshadows the troublesome power that courtiers like Buckingham, Laud, and Strafford held over Charles and the commonwealth—at least in the popular imagination, as Perry argues, if not in reality.

While *Leicester’s Ghost* invokes the scurrilous specter of the Elizabethan earl of Leicester to protest against the corrupting influence of court favorites on the commonwealth, a similarly complicated ghost pamphlet, 1642’s *Tom Nash his Ghost*, appeals to the Elizabethan Martin Marprelate controversy in a way that allies the writer with Charles I and the Church of England against “the Anabaptist, the Libertine [i.e., religious free thinker], and the Brownist.”

---

116 Anonymous, *Tom NASH his Ghost. To the three scurvy Fellowes of the upstart Family of the Snuffers, Rufflers and Shufflers; the thrice Treble-troublesome Scuffers in the Church and State, the onely Lay Ecclesi-ass, I call GENERALLISSIMOS. Being like Jobs 3. Comforters, or the Churches 3. Anti-Disciples, the Clergies 3. Persecuters, the States 3. Hors-leeches, the Divels 3. Chaplaines; namely, the Anabaptist, the Libertine, and the Brownist. Written by Thomas Nash his Ghost, with Pap with a Hatchet, a little
years old indicates the extent of Martin Marprelate’s fame. In the fall of 1588, just after
the defeat of the Spanish Armada, the puritan antiprelatical tracts associated with the
name Martin Marprelate ignited a pamphlet war between Church of England Protestants
and puritans. Characterized by a scathing satire of the prelacy, the Martinist pamphlets
enjoyed considerable success over the first staid Church of England responses. As a
result, the Elizabethan government brought in popular pamphleteers to write rejoinders to
the Martinist accusations. John Lyly, Anthony Munday, and Thomas Nashe were all
conscripted to write for the anti-Martinist side. Thomas Nashe, in particular, cut his
satirical eyeteeth during the Marprelate controversy, apparently writing the anti-Martinist
An Almond for a Parrot and kicking off a decade-long pamphlet war with the puritan
Gabriel Harvey. His association with Elizabethan pamphlet wars, whether specifically the
Marpulate controversy or his feud with Harvey, seems to have persisted until the
publication of Tom Nash his Ghost fifty years later.

revived since the 30. Yeare of the late Qu. Elizabeths Reigne, when Martin Mar-prelate was as mad as any
of his Tub-men are now (London: n.p,1642; Wing T1784), A2r. Cited parenthetically hereafter.

117 For more information on the Martin Marprelate controversy, see William Pierce, An Historical
Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts (London: Archibald Constable, 1908); William Pierce, ed., The
Marpilate Tracts, 1588, 1589 (London: James Clarke, 1911); Ronald B. McKerrow, “The Marprelate
Raymond A. Anselment, “Betwixt Jest and Earnest”: Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift and the Decorum
of Religious Ridicule (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979); Leland H. Carlson, Martin Marprelate,
Gentleman: Master Job Throkmorton Laid Open in His Colors (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library,
1981); Joseph Black, “The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89), Anti-Martinism,
Joad Raymond, Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain, 27-52.

118 Throughout this section, the spelling “Nashe” refers to the historical Thomas Nashe, while “Nash” refers
to the ghost in the pamphlet.
The title page of *Tom Nash his Ghost* claims that the pamphlet was printed in York first, suggesting that even in the provinces, the memory of Martin Marprelate persisted enough that a current anti-puritan pamphlet could be advertised on the strength of it. Although one scholar claims that “the memory of Martin played a minor role” in the renewed antiprelatical debates of the seventeenth century, it is a tribute to the power of the Martin Marprelate phenomenon that the controversy still carried enough cultural currency to be resurrected at all.\textsuperscript{119} Part of the contemporary relevance of *Tom Nash his Ghost* must have derived from the flowering of Elizabethan ghost narratives at particularly vexed moments throughout Charles’s reign. As ghosts provided imaginary and malleable historical voices around which to organize polemical publications, *Tom Nash his Ghost* resurrects not only Thomas Nashe but also the fictional Martin Marprelate. At stake for the anonymous author are the very structure and theology of the Church of England, the revolutionary and treasonous import of antiprelatical critiques, and the role of the public press in disseminating religious and political debates.

Indeed, the author’s byline on the title page highlights the connections between current events and the Marprelate controversy: “Written by Thomas Nash his Ghost, with *Pap with a Hatchet*, a little revived since the 30. Yeare of the late Qu. Elizabeths Reigne, when *Martin Mar-Prelate* was as mad as any of his *Tub-Men* are now.” It is unclear whether the title is attributing the anti-Martinist *Pap with a Hatchet* to Nashe, or whether *Pap with a Hatchet* is meant to stand metonymically for John Lyly, who wrote it. In any case, the ghost’s politics clearly align Charles I and the Stuart Church of England against

\textsuperscript{119} Stephen Hilliard, *Nashe’s Singularity* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), 37.
the “tub-men”—i.e., dissenting preachers—who follow in Martin Marprelate’s footsteps. The title page also includes other digs against presbyterian preachers as participants in the types of con-artist occupations familiar from cony-catching pamphlets: they are “snuffers” ("one who speaks cantingly,” says the OED, citing this pamphlet as the first use); “rufflers” (a con artist who pretends to be a maimed soldier; alternately, “one who makes much stir or display; a proud swaggering or arrogant fellow”); and “shufflers” ("a drinker,” for which the OED again cites this pamphlet, albeit with little similar evidence; alternately, “a slippery, shifty person”). Like cony-catchers, presbyterians represent the breakdown of social order. By positioning the pamphlet against “the Anabaptist, the Libertine, and the Brownist,” the writer rhetorically matches Charles’s own practice of “describ[ing] his opponents as consisting mainly of “Brownists, Anabaptists, and Atheists.” Furthermore, the title page accuses them of being “thrice Treble-troublesome Scufflers in the Church and State” and “generalissimos,” thereby associating them with militant revolutionary sentiments. From the title page, then, Tom Nash his Ghost categorizes those on the fringes of protestant beliefs as agents of disruption. They embody not only the cony-catchers’ deceptive and socially threatening practices, but also political turmoil and strife.

The pamphlet’s accusations against presbyterians, the prefatory poem suggests, find voice in the rhetorical free space enabled by the narrator’s purported ghostly


existence. This pamphlet provides the most straightforward explanation for the popularity of ghost narratives: “I am a Ghost,” it begins, “and Ghosts doe feare no Lawes; / Nor doe they care for popular Applause” (A1v). Inverting the trope of the approval-seeking preface to the reader, the poem argues that Nash’s ghostliness absolves him not only from subjection to the law, but also from menial earthly desires. The narrator, therefore, supposedly has nothing material at stake. Without a body, he fears neither imprisonment nor punishment; nor does he need to turn a profit on published work. Instead, he is motivated purely by his devotion to England, as the historical Nashe modeled during the Marprelate controversy:

The thirtieth yeare of blest Eliza’s Reigne

I had a yerking, firking, jerking veine;

In those days, we had desperate madmen here,

Who did the Queene, State, Church and Kingdome jeere.

And now a Crew are up as wise as those

Who doe all Rule and Goverment oppose.

In these days I did bring those men in frame;

And now my Ghost is come to doe the same. (A1v)

If the presbyterians represent anarchic opposition to “all rule and government,” Nash’s ghost represents religious and political conformity as well as continuity between the Elizabethan and Caroline governments. Nash’s “yerking, firking, jerking veine” lashed out against the Elizabethan Martinists, and the ghost credits his invective with the eventual triumph of the Church and State over the Martinist agents of chaos. This focus
on the rebellious madness of the antiprelatical position borrows from the Elizabethan anti-Martinists and sets the tone for the rest of the pamphlet.

Throughout the poem the ghost uses metaphors of containment to describe his goals: containment of the Martinists themselves, as above (“I did bring those men in frame”), and containment of their ideas, which are likened to a disease. According to the ghost, the Elizabethan anti-Martinist containment efforts did not succeed. Instead, the ghost says, their “fond opinions,” having been disseminated all over the kingdom, “(like Impostumes) not well cur’d at first, / Corrupted ever since, doth now out-burst” (A1v). This charming image of puritan antiprelaticalism as the pus in a festering and now burst boil aligns nonconformist religion with disease. And not just any disease: given the prevalence and fear of plague, comparison with contagious boils must have evoked the plague’s characteristic buboes. However, against the contagious corruption of presbyterian ideals, the ghost will “undertake / Once more to try a perfect Cure to make” (A1v). As an “invisible” ghost, he can “cut through th’ Ayre, and in the Earth can ferrit,” hiding himself in an “Augure hole” to “heare their knaveries and spie unspide” (A1v).

Indeed, Nash’s ghost seems positively Foucauldian in his emphasis on containing subversive ideas and publicizing the paranoia-inducing possibilities of invisible surveillance. By containing presbyterianism and curing the antiprelatical disease, the

---

123 Indeed, there was an outbreak of plague in 1641—in fact, this outbreak seems to have occasioned an early modern attempt at biological terrorism (or at least the urban legend of one) in which someone, disgustedly, wrapped up a plaster of a plague sore and sent it to John Pym, leader of the opposition in the Long Parliament, apparently hoping that he and the rest of Parliament would contract the plague as a result. This amazing and grotesque plot is detailed in the pamphlet A damnable treason, by a contagious plaster of a plague-sore: wrapt up in a letter, and sent to Mr. Pym: wherein is discovered a divellish, and unchristian plot against the High Court of Parliament, October 25. 1641 ([London]: Printed for W.B., 1641; Wing D157).
ghost hopes to make the new Martinists “conform” (A1v). Nash’s ghost stands on the side of religious conformity against the dangerous schismatics that would overthrow the church hierarchy (and, by implication, the state hierarchy as well). As a participant in a previous religious imbroglio, Nash models how English subjects can play important roles in maintaining the commonwealth.

Thus, *Tom Nash his Ghost* evokes the Elizabethan era in defense of Charles and the Church of England. The “Martinists,” the ghost declares, claim that because “Bishops have beene erronious, negligent[,] proud, contentious, covetous, uncharitable, ambitious, &c,” the whole church structure must be overthrown (A2v). The ghost concedes that these accusations are true, but he then compares the presbyterian desire to get rid of prelates altogether with having “no easier cure for the Tooth-ach, but by knocking out your braines” (A3r). He pleads for conformity and the taming of the civil unrest that has been building since the Lambeth riot of 1640:

[T]here is no doubt but if the State were settled, (which by your Sectaries have too much disturb’d) there are (under God) Parliamentall Chyrurgions, and Physitians that with his Royall Maiesties most humble, hearty, loyal and all desired assistance and protection, would soone recover this almost gangrean’d Church and Common-weale to its former health, and most renowned reputation and dignitie. (A3r)

The ghost picks up on the disease metaphor of the prefatory poem, but he suggests that conformity and compromise between Parliament and the Crown would heal England of the corruption that has taken over both state and church. In this way, the pamphlet’s
author demonstrates a proto-royalism that remains not only compatible with but dependent on harmonious relationships between Crown and Parliament, a model for compromise associated with Elizabethan politics. In this way, he suggests, the commonwealth can be restored “to its former health.” Instead of fighting, the ghost asks “these shuttle-heads that desire to rake in the embers of Rebellion, to give over blowing the Coales too much, lest the sparkes flee in their faces, or the ashes choake them” (A3r).

Likewise, he castigates puritan preachers for breaking their oaths of conformity by inveighing against the Book of Common Prayer as “popish.” Tracing its history back to its creation under the reign of Edward VI, its suppression under Mary I, and its unimpeached Protestantism through the reigns of Elizabeth and James, the ghost argues that the Book of Common Prayer serves an integral role in the Protestant orthodoxy of the Church of England. During Elizabeth’s reign, Thomas Nashe and others defended this orthodoxy, and now that rebellion threatens to “swallow Churches and devoure Authority,” Nash’s ghost must speak up in defense of a fruitful compromise between Crown and Parliament (A4v). By casting presbyterians as the radical edge of an understandable and necessary movement to reform both church and state via parliamentary means, *Tom Nash his Ghost* draws on Elizabethan moderate Protestantism to model the continued viability of the Church of England even in the face of outright civil war.

Given the generally hawkish and parliamentarian politics of the ghost pamphlets of the 1620s, one might expect the ghost pamphlets of 1641 and 1642 also to glorify the militarism and parliamentarianism of the Elizabethan era. However, what we find instead
are *Leicester’s Ghost* and *Tom Nash his Ghost*, neither of which lauds militarism. *Leicester’s Ghost* does not even present a flattering image of the Elizabethan era, but rather depicts a Machiavellian courtier who commits all manner of evil to achieve preferment at court. Yet even while the topic of the ambitious favorite would align the text with puritan opposition to the Crown, by basing it on the Catholic libel *Leicester’s Commonwealth* Rogers associates the figure of Leicester (who was known for his leadership of the puritan faction at Elizabeth’s court) with a hypocritical and chameleon-like religiosity, changing colors to match his ambitions. In effect, this strategy critiques favoritism without critiquing personal rule or Arminianism. Similarly, *Tom Nash his Ghost* links conformity to the Caroline Church of England with conformity to the Elizabethan Church of England. *Tom Nash his Ghost* promotes compromise between Crown and Commons, but the pamphlet certainly leans more toward the Crown’s policies than Parliament’s demands.  

Overall, these famous Elizabethans, invoked on the cusp of civil war, deploy the rhetoric of compromise to advance their own political position, which the other side viewed as either rebellious or a popish plot.

**Conclusion**

The Elizabethan ghost narratives published between 1624 and 1642 run the gamut of political and religious affiliations, from the parliamentarianism of *Vox Coeli* to the proto-royalism of *Tom Nash his Ghost*, from the Catholic propaganda of *Rawleigh his

---

124 Because of the incompleteness of records from this period, it is impossible to date the pamphlet. However, the title page reads 1642 (Old Style), and by the time the English observed New Year’s in March 1642, tensions had risen so high that Charles had already relocated to York and Henrietta Maria had already fled to the Hague. See Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (London: Pearson, 2005), 332-7.
Ghost to the anti-Catholic satire of Tarltons Newes out of Purgatory. They include first editions and reprints; they invoke commoners, privateers, and courtiers; they range from palace halls to London alleys. At first glance, it is tempting to claim that Elizabethan ghosts appear in such wide variety because they provide a simple and widely legible shorthand for one particular set of political positions: militant, Protestant, anti-Stuart. However, their multivalent uses—and the decidedly disparate representations of Ralegh, in particular—believe that assumption. Instead, each of the ghost narratives focuses in its own way on negotiating the roles and responsibilities of individual subjects in the commonwealth, whether that means contributing to a maritime-only policy in the 1620s or espousing political compromise to reinforce religious conformity in 1642.

This commonality raises a further question: why use Elizabethan figures and not Jacobean, Edwardian, Henrician, or medieval ones? Until 1641, all the ghost narratives of Caroline England that I have found resurrect Elizabethan figures. Only in the explosion of print that coincided with the Long Parliament do we see an expansion in the types of ghosts that appear. In 1641, for example, several more ghost narratives are published, including the ghosts of Machiavelli and Thomas Bensted (the apprentice so recently executed for his role in the Lambeth uprising); 1642 brings the ghosts of King James and Jack Straw, among others. However, the sole focus on Elizabethan figures from 1624

---

125 Anonymous, [i.e., Thomas Heywood, according to the ESTC], Machiavels ghost. As he lately appeared to his deare sons, the moderne projectors. Divulged for the pretended good of the kingdomes of England, Scotland, and Ireland (London: printed by J.O. for Francis Constable, 1641; Wing H1788); Anonymous, Canterburies amazement: or The ghost of the yong fellow Thomas Bensted, who was drawne, hangd, and quartered by the meanes of the Bishop of Canterburie; who appeared to him in the Tower, since the Iesuites execution. With a discourse between the two heads on London Bridge, the one being Thomas Bensteeds, the other the late Iesuites (London: F. Coules, 1641; Wing C456); Anonymous, Strange apparitions, or The ghost of King Iames, with a late conference between the ghost of that good king, the
to 1641 cannot result merely from the limiting effects of the licensing system because several were unlicensed, notably Reynolds’s *Vox Coeli*, Scott’s *Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost* and *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost*, and the Lessius translation *Rawleigh his Ghost*. Of these, only *Vox Coeli* represents non-Elizabethan figures at all, and even in it, Elizabeth plays the starring role. The apparently overwhelming preference for Elizabethan ghosts indicates that the Elizabethan era carried a unique fascination and rhetorical power, while the repeated choice to focus on Elizabeth’s subjects reflects a persistent interest in accessing some particularly populist aspect of the period. I do not mean that evocations of the Elizabethans indicated submerged revolutionary sentiments—merely that the frequent impetus of the ghost narratives to sponsor parliamentary compromise and religious conformity suggests a nuanced interest in active subjects in the English commonwealth. Thus, although these ghost narratives do not champion ideological populism (such as that later espoused by the Levellers), they do manifest an overall view that Elizabeth’s reign was characterized by the importance of individual subjects, including favorites at court (Leicester and Ralegh), military heroes (Drake), and cultural figures (Nashe and Tarlton).

Not only the content but also the format of these books implies engagement with a large number and variety of readers: most of the ghost narratives would be among the

---

*Marquessse Hameltons, and George Eglishams, Doctor of Physick, unto which appeared the ghost of the late Duke of Buckingham concerning the death and poysoning of King James and the rest* (London: J. Aston, 1642; Wing S5880); Anonymous, *The iust reward of rebels, or The life and death of Jack Straw, and Wat Tyler, who for their rebellion and disobedience to ther king and country, were suddenly slaine, and all their tumultuous rout coverome and put to flight. Whereunto is added the ghost of Jack Straw, as he lately appeared to the rebells in Ireland, wishing them to forbeare and repent of their divellish and inhumane actions against their lawfull King and country* (London: F. Couls, I. Wright, T. Banks, and T. Bates, 1642; Wing J1241).
cheaper books produced in the book trade. Of the ten that I examine, only three are longer than nine sheets, the median length of the books in Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser’s three-year statistical sample.\(^\text{126}\) The two Elizabethan re-publications, *Tarltons Newe out of Purgatory* and *Greenes Ghost Havnting Cony-Catchers*, are seven sheets each; the rest are shorter than that. *Tom Nash his Ghost* consists of only one sheet. Despite the conspicuous outlier *Rawleigh His Ghost*, the theological treatise that extends to thirty sheets, most of these books are small and affordable. However, although the books are cheap, they do not tend to be republished. *Greenes Ghost* and *Tarltons Newe out of Purgatory* are already second editions, but the only ghost narratives that we know ran to a second Caroline edition are *Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost* (1624, 1642) and *Sir Francis Drake Revived* (1626, 1628). The relative shortness of Elizabethan ghost narratives, along with their tendency not to be reprinted, suggests an ephemeral existence in the marketplace. Like other cheap print genres, their general briefness and timeliness seem calculated to appeal to a broad range of readers.

Overall, however, the most important aspect of Caroline ghost narratives is their diversity. The fame of the Cult of the Virgin Queen and the glorified Jacobean representations of Elizabeth in texts such as *The Whore of Babylon* and *1 & 2 If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* make it all too easy to assume that invocations of the Elizabethan era always equate with a militantly Protestant nostalgia for Gloriana herself. However, this study shows that beginning with the increased Anglo-Spanish tensions of

\(^{126}\) See Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser, “The Popularity of Playbooks Revisited,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56.1 (Spring 2005): 1-32, 25, which identifies the median length as 10.5 sheets. Since then, Farmer and Lesser have revised the figure down to 9 sheets (Alan Farmer, personal correspondence, 31 July 2009). The three longer-than-median books are *Vox Coeli* (13.5 sheets), *Sir Francis Drake Revived* (13 sheets in 1626 and 11 in 1628), and *Rawleigh his Ghost* (by far the most expensive at 30 sheets).
1624, the invocations of the Elizabethan age became much more diffuse, deploying a
wide range of political and cultural figures in service of Protestantism, Catholicism,
proto-parliamentarianism, proto-royalism, and many positions in between. The
Elizabethans carried a certain cultural currency, to be sure, but that currency—the power
and importance of subjects in the commonwealth—could be and was used to purchase
legitimacy on a number of different social, political, and religious axes, all in the name of
the common weal. As Caroline ghost narratives indicate, the Elizabethan era quickly
became a primary locus to which English subjects returned in order to sanction their
particular views of English nationhood—a rhetorical move that would influence and
characterize the development of English nationalism for centuries to come.
Ghost narratives formed only one type of Elizabethanist resurrection in Caroline England. The London book trade of the 1630s also saw a print revival of Elizabethan plays, including a collection by John Lyly (whose *Sixe Court Comedies* explicitly detailed their Elizabethan provenance on the title page) and Shakespeare's Second Folio, both in 1632. However, the 1630s also produced new plays that focus on Elizabeth figures. Conventional wisdom tells us that in the seventeenth century, the parsimonious old queen of the 1590s faded into obscurity. In her place a glittering icon appeared: “Queen Elizabeth of blessed memory,” a magical construct made of nostalgia, patriotism, and militant Protestantism.\(^1\) Roy Strong provides a typical account: interest in Elizabeth

---

rose in the 1620s, when she “became a golden age ruler and the posthumous heroine of the Protestant cause.” Of course, scholars have also complicated this narrative, most notably John Watkins in *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England*. However, even Watkins suggests that English subjects did not begin turning to Elizabeth to defend Charles until the Civil Wars. Thus, according to the typical scholarly narrative, the quasi-mythical figure of Good Queen Bess rose phoenix-like from the ashes of her last troubled years on the throne, looming over her Stuart successors to remind them of their failure to live up to a glorious English past that never quite existed. This is the Elizabeth of the ghost narrative *Vox Coeli* and the early Jacobean nostalgia plays *The Whore of Babylon* and *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*. Yet it is not necessarily the Elizabeth of Caroline playbooks—especially since the standard narrative assumes that Elizabeth only ever signified one particular kind of political and religious agenda: militant, anti-Spanish, rabidly Protestant. In fact, dramatic figures of Elizabeth in the 1630s carried multiple and shifting valences, not all of them flattering.

This chapter analyzes four Caroline plays that all feature an Elizabeth-figure and that appeared in print for the first time during the years of peace between the treaties with France and Spain in 1629 and 1630 (respectively) and the Scottish prayer-book riots of 1637. Three of the plays include characters that clearly invoke Elizabeth: Bess Bridges in Heywood’s two-part *The Fair Maid of the West* (1631) and Pulcheria in Philip

---


3 See Watkins, esp. ch. 4. He does argue that Charles invoked Elizabeth in the 1630s in two particular instances—to clarify common law jurisdictions and to support Laudian ecclesiastical reforms—but does not examine literary texts of the same period that follow Charles’s lead, instead focusing on the “Tacitean narratives” of the Elizabethan era that William Camden, Robert Naunton, and Fulke Greville wrote.
Massinger’s *The Emperour of the East* (1632). The third play, William Sampson’s *The Vow Breaker* (1636), concludes by showing us a young Elizabeth at the 1560 siege of Leith. Even though these plays depict figures of Elizabeth, I argue, they represent not “simple” nostalgia but rather distinctly different and nuanced revisions of Elizabeth as a way of negotiating questions of both good governance and what it means to be English. Indeed, even the representations themselves complicate memories of the Virgin Queen: Sampson’s Elizabeth only appears onstage at the very end of the play, and both Heywood’s Bess Bridges and Massinger’s Pulcheria exhibit traits that simultaneously identify them with Elizabeth and distance them from her.

Still, the plays all revise a dramatic tradition of Elizabethan nostalgia that began in the early years of James’s reign with patriotic drama such as Heywood’s two-part play *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* (1605-06) and Thomas Dekker’s *The Whore of Babylon* (1607). The *Whore of Babylon* allegorizes Elizabeth as Titania, the Faerie Queen, and details her triumphs over Catholic and Spanish threats; *If You Know Not Me* similarly stages the providential preservation of Elizabeth against the Catholic threats of Mary I (in Part 1) and the Spanish Armada (in Part 2). Heywood’s play proved extremely popular; frequently reprinted after the 1605 first edition, it also seems to have been revived in performance in the early 1630s. The popularity and prominence that *If You

---

4 The two parts of *If You Know Not Me* were printed separately. Part 1, which portrays a hagiographic version of Elizabeth’s “troubles” during the reign of Mary I, was printed in 1605, 1606, 1608 (in which it was issued twice, by two different publishers), 1610, 1613, 1623, 1632, and 1639; Part 2, which focuses on Sir Thomas Gresham and the founding of the Royal Exchange but also stages Elizabeth and her counselors responding to the Spanish Armada, was printed in 1606, 1609, 1623, and 1633.

5 The revisions of Part 2 in the 1633 edition, which extend the Armada scene, indicate that the play was reworked for performance; for an analysis of these revisions, see Alan Farmer, “‘Made like the times"
Know Not Me sustained throughout the reigns of both James and Charles laid the groundwork for the plays I focus on here, reinforcing the commonplace notion that Elizabeth remained a popular figure throughout the decades after her death. However, these plays also indicate that her reputation remained controversial and reflected English struggles to reconcile past and present during the political and religious changes of Charles I’s personal rule, especially since those struggles came to define the ways in which English nationalism would develop over the next several hundred years. The very mythmaking moves that Krishan Kumar identifies as a fallacy of retrospective Victorian nationalism actually become a theme in these plays; The Fair Maid of the West and The Vow Breaker, especially, emphasize the increasing power of the “horizontal ties of nationhood.”

The Emperour of the East focuses on the correct performance of kingship, but the emphasis on the monarch as emperor fits in with Liah Greenfeld’s argument that the rising use of the term “empire” in the period indicates that the nation was becoming as powerful a category of identity as religion.

This chapter argues that the plays featuring Elizabeth-figures that were printed in the 1630s hearken back to the Virgin Queen in order to explore concepts of Englishness.


6 For a more detailed account of the development of nationalism in early modern England, see the Introduction above, 18-20.


Considered together, these plays construct a form of nationhood invested in a more comprehensive identity as English than mere identification with Elizabeth as an ideal monarch. This form of Englishness, as we see in each play, balances between the glorified memories of a militant Elizabethan past and current irenic foreign policy, between regional and national loyalties, between identification with the monarch and with the country. In other words, these plays recall Elizabeth as neither radical critique nor sycophantic support, but rather to negotiate a moderate path through the unique challenges of the early to mid-1630s, demonstrating the nuance of even seemingly simplistic Caroline drama.

**Heywood’s “English Bess” at the Caroline Court**

Thomas Heywood produced some of the most memorable seventeenth-century versions of Elizabeth. John Watkins notes that “[n]o other seventeenth-century writer devoted so many individual works to the Queen of famous memory, and only Camden played as large a role in shaping her posthumous reputation.”9 Although he only discusses direct representations of the queen in *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, Watkins’s argument can also be applied to Heywood’s *Gunaikeion, or Nine Books of Various History Concerning Women* (1624), *Englands Elizabeth* (1631), *The Life and Death of Queen Elizabeth* (1639), and *The Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine the Most Worthy Women of the World* (1640). According to Watkins, Heywood was unique among his contemporaries in both the frequency and the “unqualified enthusiasm”

---

of his Elizabethanism, which recast the queen as a powerful advocate for her subjects. Both parts of If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, for example, emphasize the dynamism and power of the mercantile class and downplay Elizabeth’s absolutist tendencies. The plays project “an oppositional fantasy of Elizabeth as simultaneously all-powerful and all-yielding, a virago in her dealings with Spain and a dependent princess in her dealings with her own countrymen”\(^\text{11}\) — but, intriguingly, The Fair Maid of the West reverses this fantasy by depicting its Elizabeth-figure as a virago in her dealings with her countrymen in Part 1 and a dependent princess in her dealings with Morocco and Florence in Part 2.\(^\text{12}\) The Fair Maid of the West offers an intriguing exception to this pattern. If most of Heywood’s Elizabethanist works focus on the queen as ideal monarch, The Fair Maid of the West conflates Elizabeth with her subjects to highlight the power of Elizabethanism to reconcile changing forms of Englishness with memories of the golden past.

The Fair Maid of the West has enjoyed a small influx of critical attention since the early 1990s, largely due to the swashbuckling, gender-bending excitement of Part 1, in which Bess Bridges cross-dresses, successfully manages a tavern, and becomes a famous pirate. Scholars who discuss the play usually focus on its two most outstanding characteristics: Bess herself and/or the depictions of the Moroccan king Mullisheg and his court. In both parts of the play, characters frequently compare Bess with the queen

\(^{10}\) Ibid.

\(^{11}\) Watkins, Representing Elizabeth, 55.

\(^{12}\) Kathleen McLuskie also refers to the Bess of Part 1 as a “virago”; see Dekker and Heywood: Professional Dramatists (New York: St. Martin’s, 1993), 139.
whose name she shares, but, as Jean Howard has noted, she is not a queen but a tavern-running, ship-sailing tanner’s daughter, powerful in Part 1 but perpetually needing to be rescued in Part 2. Indeed, many critics ignore the tamer Part 2 altogether in favor of the more politically interesting discourses of gender, race, and religion that characterize Part 1. In these contexts, critics note that although Part 1 of *The Fair Maid of the West* seems to have been written sometime between 1597 and 1603, the play was not published until after the 1630/1 performances at Hampton Court and the Cockpit. Those critics who do examine Part 2 usually point out that it evinces a vastly different tone from Part 1. Charles Crupi, Claire Jowitt, and Kathleen McLuskie have constructed persuasive arguments about the way Part 2 tames Bess and restores patriarchal authority by echoing Fletcherian tragicomedy. However, they leave one important question unanswered.

There is no record that *The Fair Maid of the West* was published or performed before

---


1630; unlike *If You Know Not Me*, it seems not to have been particularly popular either on stage or in print. So what prompted Queen Henrietta Maria’s Men to stage *The Fair Maid of the West* in 1630 at all?

To answer this question, we need to read *The Fair Maid of the West* in the context of the wide-ranging Elizabethanism that, as this dissertation argues, played such an important role in Caroline England. As Chapter 1 shows, the mid-to-late 1620s had already seen the resurrection of several Elizabethan figures, including Sir Francis Drake and Sir Walter Ralegh. By the time *The Fair Maid of the West* was published in 1631, writers and publishers were routinely reviving the cultural memories of the Elizabethan age, and appeals to the Elizabethans represented a recognized strategy by which English subjects could sanction or condemn various religious and political positions. In this context, *The Fair Maid of the West*’s explicitly Elizabeth-like heroine and its clearly Elizabethan setting at the time of the Islands Voyage of 1597 place it alongside other representations of Elizabethan figures to engage with questions of English nationhood. Part 2 then revises the version of Englishness that the first part creates, moving from a model of nationhood based on both regional identity and difference from Spain and Morocco to model a form of national identity based on internal and particularly *English* virtues.

Part 1 opens in Plymouth with discussion of the Islands Voyage of 1597, that ill-fated raid on the Azores led by the Earl of Essex and Sir Walter Ralegh.¹⁷ In anticipation

---

of the expedition, Plymouth has become “A very Court of Souldiers.”

Essex’s victory at Cadiz has inspired the English, as the captains who open the play discuss:

The great successe at Cales under the conduct
Of such a Noble Generall, hath put heart
Into the English: They are all on fire
To purchase from the Spaniard. (B1r)

This opening scene sets the tone for the rest of the play, which maintains the anti-Spanish slant and glorifies Essex and “English Rawleigh” as heroes (G4v). The fighting in the Azores hovers in the background of the play; while Bess Bridges manages a tavern in Cornwall, her betrothed, Spencer, ships out with the expedition after he kills a man in order to defend her. Later, Spencer is captured by the violent and bloodthirsty Spanish, who prove their incivility by threatening unarmed men. The Spanish further demonstrate their barbarism when they retake Fayal and exhume the English bodies in the churchyard, burying them outside the city. Such actions demonize Spain and valorize the English heroes who fight against such unchristian cruelty. In this way, as Jean Howard has pointed out, Heywood constructs Englishness throughout Part 1 in opposition to the Spanish, Roman Catholic Other.

Heywood also explicitly contrasts the viciousness of Spain with the noble generosity of England by turning Bess into an avatar of Queen Elizabeth. Because Bess believes that Spencer was killed in a duel and she wants to retrieve his body, she buys

---


and captains a ship, setting sail from Cornwall for the Azores. Like Elizabeth, she occupies a leadership role that typically belonged to men. Heywood further emphasizes the connections between Bess and Elizabeth by treating Bess as an ideal representative of England. Whenever she comes in contact with the Spanish, she wins their respect by extending charity to them. Instead of revenging herself, she sets them free and gives them money, saying, “Spaniards where you come, / Pray for Besse Bridges, and speake well o’th English” (H1r). Here Bess represents English virtue while still maintaining her own identity, but the next encounter explicitly conflates her with Elizabeth. Bess and her crew of pirates take a Spanish ship; she maroons the Spanish captain but does not kill him. “Pray for English Besse,” she tells him, and he responds, “I know not whom you meane, but bee’t your Queene / Famous Elizabeth, I shall report / She and her subjects both are mercifull” (H2r). By claiming the name of “English Bess” and extending mercy to the Spanish, Bess Bridges elides the differences between herself and the queen. In this sense, as Jean Howard has noted, Bess “both is and is not a stand-in for the much grander Elizabeth.”\footnote{Howard, “An English Lass,” 102.} For Howard, Bess’s status as tanner’s daughter trumps the instances in which Bess and Elizabeth blend into one another. Yet when Bess meets Mullisheg, the king of Morocco, he associates her with the queen whose name she shares:

There’s vertue in that name,

The Virgin Queene so famous through the world,

The mighty Empresse of the maiden Ile,

Whose predecessors have ore-runne great France,
Whose powerfull hand doth still support the Dutch,
And keeps the potent King of Spaine in awe,
Is not she titled so? (H4v)

By framing his description of Elizabeth with lines that emphasize her name, Mullisheg conflates the two Elizabeths. This quotation carries three further important implications. First, Mullisheg sees Elizabeth’s defining characteristics as her virginity and her prowess in international relations. Second, by referring to her as the “Virgin Queene” of the “maiden Ile,” he recognizes the link between Elizabeth’s impenetrable body and England itself. Third, and most importantly, he describes an English national identity that is not only tied to Elizabeth’s virgin body and the land’s uniqueness as an island, but also bound inextricably to England’s international conquests.

In this sense, the model of Englishness that Mullisheg describes aligns with Richard Helgerson’s argument in *Forms of Nationhood* that in the late Elizabethan era, “some other interest or cultural formation”—in this case, difference from other nations—“rivals the monarch as the fundamental source of national identity.”²¹ Howard has similarly noted that *I The Fair Maid of the West* illustrates a form of national identity “which, despite many differences, shares with modern nationalism a supposed fraternity of subjects within an imagined community defined in part by a bounded geographical essence and in part by cultural and racial differences from other such imagined communities.”²² This challenges the idea that Tudor England could only experience the

---


sort of patrimonial nationalism that Kumar describes. Although Elizabethan and Caroline forms of nationalism remained clearly distinct from the nationalism that developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the connection that Heywood builds between the queen and one of her middle-class subjects inscribes a form of nationalism that not only is based on the monarch but also emphasizes the contributions of English subjects to England’s success as a nation. Moreover, the play suggests that without the deeds of subjects like Bess and Spencer, Essex and Ralegh, the meaning of Englishness would change dramatically. Without the valor of English subjects, how would England have an identity any different from Spain’s or Morocco’s?

Thus, it becomes even more crucial that Heywood connects Bess so frequently with Elizabeth: Bess unites the two forms of nationalism. Indeed, before Bess leaves Cornwall, she draws up a will in which she leaves ten pounds “To every Maid that’s married out of Foy, / Whose name’s Elizabeth” (G2r). This will creates a community of women who share the queen’s name; even though Bess belongs to the merchant class, she still mirrors the queen by providing for English subjects. She extends generosity not only to women like her, though, but also to the Spanish and Moroccans who come in contact with her, as further demonstration of the superior virtue of the English. In this sense, Heywood’s anti-Spanish, pro-Elizabeth rhetoric seems, on the surface, to align with the sort of Elizabethan nostalgia that is familiar from scholarly narratives.

Yet, even though anti-Spanish sentiments enjoyed perennial popularity in early modern England, the winter of 1630-1631—the winter before The Fair Maid of the West appeared in print—was the first winter of Charles I’s reign in which war with Spain
and/or France did not loom on the horizon. In fact, England and Spain had just signed a peace treaty in November 1630, and the previous year England had made peace with France. Nor had these wars gone particularly well for the English. In 1631, Heywood’s invocation of Essex’s successful Cadiz expedition must have conjured up painful reminders of the late Duke of Buckingham’s disastrous attempt to rekindle that glory. Performing and publishing Part 1 in 1630/1 could certainly be written off as a fantasy of English triumph, a nostalgic celebration of Elizabethan virtues that deploys the transgressive potential of Bess Bridges/Good Queen Bess to tame the threat of the Spanish. However, such an interpretation stumbles over Part 2, which continues Bess’s story after the Spanish threat has vanished and she has dwindled into a wife.

Part 1 ends with Mullisheg vowing to see Bess “crown’d a bride” to Spencer (14r); Part 2 opens with Mullisheg’s own crowned bride, Tota, who is jealous of Mullisheg’s desire for Bess. Her ambition drives the plot, and she takes on the agency that Bess loses between the two parts of the play. This fits in with the pattern that Jean Howard points out in Part 1 in which everything that is threatening about Bess is displaced onto Mullisheg and his court: the castrating potential of a powerful woman actually finds fulfillment at the end of Part 1 when Bess’s servant is castrated at Mullisheg’s order. By Part 2, Bess has become Spencer’s wife, and the plot centers on rescuing her from the clutches of various would-be rapists. Kathleen McLuskie has noted that Part 2 fits in with the larger demand at the Caroline court for romance plots, and

---

Charles Crupi likewise blames the doormat-Bess of Part 2 on the “centralized authority” that characterized the Caroline court.\textsuperscript{24} The intertwined aesthetic and political demands of the 1630s do provide an important context for Heywood’s revision of Bess. But ultimately, I argue, the revision has much more to do with changing conceptions of Englishness than with a sort of top-down demand for Bess to become submissive based on an overly totalized notion of Charles’s authority in 1631.

Howard argues that the nationalism in \textit{Fair Maid of the West} matches a Helgersonian model of national identity that was based in English regionalism as opposed to the “monarch-based ideologies of dynastic statehood.”\textsuperscript{25} In this reading, Bess is the fair maid of the \textit{West Country} of England, not necessarily of the Western Islands of Europe. In Part 1 Goodlack tells us that Bess’s father “Sold hyde in Somersetshire” (B2r); she goes into service in Plymouth; and she runs a tavern in Foy. Each relocation moves her further west. In fact, Part 1 refers multiple times to Foy, Plymouth, London, Cornwall, and Somersetshire (see table 2.1). Notably, all except London are in the west of England. Because of this emphasis on localities, when Part 1 uses the words “England” and “English,” it emphasizes a regional England, as Howard suggests. However, Part 2 revises the vocabulary of nationhood. The words “England,” “English,” and “Englishman” (or “-men”) appear nearly twice as often as in Part 1—and of the cities and counties mentioned in Part 1, only Foy is mentioned in Part 2, and then only once, in passing. Part 2 also uses the word “country” four times more often than Part 1, always in

\textsuperscript{24} McLuskie, \textit{Dekker and Heywood}, 140; Crupi, “Subduing Bess Bridges,” 81.

\textsuperscript{25} Howard, “An English Lass,” 107.
Table 2.1. Words relating to local and national identities in *The Fair Maid of the West, Parts 1 and 2*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related to cities</th>
<th>Number of Uses in Part 1</th>
<th>Number of Uses in Part 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foy (i.e., Fowey)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related to counties</th>
<th>Number of Uses in Part 1</th>
<th>Number of Uses in Part 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somersetshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryman/men</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related to the nation</th>
<th>Number of Uses in Part 1</th>
<th>Number of Uses in Part 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englishman/men</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryman/men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the sense synonymous with “nation.” Likewise, although Howard suggests that in Part 1, Bess “is identified with a particular region of the country, not with the court,” in the first act of Part 2 Tota conflates the distinctions between Bess and Elizabeth by referring

---

26 “Country” is used in Part 1 a total of 8 times; in Part 2, it is used 30 times. Its use to mean “nation” contributes another definition to the ones that Martin Butler identifies in *Theatre and Crisis*, ch. 9.
to Bess as “the English Elizabeth; / So great in Court” (B2r).\textsuperscript{27} These changes between Parts 1 and 2 suggest that both the revival of Part 1 and the writing of Part 2 respond to shifting conceptions of English nationhood in the thirty years between the two plays. While in the 1630s English subjects certainly still identified with their regions, \textit{The Fair Maid of the West} also shows an increasing identification with England as a nation. In this sense, the play even more emphatically constructs Bess as a national figure, no matter how local her West Country origins.

Although Bess is born in Somersetshire and catches Spencer’s eye while working at a tavern in Devon—the home of many of the famous Elizabethan explorers and sea-dogs, including Drake, Ralegh, and Sir Richard Grenville—the play locates her primarily in her Cornish tavern in Foy. Cornwall itself reflected a changing balance between localities and national government in the late 1620s and early 1630s. Cornwall was, in many ways, the epitome of a distant province, isolated geographically from London. Anne Duffin points out that the Cornish language was spoken well into the seventeenth century—indeed, as late as 1646, the sacraments were administered in Cornish—and that the residents of Cornwall retained a sense of racial difference as well, due to their Celtic heritage.\textsuperscript{28} She likewise emphasizes the prevalence of Cornishmen marrying Cornish brides (rather than expanding kinship networks by marrying outside the county), quoting the proverb that “all Cornish gentlemen are cousins.”\textsuperscript{29} However, she also cites the large

\begin{footnotes}
\item[27] Howard, “An English Lass,” 107.
\item[29] Ibid., 30.
\end{footnotes}
volume of correspondence among Cornish gentry and others throughout the kingdom, noting, “While the preservation of a local identity was important, the greater Cornish gentry were neither as insular nor as narrow-minded as they have been portrayed.”

Cornwall sustained a special relationship with the Crown, since one of the titles that the heir to the throne traditionally held was Duke of Cornwall (in 1630, the title had just passed to the infant Prince Charles), and the Duchy retained significant land holdings distinct from the county as a whole. This gave the court more direct influence in Cornwall than it had in some other counties. Furthermore, the increasing mobility of English society as a whole also increased the frequency of communications between Cornwall and London. Cornish gentry circulated news from London with great interest and alacrity, and a number attended university (usually at Exeter College, Oxford, the “West Country college”) and formed nationwide connections as a result. Cornwall may have represented the most westerly reaches of England—indeed, Land’s End—but in the seventeenth century, it also became ideologically central, just as the local conflict between Sir John Eliot and the Bagg-Mohun faction played an important role in the parliaments of the late 1620s, a role which I discuss in greater detail below. The wider significance of local Cornish politics signals the ways in which local and regional loyalties shaped the nation.

Considered in this light, it is no coincidence that Bess is shipwrecked and washes up in Italy: as the Fair Maid of the West has represented England to the Spanish and

---


31 Ibid., 26.
Moroccans, so she now does to other Europeans. Indeed, she is rescued from bandits by none other than the Duke of Florence, the city that lay at the artistic heart of the Renaissance. Yet Florence is corrupt and Bess’s virtue is endangered there, just as it had been in Morocco. According to Crupi, Part 2 stages the triumph of European religious, racial, national, class, and gender hierarchies, which together “smother[] Bess Bridges under gestures of chivalric honor.” Indeed, Bess does become smothered, but the values that triumph are not couched as European ones but English ones. In fact, the Continent represents danger; as in Morocco, Spencer must exert his English chivalric honor to save Bess. Likewise, when the Duke of Florence meets Spencer and Roughman, he praises them as reflections of a national character: “These bold Englishmen / I think are all compos’d of spirit and fire, / The element of earth hath no part in them” (K1r). The conclusion of Part 2 similarly emphasizes Bess and Spencer’s English virtues:

    Worthy Englishman,
    
    And you, the mirror of your sex and nation,
    
    Fair English Elizabeth, as well for virtue
    
    As admired beautie, wee’ll give you cause, ere
    
    You depart our Court, to say great Fesse
    
    Was either poor, or else not bountifull. (M1v)

Bess and Spencer embody Englishness, and in Part 2, that Englishness reflects the nation as a whole. Significantly, Heywood links Englishness with Bess’s modest behavior and Spencer’s honorable actions, yet his prologue for the court performance of 1630

32 Crupi, “Subduing Bess Bridges,” 84.
emphasizes the “beauty” and “majesty” of his own monarchs without connecting them with Englishness (A4v). While the prologue praises the king and queen in conventional terms, Bess and Spencer become powerful agents of conversion and reformation: Joffer, a Moor, converts to Christianity, while the Duke of Florence reforms his behavior and relinquishes his claim to Bess. In this way, Heywood highlights the transformative power of his English characters: they reform one of the cultural hubs of Europe. Furthermore, Part 2 takes a much more diplomatic approach to Catholicism than Part 1 does. Florence, for example, is transformed by Bess’s English virtue and Spencer’s English honor, instead of serving merely as an example of corrupt, Roman Catholic society. In this play, the power of Englishness can reform Florence and domesticate cosmopolitan Europe, even in Italy, the heart of Catholicism.

Thus, 2 The Fair Maid of the West revises Bess not only to appeal to the aesthetic tastes of the Caroline court but also to represent the transformative power of Englishness. Bess and Spencer’s experiences in Part 2 demonstrate the victory of “English vertue” over foreign vice, a triumph that displays English superiority in non-military arenas (M1r). In this context, the play’s publication by Richard Royston becomes provocative. Remembered as the “bookseller to three kings” (Charles I, Charles II, and James II), Royston would become famous during and after the Civil Wars for his royalist and high-church publications, including Eikon Basilike in 1649. In 1631, he had only been a freeman of the Stationers’ Company for four years, and The Fair Maid of the West was

---

his first play—one of only four he published before the Restoration.\textsuperscript{34} That Royston, “always a staunch supporter of the church and the crown,” would publish this Heywood play and no other supports a reading in which it might depart from Heywood’s norm.\textsuperscript{35}

*The Fair Maid of the West* illustrates shifting models of English nationalism—from Part 1’s nationalism based on difference from the Spanish and Moroccans and rooted in regionalism to Part 2’s nationalism based in a concept of England as an imagined community with a powerful enough identity to subsume the cosmopolitanism and even the Catholicism made so visible in the person of Queen Henrietta Maria (a phenomenon I discuss in greater detail in Chapter 3). Other works in Heywood’s oeuvre align with the sort of simplistic Elizabethanism that celebrates the queen as a propagandistic model of English Protestantism, but Bess Bridges breaks that pattern. The Bess Bridges of Part 2 contrasts sharply not only with the Bess of Part 1 but also with the young Elizabeth whose story Heywood tells in *Englands Elizabeth*, also published in 1631. Figuring Elizabeth as Bess allows *The Fair Maid of the West* to show how the Elizabethan forms of Englishness in Part 1 could be updated for the Caroline era in Part 2. Ultimately, the play invokes the Elizabethan age to negotiate different forms of English national identity, illustrating that the cultural memory of the Elizabethan era could begin to balance between the extremes of past and present, even for a characteristically patriotic writer like Thomas Heywood.

\textsuperscript{34} He also published John Jones’s *Adrasta* (1635), Thomas Randolph’s *The Jealous Lovers* (1646), and Francis Quarles’s *The Virgin Widow* (1649 and 1656). Royston printed several of Quarles’s other works, as well, including *The Whipper Whipt* (1644); *Solomons recantation*, a paraphrase of Ecclesiastes (1645, 1648); and *Boanarges and Barnabas* (1646, 1651, 1657, 1660, 1664, 1667, 1671, 1674, 1679).

\textsuperscript{35} Tedder and Williams.
*The Emperour of the East, the West Country, and Authority*

While *The Fair Maid of the West* uses its Elizabeth figure to spread English virtues over the seas, Philip Massinger’s *The Emperour of the East* (1632) maps Byzantine history onto English. Acted at the Globe and Blackfriars by the King’s Men, the play stages an allegory of England’s transition from Tudor to Stuart rule. Although nominally set in Constantinople and based on classical sources, *The Emperour of the East* nevertheless clearly connects Byzantium and England, sketching images of Elizabeth, James, and Charles in the figures of Pulcheria and Theodosius. The story is based on the lives of the Roman emperor Theodosius II, his wife Aelia Eudocia Augusta (formerly known as Athenais), and his sister and regent Pulcheria. For Massinger, Theodosius becomes a combination of Charles and James, Athenais mirrors Henrietta Maria, and Pulcheria represents Elizabeth. Michael Dobson and Nicola Watson categorize the play as one more example of “the theatre’s customary pro-Tudor and anti-Stuart version of nostalgia,” but a close reading reveals the inadequacy of such an interpretation. In *The Emperour of the East*, Elizabethanism provides a unique lens with which to examine local and national politics, constructing a form of English nationhood that balances the localities and the nation to suggest the possibility of an idyllic reciprocal relationship between the two that derives from the lessons of the Elizabethan past.

---

36 The play also includes a prologue for a court performance.

37 J.E. Gray argues persuasively that Massinger borrowed the story from Thomas Hawkins’s 1626 translation of the French Jesuit Nicholas Caussin’s *The Holy Court*; see “The Source of *The Emperour of the East*,” *Review of English Studies* 1.2 (April 1950): 126-35. Massinger’s use of this text as a source—a French Catholic text, dedicated in translation to Henrietta Maria—suggests an alignment at least with the Arminian end of the Church of England spectrum, emphasized by the play’s dedication to an Arminian, as I discuss below.

In the first scene of the play, Massinger sets up the correlations between Pulcheria and Elizabeth. Drawing on Elizabethan iconography, Theodosius’s most trusted counselor, Paulinus, describes Pulcheria as “a perfect phoenix” who “disdaynes a riuall.” Pulcheria, Paulinus explains, became the guardian of her brother, the Emperor Theodosius, after the death of their father, Arcadius. Since then, she has raised Theodosius, training him “in all those arts / That are both great and good, and to be wished / In an Imperiall Monarch” (B1v). Furthermore, she exhibits exemplary personal virtue and that specifically female form of honor, virginity:

She by her example

Hath made the court a Kinde of Academy,

In which true honour is both learnd, and practisd,

Her priuate lodging’s a chaste Nunnery,

In which her sisters as probationers heare

From her their soueraigne Abbesse, all the precepts

Read in the schoole of vertue. (B1v)

Pulcheria here becomes not only the model of a great monarch but also manages to conflate the best qualities of educators and nuns. Furthermore, Paulinus makes clear that although Pulcheria’s hand is sought in marriage by the various kings of the east, she refuses them all because “She that knows her strength / To rule, and gourne Monarchs,

---


40 If we push the limits of the allegory, Arcadius might represent Henry VII, from whom both Elizabeth and James derived their right to the English throne. Although Arcadius’s name derives from the source material, one cannot help but think it must have recalled Sidney’s *Arcadia* as well.
scornes to weare / On her free necke the seruile yoke of marriage” (B2r). To sum up, she is a well-educated, intelligent, strong, honorable virgin who refuses to cede authority by marrying, and she also reigns with such wisdom and justice that “‘tis not superstition to beleeeue / Astrea once more liues vpon the earth, / Pulcheriaes brest her temple” (B2r). Astraea, of course, had become one of the most potent iconographic representations of Elizabeth. Massinger associates Pulcheria with Elizabeth as a way of illustrating the extent to which both are ideally wise and just rulers.

Yet Pulcheria is merely the regent, not the rightful ruler, and not all is well in Constantinople. Theodosius’s eunuchs resent the fact that “The globe and awfull scepter should giue place / Vnto the distaff,” and they try to distance him from Pulcheria (B3r). Theodosius is resistant at first: “No more, hee neuer learned / The right way to command, that stopp’d his eares / To wise directions” (C1r). However, rather than observe while Pulcheria is busy governing, Theodosius leaves to find a place where he can more easily ogle a newcomer to court, the lovely refugee Athenais. Meanwhile, in his rightful place, Pulcheria performs the appropriate duties to welcome Athenais to court. Theodosius’s men find her performance of monarchy a galling inversion of the rightful order, in which they should reap the rewards (both material and not) of serving the sole ruler of the empire, rather than seeing their master cede authority to another. Warping the poetic

language familiar from Elizabethan literature such as Ralegh’s *The Ocean to Cynthia*, Lyly’s *Endymion*, and Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, Chrysapius compares Pulcheria to an unnatural moon:

The pale fac’d Moon that should  
Gouerne the night, vsurps the rule of day,  
And still is at the full in spite of nature,  
And will not know a change. (D2r)

Chrysapius’s complaint implies a larger concern with the perpetuation of the myth of Elizabeth in early Stuart culture. Instead of remaining decently in the tomb James built, Elizabeth lives on in memories and elegies, on church walls and the public stage.  

Chrysapius may be the most corrupt and untrustworthy of Theodosius’s advisors, but his description of Pulcheria as usurper nevertheless undermines the positive readings of her character with which the play began—and thus undermines the play’s representation of Elizabeth, as well.

Athenais, meanwhile, shares enough characteristics in common with Henrietta Maria to make the connections between the two clear, even while she remains different enough for plausible deniability. As the queen whose religion differs from that of the court and who declares upon her arrival that she refuses to convert, Athenais aligns with Henrietta Maria; yet unlike Henrietta Maria, Athenais does convert, even before Theodosius marries her. Like Henrietta Maria, Athenais’s brother is king of her native

---

country; unlike Henrietta Maria, Athenais’s brother detains her legacy and casts her out of his court after their father dies. When Pulcheria presents Athenais to Theodosius as a potential bride, the emperor falls instantly in love with her—as popular myth held that Charles did with Henrietta Maria. Her power struggle with Pulcheria over who will wield greater influence over Theodosius maps onto the larger religiopolitical concerns of the Caroline court: would Charles preserve connections with the traditional, Elizabethan, Calvinist-leaning Church of England, or would he continue to edge toward the Arminians and his Catholic wife? In 1631-32, when the play was performed and published, such questions remained open for speculation, even though Charles’s opinions were becoming increasingly clear. The closeness of the royal couple was well-known by 1632; similarly, William Laud already occupied powerful positions as Bishop of London and a member of the Privy Council, even if he would not be appointed Archbishop of Canterbury until 1633.

Yet the fact that Pulcheria orchestrates the match between Theodosius and Athenais complicates simplistic historical readings of the play. Indeed, Theodosius praises Pulcheria as “a prouident Protectresse” for introducing the two (E4r). Pulcheria urges him to weigh their religious differences carefully: “Consider her condition, / Her father was a Pagan, she her selfe / A new conuerted Christian”—so new-converted, in fact, that she has not yet been baptized (E4r). But Theodosius’s love for Athenais springs into existence as intensely as it does suddenly. He insists that she be baptized so that they

can be married as soon as possible.\textsuperscript{44} In the wake of his marriage, Theodosius changes considerably. Where he was once, like James, both active and studious, he is now “vxorious,” like Charles (F2r). Where he was once “frugall and sparing,” he now shows “nor boundes, nor limits / To his magnificent bounties” by signing everything he is given without even looking at it, as well as issuing decrees that debts be forgiven and all crimes pardoned, save murder and treason (F1v). Because of his marriage, Theodosius has become a king of excesses. Before, he left all matters of governance to Pulcheria; now he threatens the stability of the state by granting permissions and pardons without even considering the consequences of his actions.

However, Pulcheria cannot simply let him rule badly, so she tries to enlist Athenais’s help. “You know, nor do I enuy it, you haue / Acquir’d that power, which, not long since, was mine, / In gouerning the Emperor,” Pulcheria says (F3r). Yet in spite of her claim that she does not envy Athenais’s new place, Pulcheria still asks Athenais to “obey [her] counsels” (F2v, emphasis mine). When Pulcheria explains her full meaning—that Athenais should “aduise” or “command” Theodosius (F3r)—Athenais recoils in horror, declaring that her status as both wife and “vassal” prohibits her from interfering with her husband’s desires. Instead of using her influence for the good of the empire, Athenais instead vows, “Though now my Lord would rashly giue away / His Scepter, and imperiall Diadem, / […] I would not crosse it” (F3v). Instead of behaving like an empress, she preserves the values and behaviors of a private citizen.

\textsuperscript{44} Upon her baptism, he renames her: instead of Athenais, she is now Eudoxia, which was Theodosius’s mother’s name. Although in dialogue Athenais becomes Eudoxia, the speech prefixes continue to refer to her as Athenais. For the sake of simplicity, I do the same. It is worth noting, as another parallel between Theodosius/Athenais and Charles/Henrietta Maria, that Charles declared that Henrietta Maria would be called “Queen Mary” (no matter what she preferred to be called—indeed, she signed herself “Henriette”).
In this she mirrors Theodosius, who at the beginning of the play behaves too much like “a priuate man” and not enough like an emperor. As Philanax says,

To bee a perfit horseman, or to know
The words of the chace, or a faire man of armes,
Or to bee able to pierce to the depth,
Or write a comment on th’obscurest Poets,
I grant are ornaments, but your maine scope
Should bee to gouerne men to guarde your owne,
If not enlarge your empire. (D2v)

Horsemanship, hunting, interest in the arts: for Philanax, the habits appropriate to the nobility provide only the veneer of good kingship. They also mirror some of the activities most valued by both James, who loved to hunt and to produce works of scholarship, and Charles, who was renowned for his patronage of artists and musicians.

Yet by allowing these activities to distract from his responsibility to govern the empire, Theodosius is failing as a ruler. He soon finds, however, that the other counselors would be happy just to see him present a different veneer of good kingship: “pompe” and “glorious shows of royaltie,” as enacted most visibly in the pursuit of the many court “beauties / Ambitious at the height to impart their deare, / And sweetest fauours” to him (D3r). Theodosius rebukes them sharply for their advice that he use his powerful position merely to satiate lust, chastising them for daring to criticize his willingness to follow Pulcheria’s “wise directions” (D3v). He then lets loose a veritable tirade about the distinctions between his royal prerogative and tyranny:
Cannot I bee an Emperour, vnlesse
Your wiues, and daughters bow to my proud lusts?
And cause I rauish not their fairest buildings
And fruitfull vineyards, or what is dearest,
From such as are my vassalls, must you conclude
I doe not know the awfull power, and strength
Of my prerogative? Am I close handed
Because I scatter not among you that
I must not call mine owne[?] (D4r)

For Theodosius, good kingship means “sparing to inrich a few / With th’iniuries of many” and resisting “the rapine / And auarice of [his] grooms” (D4r). In his strict disapproval of illicit sexual profit, Theodosius resembles Charles; however, the equal condemnation of extralegal pecuniary profit suggests a more prickly relationship between Theodosius and the Stuarts, especially given Charles’s implementation of the Forced Loan only a few years before the publication of The Emperour of the East.\(^45\)

While Pulcheria’s popularity wanes because of her strict virtue, Theodosius’s waxes because of his overly abundant generosity. So Pulcheria finds a way to use his own actions against him: she submits a petition asking for Athenais to become her slave, and in accordance with habit, Theodosius signs it without even reading it—even after Pulcheria urges him to. Ironically, his main reason for not reading the petition is that all this business prevents him from seeing his wife. Still, even though Theodosius is clearly

\(^{45}\) For a brief summary of the circumstances surrounding the Forced Loan, see Chapter 1 above, 73-4.
in the wrong, Pulcheria’s sheer effrontery in petitioning that the empress be made her personal slave at least raises the possibility that Athenais’s later suspicions of her might be partly true. In any case, Pulcheria’s deception here reads as distinctly morally ambiguous, no matter how justified the ends. Indeed, by casting Pulcheria in a particularly unflattering light even as she tries to teach Theodosius how to be a good king, this episode questions the entire edifice of oppositional nostalgia for Elizabeth.

Pulcheria’s trickery shocks and dismays Athenais not only because Athenais is now a slave, but also because Pulcheria treats her cruelly. “[T]is some delight / To urge my merits to one so ungrateful,” Pulcheria tells the newly enslaved empress; “Therefore with horror hear it” (G3r). The satisfaction that she takes in lording her power over Athenais chillingly recasts her as more vindictive than honorable. Pulcheria moreover chastises Athenais for lying, but it is never clear what precisely she believes that Athenais has lied about. She accuses Athenais of deploying “Syren charmes” and fake tears like a “dissembling Crocodile”—but she then reveals that she has also manipulated both Theodosius and Athenais to bring about the royal marriage:

    I put thee in a shape as would haue forc’d
    Envy from Cleopatra, had she seene thee;
    Then, when I knew my brothers blood was warm’d
    With youthfull fires, I brought thee to his presence,
    And how my deepe designes, for thy good plotted,
    Succeeded to my wishes is apparent,
    And needs no repetition. (G3v)
Pulcheria’s political power and savvy have taken a sudden turn for the sinister. She may be trying to teach Theodosius a lesson, but her confession here reveals a strand of Machiavellian plotting more akin to the boasting of a villain than the “good counsell” that Pulcheria claims to share. When Athenais responds in humility and confusion, Pulcheria accuses her of “Pride and forgetfulnesse,” claiming that her current demeanor “couer[s] with / False colors of humility [her] ambition” (G3v). Theodosius then confronts Pulcheria. She immediately shows him the deed he has signed, and order is quickly restored when Pulcheria tears up the deed and relinquishes her claim on Athenais. Yet, although Theodosius forgives Pulcheria, his wife does not. She has learned part of the lesson that Pulcheria tried to teach her—i.e., that what may have been appropriate for Athenais the private subject differs from what is appropriate for Eudoxia the empress, and liberties such as Pulcheria has taken become downright seditious when taken against the empress.

However, Athenais has not yet learned how to be a good empress; she holds on to her grudge against Pulcheria throughout Acts 4 and 5. The corrupt Chrysapius develops a closer relationship with Athenais, flattering her and stirring up her resentment against Pulcheria. “Your maiestie / Hath just cause of distast,” he tells her; she, in turn, complains that while she has “the title of an Empresse,” Pulcheria has “ravish’d” the power (H1v). Such sexualized language casts Pulcheria as not only dangerously insubordinate but also unwomanly. Without the oversight of a husband, Pulcheria’s power reigns unchecked in her brother’s court. Moreover, Pulcheria’s centrality to court politics means that Theodosius’s authority derives from her. Without her, the play makes
clear, he remains a well-intentioned but flighty boy, rather than the wise emperor that she would make him. Even after his marriage, he does not occupy the place that a husband and emperor ought to in the court’s power structure.

Theodosius’s failure to exercise his rightful authority likewise opens him up for manipulation by the courtiers lobbying for power all around him. Indeed, the play highlights the problems that ensue when courtiers monopolize access to the monarch. In one short but significant scene, a “countryman” enters, seeking the Emperor and criticizing the courtiers he encounters for their parasitical behavior, not only toward the king but toward the country as a whole:

I would zee the Emperour, why should you Courtiers
Scorne a poore Countryman? wee zweet at the Plough
To vill your mouths, you and your curs might starue els.
Wee prune the orchards, and you cranch the fruite,
Yet still you are snarling at vs. (H3r)

The man’s dialect identifies him as a West Country man, notably by his voicing of fricatives (i.e., he pronounces s as z and f as v). This characteristic marks a standard literary dialect for rural folk; Paula Blank points out that “in general, the western dialect, at least when seen from the perspective of London writers, represents the untranslatable difference—regional, social, intellectual—between courtiers and rustic ‘clowns.’”46 Yet Theodosius holds the Countryman’s “rude language,” the verbal markers of his otherness, as “an ornamente, not a blendish” (H3r). Speaking in dialect as a country bumpkin, the

---

Countryman clearly belongs to that category of honest country-dwellers, uncorrupted by the ambitions of court society, whose blunt speech cuts to the heart of the court/country dichotomy. He makes the courtiers uncomfortable—the counselor Timantus keeps trying to get rid of him and calls him an “vnmannerly swaine”—but Theodosius proves his inherent goodness by desiring to listen to the Countryman:

Since that drad power by whom we are, disdaines not
With an open eare to heare petitions from vs,
Easie accessse in vs his deputies,
To the meanest of our suiciets, is a debt,
Which we stand bound to pay. (H3r)

The Countryman’s presence moves Theodosius to voice his belief in a model of governance that implies a reciprocal relationship of obligation: as he owes allegiance to God, who hears his prayers, so he also owes his subjects access so that they may make requests of him.

Yet the Countryman upends this version of the Great Chain of Being. He has not come to make a request of the king, but to offer Theodosius the fruits of his labor:

*Theod.* What’s they suite friend?

*Count.* Zute? I would laugh at that. Let the court begge from thee
What the poore countrie giues: I bring a present
To thy good grace, which I can call mine owne,
And looke not like these gay folke for a returne,
Of what they venture. (H3r)
The incursion of a West Country man into the court provides an important symbol of the ideal symbiotic relationship between crown and country. The Countryman may represent the foreign world of “rustic ‘clowns,’” but he also supports the Crown voluntarily and wholeheartedly, not as an investment for which he expects a return. It is as if he has come from the Sidneys’ idyllic estate in Jonson’s poem “To Penshurst,” where “all come in, the farmer, and the clown, / And no one empty-handed to salute / [Penshurst’s] lord and lady, though they have no suit.”47 The Countryman gives Theodosius an apple “of [his] own grafting,” a symbolically laden gift that highlights both knowledge and mastery of nature. Theodosius recognizes in it an emblem of the power of his subjects:

He that could

So ayde weake nature, by his care, and labour,

As to compel a crabtree stocke to beare

A pretious fruite of this large size, and beauty,

Would by his industrie change a pettie village

Into a populous Citty, and from that

Erecte a flourishing Kingdome. (H3v)

According to this view, the Countryman’s skill as a farmer enables the entire kingdom to grow. The apple metonymically becomes the nation, flourishing because of the efforts of its people. If Pulcheria represents one strategy by which Theodosius can gain authority as a ruler—wisdom in acting—the Countryman represents its necessary corollary, the loyalty and generosity of subjects. By emphasizing the “industrie” of his hard-working

subjects, Theodosius privileges not only their work ethic but also their economic power and their loyalty as the essential foundation for a “flourishing Kingdome.”

This model of the economically powerful countryman as generous and loyal subject fits well with Massinger’s dedication of the play to John, first baron Mohun of Okehampton, a member of the Cornish gentry who gained advancement and his title by joining Buckingham’s faction in the late 1620s. In the hotly conflicted parliaments before Buckingham’s assassination, Mohun and Sir John Eliot represented two sides of a pitched local battle in Cornwall. These local struggles between Eliot’s faction (aligned with the earl of Pembroke) and that of the Buckingham clientele (headed by Mohun and Sir James Bagg) were writ large in the parliamentary debates of the 1620s. Mohun enjoyed Buckingham’s patronage as both a local justice of the peace (in 1625) and a member of the House of Commons (in 1624 and 1625). In 1628, when Buckingham facilitated his elevation to the peerage, Mohun joined the House of Lords. Throughout the 1620s, Mohun worked in Cornwall for the king’s benefit and his own. His efforts on behalf of the king during the Forced Loan led Buckingham to finagle him a position as vice-warden of the stannaries, replacing Eliot’s ally William Coryton—a position that court cases show Mohun abused. Despite—or perhaps because of—the abuse of his own power, Mohun staunchly defended Charles’s royal authority during the controversy of the

48 The word “industry” in the seventeenth century primarily referred to hard work, ingenuity, and diligence, but the more modern senses of “Systematic work or labour; habitual employment in some useful work” and “A particular form or branch of productive labour; a trade or manufacture” were also available. See the OED, “industry, n.4–5.”

Five Knights’ Case. He also helped to make the Forced Loan successful in Cornwall, gathering resources in support of the king, just as the Countryman offers Theodosius his own resources. However, like many of Buckingham’s other clients, Mohun floundered after the duke’s assassination. By 1632, when The Emperour of the East was published, he had withdrawn from the political scene, his former alliance with Bagg having deteriorated into enmity and his old foe Eliot having been imprisoned in the Tower.

Yet Mohun seems to have retained an interest in building patronage circles, this time literary rather than political. In the dedication, Massinger says that Mohun’s nephew Aston Cokaine

deliuer’d to mee, that your Lordship at your vacant hours sometimes
vouchsafed to peruse such trifles of mine, as haue passed the Presse, & not alone warranted them in your gentle suffrage, but disdain’d not to bestow a remembrance of your loue, and intended fauour to mee. (A2v)

Unlike so many dedications, this one recognizes bounty already promised—or, at least, so Cokaine and Massinger claim. Cokaine demonstrated further support for Massinger by writing the first commendatory poem that appears in the book. This poem connects Massinger’s play with the quintessence of English literature, a tradition which, for Cokaine, starts with Queen Elizabeth, Spenser, and Shakespeare. He hopes that


51 He also wrote a commendatory verse for Massinger’s The Maid of Honor (also published in 1632), but that play is dedicated to Sir Francis Foljambe and Sir Thomas Bland. It was entered to John Waterson in the Stationers’ Register in January 1632, two months after he entered The Emperour of the East. As in The Emperour of the East, Massinger mentions “frequent courtesies, and favours” which the two men had already bestowed on him, suggesting that these two dedications honor Massinger’s past patrons, rather than attempting to persuade the dedicatees to become patrons (B2r).
Massinger will “Live long / To purifie the slighted English tongue,” a purity aligned with “The matchless features of the faerie Queene” (A3, italics original). This emphasis on the purifying force of an Elizabeth figure highlights the uncomfortable connections that Massinger draws between his protagonist, Pulcheria, and Queen Elizabeth. By focusing on Pulcheria/Elizabeth, dedicating the play to a retired local politician famous for his connections to the court, and including the scene with the Countryman, The Emperour of the East suggests that one use of Elizabethanism in 1632 emphasized the importance of individual local subjects to the running of the nation. Still, merely invoking Elizabeth cannot be enough. What is more important, according to The Emperour of the East, is that local and personal concerns be subsumed by the larger concerns of governance, for monarchs as well as for their councilors and legislators, just as the Countryman suggests that it is for English subjects.

In this sense, the Countryman’s exchange with Theodosius models an idealized version of the ways in which Mohun offered Cornwall’s services and resources to Charles: both present the fruit of their labor, freely given without needing any Parliament to order them to do so. But even though Theodosius praises the Countryman here, the man’s departure seems to give Theodosius license to forget about the conversation. He sends the symbolic apple to Athenais; moreover, instead of doing further governmental work, he insists on going hunting because his mind is “wholly taken vp, / In the contemplation of [Athenais’s] matchlesse vertues” (H3v). In spite of his clear ability to

---

52 Intriguingly, as Justice of the Peace, Mohun heard the October 1628 case against John Trevillian for various slanders, including that Queen Elizabeth was “as arrant a whore as ever breathed, and that she was kept by Essex, Leicester, and others” (qtd. in Duffin, Faction and Faith, 41).
acknowledge the correct priorities, at this point in the play Theodosius lacks the desire or self-control to act on them. Instead, his infatuation with his new wife only distracts him from the business of ruling. If, as Martin Butler has claimed, “much Caroline drama […] chose to show kings in love rather than kings actually ruling,” *The Emperour of the East* both proves the point and serves as exception to it, since it shows Theodosius both in love and learning to rule.53

Indeed, Athenais still needs to learn similar lessons about becoming a proper consort, as demonstrated by her accusations that Pulcheria overvalues her own importance and wisdom. The Countryman’s apple plays an important role in her learning process, as well. As Athenais dismisses Pulcheria, Philanax enters, carrying the apple. Unaware of its symbolic freight, Athenais sends it to Paulinus, who is bedridden with the gout. Like her husband, Athenais is not evil, merely foolish; she does care about people, but she refuses to accept good counsel from her sister-in-law. Unfortunately, her act of kindness will turn this apple into an apple of discord: upon receiving it, Paulinus sends it as a gift to Theodosius, who reads the gesture as Paulinus’s bragging about having an affair with Athenais. Athenais unwittingly only confirms his darkest suspicions when she lies about eating the apple, thinking that he would be angry to learn that she had sent it as a gift. Once more, Theodosius’s rashness overshadows his basic good-heartedness; he immediately condemns Paulinus to death and casts away Athenais without giving either of them a trial.

53 Butler, “Early Stuart Court Culture: Compliment or Criticism?”, *The Historical Journal* 32.2 (June 1989), 433.
Pulcheria’s response to Theodosius’s tyrannical behavior further complicates the ways in which she represents Elizabeth. After Theodosius confronts Athenais, Pulcheria assures Athenais that she will do all she can. Yet she also takes a cold and frankly Machiavellian approach to the situation, acknowledging that she should “In pollicie reioyce” that Athenais is no longer “a riuall / Of [her] greatnesse” even as she promises to do all she can to help the empress (K2v). During the denouement of the play, Pulcheria does in fact work to convince Theodosius to pardon Athenais and Paulinus, but she still lies about Paulinus’s death to manipulate Theodosius into feeling guiltier. Then, having ensured that the emperor learned his lesson about governing with wisdom rather than allowing his emotions to dictate his governance, she fades into the background, while her sisters ask Theodosius to find them husbands. And yet the final scene suggests that Theodosius has not learned quite as much as he should: he rewards the faithful counselors Paulinus and Philanax, but at the same time he rewards Chrysapius, who has selfishly counseled Athenais to do that which will most benefit him. However, Pulcheria says nothing about this, nor do the stage directions indicate what Pulcheria does after her final line, which is itself a lie. Such an ambiguous silence at the end of the play withholds Pulcheria’s final judgment of Theodosius: her approval would sanction his authority, but he does not receive that approval.

Ultimately, Pulcheria presents an intriguingly complicated version of Elizabeth, just as Theodosius embodies a conflated version of the Stuarts. While on the one hand Pulcheria represents wise governance and serves as the center of avirtuous court, on the other hand she usurps the authority of the rightful ruler and reveals a more ambitious and
politically complicated persona than first impressions might suggest. Even though she acts in the service of the king, she still seizes power that is not rightfully hers. Thus, like Bess Bridges, Massinger’s version of Elizabeth operates along a different trajectory than we see in plays like If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, one that represents the Virgin Queen in more complex and less straightforwardly laudatory ways. The Emperour of the East seems intriguingly suspicious about the institution of monarchy as a whole; the Elizabeth figure is alarmingly power-hungry, while the James/Charles figure ends the play by giving the audience just as much reason to suspect his wisdom as before.

Similarly, Massinger’s dedication to a well-known scoundrel like Mohun complicates the play’s politics. While the paratextual material aligns the play with Charles’s favorites and recalls Buckingham’s corrupt faction in Cornwall, the figure of the honest Countryman serves as both a localized representative of West Country loyalty and a general representative of rural countrymen throughout the nation. In this sense, perhaps the Countryman aligns with Mohun’s own support for personal rule: in July 1628, Mohun told Sir William Courtney that parliaments were useless because of the clash of personal agendas. Instead, he claimed, local government should be entrusted to “select men in every county.”

While this philosophy matched Charles and Buckingham’s, it also lay in Mohun’s own interests as one of only two peers “born, bred, and resident in [Cornwall].” In the end, the dedication to Mohun and the figure of the Countryman accentuate most sharply the links between court and country. The presence

54 Quoted in Duffin, Faction and Faith, 95.

55 Duffin, Faction and Faith, 8.
of the West Country—in 1632 still part of the Celtic fringe, distant in geography and even language from the centers of the kingdom—emphasizes the importance of counties in Caroline forms of nationhood. At the same time, Massinger formulates the West Country not as an untamable corner of the nation, but rather as a cultivated, domesticated, and loyal one that freely offers itself up to king and country. In a play that focuses so extensively on how legitimate monarchs rule wisely, the emphasis on Theodosius’s derivation of kingly authority from both the higher and lower orders—Pulcheria teaching him from above, the Countryman from below—accentuates the insufficiency of an Elizabeth-figure alone to model good governance on both a local and national scale. Instead, like The Fair Maid of the West, the Elizabethanism of The Emperour of the East espouses a form of Englishness in which regional loyalties become national and the monarch is subsumed into the country as a whole. By focusing on harmony between court and country, both plays walk a via media between extremes. Neither oppositional nor sycophantic, they focus instead on the kingdom’s imagined community, The Fair Maid of the West from without and The Emperour of the East from within.

The Vow Breaker: Generic Hybridity and Female Chastity

William Sampson’s little-known domestic-tragedy-cum-history-play The Vow Breaker seems at first glance to adhere most faithfully of these three plays to the nostalgic mode made popular in 1 and 2 If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody. Like If You Know Not Me, The Vow Breaker appears to bring Elizabeth I on stage as a sort of patron saint of Protestant England. However, rather than solidifying Elizabeth’s status as
the English Protestant nonpareil, the domestic tragedy plot borrows from plays such as *The Shoemakers’ Holiday* and *Romeo and Juliet* to depict a version of Elizabethan Nottinghamshire that diverges wildly from the celebratory and patriotic history play plot. The 1560 siege of Leith lurks in the background of the main narrative and claims the foreground of the subplot to link the two genres. Sampson stages first and foremost the ballad tale of Anne Boote, the eponymous vow breaker, who falls in love with and agrees to marry Young Bateman, the son of her father’s enemy. However, before they can marry, Young Bateman leaves to fight with English and Scottish forces against the French at the siege of Leith. During his absence, Anne agrees to marry an older and wealthier man named German. Then, in a cruel twist of fate, Young Bateman returns from battle on the day of the wedding. Young Bateman hangs himself in despair, and his ghost haunts Anne until she gives birth. The morning after she delivers her child, the women attending her awaken to find that Anne is gone; they track her through the snow and find her drowned body on the riverbank. However, the play does not end with Anne’s tragic death. Instead, the conclusion triumphantly brings Queen Elizabeth onstage to celebrate the English victory in the Battle of Leith subplot.

The few scholars who have discussed *The Vow Breaker* have not been interested in the generic hybridity that characterizes the play. David Atkinson ignores the history play subplot altogether, instead talking about the play as if it were a clear-cut domestic tragedy about the conflicting modes of dynastic and companionate marriage.\(^{56}\) Alan Farmer, on the other hand, privileges the history play subplot because he is interested in

the religious politics of the play’s depiction of Marmaduke Joshua, the Puritan limner who fights for England in the Battle of Leith. Still, even though these readings provide valuable contexts for understanding the play, analyzing it in the context of Caroline Elizabethanism enables a reading that can account for both of its plots and its generic hybridity. *The Vow Breaker* aligns with the ambiguous Elizabethanism of *The Fair Maid of the West* and *The Emperour of the East*, promoting a bifurcated view of two major qualities associated with Elizabeth: virginity and militarism. The subplots play off of one another ultimately to question militarism as a strategy for foreign policy and emphasize that the irenic foreign policy of the 1630s did not represent a new innovation, but rather dated back to the 1560 Treaty of Edinburgh.

By linking a ballad’s plot to the siege of Leith, Sampson highlights questions of foreign policy, especially since he depicts an Anglo-Scottish alliance and the triumph of Elizabeth’s English forces over Mary of Guise’s French troops. The ballad on which *The Vow Breaker* is based, “A Godly Warning for all Maidens,” identifies its setting as “Not far from Nottingham of late / In Clifton as I hear,” but has no connection with Leith. For Sampson, however, the battle becomes the catalyst for the plot. In the ballad, Anne transfers her affections to German without any provocation; in the play, Young Bateman’s absence at war enables her to marry German and precipitates the domestic

57 Farmer, “‘Made like the times Newes’,” 249-51.

58 Hans Wallrath, *William Sampson’s ‘Vow-Breaker’: Ein Beitrag zur Kunde des Nachshakespeareschen Dramas* (Löwen: Druck und Verlag der Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas, 1914), provides the name of the ballad source. In full, it reads, “A Godly Warning for all Maidens by the example of Gods Judgements shewed upon one Jermans wife of Clifton in the County of Nottingham, who lying in Child-bed, was born away and never heard of after. The tune is, *The Ladies fall*” ([London]: Printed for F. Coles, Tho. Vere and W. Gilbertson, 1670; Wing G938A). Sampson actually quotes lines from the ballad at the end of the play (I3v).
tragedy. Sampson makes this explicit by having the local hero, Sir Jarvis Clifton, comment on it: “My old Neighbour rich Boote, and Bateman, is this brabling matter ended yet! shall he have her, by my Hollidam not yet, the knave shall serve his Queene first, see the warres, where twill do him good to see knocks passe as fillips.”59 For Sampson’s Young Bateman, seeing the wars does not, in the end, do much good; instead, it causes the chain of events that leads to his suicide. War may bring glory, but it also brings tragedy, and The Vow Breaker highlights both consequences of militaristic policy.

To deflect accusations of too-trenchant political commentary, from the first pages Sampson clearly positions the play as an Elizabethan relic. In the dedicatory epistle to Anne Willoughby, Sampson invokes the figure of Astraea and praises “that noble pedigree of vertues, which [Anne’s] virgin purity hitherto hath justly maintaind” (A4r). In this way he emphasizes two typically Elizabethan virtues: justice and chastity. Similarly, the “Prologue to Censurers” historicizes the play in order to defend against accusations of libel:

\[
\begin{align*}
And yet me thinks I here some Criticke say \\
That they are much abus’d in this our Play. \\
Their Magistracy laught at! as if now \\
What Ninty yeeres since dy’d, afresh did grow: \\
To those wee answer, that ere they were borne, \\
The story that we glaunse at, then was borne \\
And held authentic [...] .
\end{align*}
\]

Bring not the Author then, in your mislikes,
If on the Ages vice, quaintly he strikes
And hits your guilt! (A4v, italics original)

Sampson makes several interesting moves in this passage. First, he acknowledges that the play may include controversial matter but denies any specific target. This in itself is not unusual; after all, for decades playwrights had been claiming to poison in jest—no offense i’ th’ world—and yet plays clearly had contemporary resonances. More interesting for my argument is Sampson’s move to criticize “the Ages vice” by comparing it with “what Ninty yeeres since dy’d.”60 In this case, the events of early Elizabethan England—long since “worne / And held authentic”—serve as exemplum for and counterbalance to the vices of the present age. Far from having become irrelevant, these events carry a rhetorical value dependent on their antiquity, which in turn bolsters the source material’s authenticity and authority.

The Vow Breaker’s prefatory material focuses on the domestic tragedy, including a striking custom woodcut depicting Anne and Young Bateman’s tragic deaths by drowning and hanging, respectively. The poem elucidating the illustration emphasizes the tragedy of a marriage based on money, convenience, or dynastic concerns instead of the companionate marriage that Anne and Young Bateman should have made:

The Morrall is Maides should beware in chosse,
And where they cannot love, divert their voice.
Parents must not be rash, nor too vnkind,

---

60 Sampson’s math is somewhat exaggerated: the play’s action is clearly set in 1560, and Sampson wrote it no more than 76 years later. The Annals date the play to anywhere between 1625 and 1636.
And not for wealth to thwart, their Childrens minde. (A1v)

Even though Anne chooses German of her own free will, her choice still ends in disaster because she has followed the logic of dynastic marriage, casting Young Bateman aside in favor of the more economically and socially advantageous husband. On the surface, this emphasis on marrying for love would seem to align with the rhetoric of marital love that characterized the Caroline courts.\(^6\)

Yet we have no record that this play was ever performed at court; instead, it is linked to the provinces (the title page claims to have been “diuers times acted by severall companies” in Nottinghamshire). Furthermore, the generic hybridity that characterizes the play suggests a more complex reading than we can achieve by only examining the lovers’ fate.

The play begins with Young Bateman and Anne protesting their eternal love to one another. He is preparing to leave for Leith because he hopes that his absence will reconcile Anne’s father to him. In this opening scene, they make the vow that will haunt Anne for the rest of the play: “’Tis I have vow’d to have thee quicke or dead,” she tells Young Bateman (B1v). He reciprocates: “Alive or dead I shall enjoy thee then [i.e., after he returns from battle] / Spite of thy fathers frownes” (B1v). On the heels of this promise, Ursula, Anne’s cousin and maidservant, urges Young Bateman to marry Anne immediately and to “trust not we wenches,” since “weomens minds are planetary, and amble as fast as Virginalls lackes, if you stop ’em not in tru time, you marre all your musique” (B2r). From the beginning, then, Ursula questions the ability of any woman to remain faithful to a lover, a deeply misogynistic position that sets up a starker conflict.

\(^6\) I discuss this in greater detail in Chapter 3.
between the female characters of the domestic tragedy plot and Queen Elizabeth, the guiding force behind the history play plot.

Indeed, Elizabeth’s chastity contrasts sharply with Anne’s infidelity and echoes the familiar link between Elizabeth’s impenetrable body and England’s impenetrable borders. The triumph over the French at Leith, Elizabeth says at the end of the play, “Link’d victory unto a virgin’s arme” (K1v). She concludes the play by declaring, “Proud France, and poisoning Spaine, if heave’n [sic] us blesse / A virgin’s arme shall quell your mightines” (K2r). The emphasis on her “virgin’s arm” turns her status as virgin, vulnerable and weak, into a marker of power: no matter how weak and feeble her woman’s body, as queen of England she commands an army that can triumph over France and Spain.

However, while virginity can enable a kind of power for Elizabeth, for commoners like Ursula it proves inadequate to ensure happiness or even security. “Poore simple virginity, that us’d to be our best Dowry is now growne as bare as a serving-mans cloake that has not had a good nap this seven yeeres,” Ursula says (B3r). Although Anne is clearly condemned throughout the play for choosing to marry German instead of Young Bateman, Ursula’s points about the plight of women emphasize the tenuous situation in which Anne finds herself after Young Bateman goes off to war. She does not know when or whether he will return home, but she knows that her father prefers that she marry the wealthy German; and although marriage introduced new threats to an early modern woman (such as the possibility of death in childbirth), it also provided a certain measure of security and the possibility of eventual economic independence, especially for
young women who married rich old men. The play draws our attention to the short time that elapses between Young Bateman’s departure and Anne’s marriage to German (six months), as well as to her faithlessness in breaking the vows that she made. Yet Ursula also voices the worries of a woman facing an uncertain fate with the knowledge that she has little to no resources of her own.

While the domestic tragedy raises interesting and complicated questions about women’s options in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the anti-French sentiments of the play at first glance demonstrate a reactionary and xenophobic nostalgia for a time when instead of marrying into the French royal family, the English monarch drove the French out of the island. The militantly anti-French tone is set early: “Come my old neighbours,” cries Clifton; “let our Drum beat a free march weele have a health to Queene Besse, cry St. George, and a fig for St. Dennis” (B3v). It only intensifies in Act 2, when the French soldiers dress up as women to sneak into the English trenches. The joke there is clearly on the English—Marmaduke Joshua, the Puritan limner, moves in the space of one line from urging his companions to “have some compunction” for the supposed women to kissing Mortigue and calling it a conversion strategy: “[T]hus I begin the conversion of a sinner!—um—she Kisses well[;] verily againe I will edifie on your lips” (D1v). The scene reads hilariously, but the success of the French ploy sets up a confrontation between them and Clifton that equates the “Frenchifi’d truls” with Mary of Guise and contrasts fluid French sexual mores with the upright chastity of the English queen. “Make this thy quarrell,” says Clifton, “I pronounce thy Queene defective in beauty, vertues, honours, unto my mistris, Englands royall Besse” (D2r). Clifton’s
denunciation could as easily apply to a private challenge about Mortigue’s mistress as to this taunt about queenship. For Sampson, national virtue is bound closely with the monarch’s sexual virtue, so that England becomes stronger and better because Elizabeth possesses ideal feminine qualities in greater measure than Mary of Guise does.

Clifton’s duel with Mortigue likewise accentuates the virtue of their respective queens. Elizabeth’s virtue inspires her subjects; “The honour of my mistris makes me young,” Clifton says; “Her name shootes majesty into my looks, / Valour into my hart, strength to this arme” (E1r-v). In the ensuing fight, Clifton disarms Mortigue. Like Bess Bridges in *The Fair Maid of the West*, Clifton proves England’s superiority by refusing to kill Mortigue; he does not even require a monetary ransom, instead asking for mercy to be shown to him in the future, even as he showed it to Mortigue. In this scene, Sampson emphasizes the power of Elizabeth’s name and virtue to sustain her subjects. Her majesty and her strong arm become Clifton’s, and the French cannot stand against such a display of English prowess. The conflicts between Clifton and Mortigue personalize the larger conflicts between France and England. Their resolution by the end of the play, like Charles and Henrietta Maria’s marriage, becomes more momentous because of the stridency of their early fights.

By juxtaposing Clifton’s victory, inspired by Elizabeth’s chastity, with Anne’s wedding night, in which she paradoxically loses her chastity, Sampson highlights the tensions at the heart of this play’s exercise in cultural memory. The tragedy of Anne Boote and Young Bateman emphasizes the inverse qualities of the ways in which militant Protestants often recalled Good Queen Bess. Instead of highlighting female chastity, their
story emphasizes female infidelity; instead of rewarding Young Bateman for fighting for his queen, the story demonstrates what men risk by leaving their homes. Ursula and the prefatory material may misogynistically attribute Anne’s infidelity to women’s frowardness, but the play provides a more sympathetic reading: she marries German because he is wealthy and present, unlike Young Bateman, who as a soldier lacks income and remains absent for six months. Thus, while the ballad flatly condemns Anne’s actions, the play provides a subtext that works against her portrayal as an overt villain.

Even Anne’s inconstancy cannot be attributed solely to female weakness, since her father urges her to marry German. Anne and Queen Elizabeth may serve as foils to one another, but Anne’s infidelity to Young Bateman occurs not due to her fatal feminine flaws but rather as a result of the actions and expectations of the patriarchal society in which she lives. Old Boote’s desire that his daughter might marry a wealthy man eventually influences Anne to do so, based on the social structures that favor rich old men. Anne even explains to Ursula that marrying German instead of Bateman shows her newfound maturity: “I lov’d young Bateman in my childish daies,” she says, but “German is wealthy and by him I gaine / Recourse amongst the modest sagest dames” (C3r). For Anne, marrying German becomes a way of growing up and joining the community of “modest sagest dames” as well as gaining wealth. She reaffirms her decision to German himself, who offers to free her from their engagement. She tells him that although she did love Young Bateman, she “began / To alienate all love” when she

---

62 This is not to say that Sampson treats Anne better than the ballad does. While in the ballad she is immediately overcome with grief after Young Bateman’s death, in the play she and her father mock grief-stricken Old Bateman and laugh at him in a display of unbelievable cruelty. The only purpose of this change seems to be to enhance the dramatic payoff of Anne’s haunting by the ghost of Young Bateman.
“saw how disproportionable / [Their] jarring fathers were” (C4r). The favor of her father, the enticements of wealth, and the appeal of joining a community of women all contribute to Anne’s decision to marry German instead of Young Bateman.

While Clifton and his men labor in battle against the French, Anne gives birth to a baby. This moment should be full of joy, not only because of her healthy baby but also because she is surrounded by her community of women (even if they do not quite live up to the “modest sagest” criteria for which she had previously hoped). The play accentuates this community: when one of the gossips asks whether the baby is a boy, another answers, “No in-sooth gossip Mag-py it is one of us” (G4r). Instead of celebrating, though, Anne dreads what Young Bateman’s ghost will do to her and asks the women to keep vigil over her. The women do not understand why they need to do so; Anne describes a dream in which she drowns herself, but the women completely misinterpret its symbolism. Thus, while Anne sleeps, her gossips get drunk and pass out. The ghost appears and draws her out of bed against her will. She cries for help, but by the time the women wake up, she has already disappeared. They track her through the snow and find her already drowned on the riverbank. Anne has lost everything because she broke her vow to Young Bateman: her love, her gossips, any chance of happiness, and now her life.

The domestic tragedy plot concludes with Old Boote and Old Bateman making their peace with one another. Old Bateman echoes Romeo and Juliet: “For never was a story of more ruth, / Then this of him, and her, yet nought but truth” (H4v). By invoking this Elizabethan play about star-crossed lovers, even though The Vow Breaker takes place thirty years before Shakespeare wrote Romeo and Juliet, Sampson reinforces the
Elizabethan setting of the domestic tragedy. This time, what matters is not historical accuracy but mood. The Elizabethan setting becomes all the more significant since the ballad itself provides no specific link to the Elizabethan era. By pinning the ballad’s tale so carefully to Elizabeth’s reign—and, indeed, Elizabeth herself—Sampson raises questions about the effects of militarism and female “frowardness” that are never given satisfactory answers in the play.

*The Vow Breaker* thus represents an intriguingly divided version of the Elizabethan era. While the history play subplot resurrects a glorified Elizabeth who wins battles through the power of her subjects, the domestic tragedy connects the ballad tale of Anne Boote with the consequences of war for the family and friends of those who fight, even of those who return physically unharmed. In this sense, Young Bateman and Anne become casualties of war, even though they die in Clifton instead of Leith. Furthermore, the fact that Anne marries a man named German suggests a tenuous but potentially more targeted connection to the events of the mid-1630s, with the Thirty Years’ War raging through the German states. For Sampson, it seems, war and an alliance with German(s) produce calamity, no matter what one’s intentions. In addition, the play highlights the power and danger of female agency: Elizabeth’s is lauded, but when Anne exercises her own agency, she causes the deaths of her lover and herself. Although the history play subplot celebrates the glory of England’s victory over France in Scotland, the domestic tragedy undermines that glory.

Even the history play’s depiction of military victory becomes less militaristic than it might seem. At the end, the play emphasizes peace with France, not only by reciting
the terms of the Treaty of Edinburgh but also by staging a more demonstrative reconciliation between the English, Scottish, and French characters: “Enter Lord Grey, Clifton, Arguile, attendants[,] Monlucce, Mortigue, Doysells, all embrace” (12r, emphasis mine). The war has not only ended, but the characters mark the newfound peace with a group hug. This amity among characters of traditionally hostile nations reminds seventeenth-century readers that the peaceful relationships among the three countries that England enjoyed in the early 1630s resulted not from dangerous popish innovations, but rather had a noble and Protestant source in the Leith victory. 63

Furthermore, the war that England fights is cast as righteous self-defense, rather than justified conquest. Elizabeth, Grey says, “Rais’d this hostility for to guard her selfe, / Not to offend, but to defend her owne” (F3v). Elizabeth’s reluctance to fight an offensive war proves her queenly virtue. Since the levying of ship money (begun in 1634) brought the renewed possibility of England becoming embroiled in an offensive war on the Continent, the tragic consequences of war on Elizabeth’s “loving subjects” in the play imply that Caroline peace finds its precedent in Elizabethan victory, costly though it was. 64 In fact, the very costliness of the Elizabethan war is highlighted in one last scene

63 The play might stress religious unity even more explicitly. Clifton’s tag line is “By my hollidam,” an oath that seems linguistically linked to Henry VIII’s “By my Holydame” in Shakespeare and Fletcher’s play (5.1.117). The OED cites Shakespeare’s use in its definition of “halidom,” which it defines as “A holy thing, a holy relic; anything regarded as sacred. Much used, down to 16th c., in oaths and adjurations” (“halidom, -dome, n. 5”). However, the OED notes, “The substitution of -dam, -dame, in the suffix was app. due to popular etymology, the word being taken to denote ‘Our Lady’. ” Clifton’s use of the oath could therefore align him with a Catholic tradition, thus showing Elizabeth’s army as succeeding because of the efforts of its religiously diverse population. Unfortunately, the significance of Clifton’s oath must remain speculation, since the play never really explores this possibility. In fact, it is possible that the oath connects to the notion of Elizabeth as “Our Lady,” especially since Clifton so frequently invokes the queen’s name.

64 Kevin Sharpe points out that in 1635, “there were new circumstances abroad and specific initiatives to promote: there were rumours of war and the king had set in order his militia and embarked on the
from the domestic tragedy, in which Old Boote thinks that the returned miller/soldier, Miles, is a ghost. Although the scene ends up being played for laughs, the laughs uneasily remind the audience of the tragedy that has accompanied this military victory. Politically speaking, *The Vow Breaker* makes a more complex argument about foreign policy than it might seem to because of the connections it forges between the history play and domestic tragedy subplots.

Thus, when Elizabeth appears in the final scene of the play, she serves as not only the royal foil to Anne Boote but also the ideal monarch, equally concerned with maintaining England’s international power as with ensuring that her subjects have what they need on a local level. Her first order of business with Clifton and the other Englishmen she meets with involves making the River Trent navigable to improve trade. Elizabeth agrees to do so, and moreover she recognizes that the strength of the English throne depends on the strength of English localities and, ultimately, English subjects. She tells Arguile,

\[
\text{Guarded by thee and these our loving subjects,}
\]

\[
\text{We feare noe Spanish force, nor French-mens braves,}
\]

\[
\text{Let Austria bragge; and Rome, and Italy}
\]

\[
\text{Send out their poyson’d Darts; dreadlesse we stand}
\]

\[
\text{Protected by thy never failing power. (K1v)}
\]

Elizabeth succeeded in spite of her “virgin’s arme” because of her loyal subjects, but the inclusion of Arguile (i.e., Archibald Campbell, fifth earl of Argyll) also links her with equipment of a fleet from ship money, which was soon to be extended throughout the country” (*Personal Rule*, 427).
Scottish Protestants, which emphasizes the points of agreement between England and Scotland. Although England and Scotland may not have been ruled by the same monarch in 1560, Arguile’s presence reminds readers that the two nations had not only been allied under Elizabeth but also shared a history based on Protestantism and unity that could replace the Auld Alliance between Scotland and France.

In fact, the invocation of the name of Argyll itself highlights the triumph of Protestant over Catholic. In 1636 the current earl of Argyll was a well-known Catholic convert. He had converted in 1618, at which point he also decided to serve Spain; for three years he lost his title altogether. Although the earldom was restored to him in 1621, he relinquished everything except the title (and, naturally, a yearly allowance) to his son, Lord Lorne, who held to the presbyterian Protestantism in which he had been raised. Indeed, after his father’s death in 1638, Lorne would become a staunch Covenanter. However, in 1636 he seems to have been primarily interested in acquiring more land and consolidating his power; he was the most influential Scottish subject and meant to remain so. He was already known to oppose Laudian reforms, so in spite of the seventh earl’s Catholicism, the name Campbell remained associated with Scottish puritanism.

---

65 Argyll (1538-1573) was one of the most powerful men in Scotland. In 1560 he aligned with England because of his staunch Protestantism; however, he later broke with Elizabeth. He similarly first supported Mary, Queen of Scots, and then eventually gave up on her after her imprisonment in England. Still, he was a major influence on the growth of Protestantism in Scotland. See Jane E.A. Dawson, *The Politics of Religion in the Age of Mary, Queen of Scots: The Earl of Argyll and the Struggle for Britain and Ireland* (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).


For the queen in the play, the Anglo-Scottish alliance rests on the love of her people; for Caroline readers, Anglo-Scottish-French peace rested on the marriage between Charles and Henrietta Maria and gained legitimacy because of its connections with the Elizabethan victory at Leith. In fact, the final scene, so triumphant on the surface, also undercuts the glory of the English victory. Clifton chastises the French for pursuing war instead of making peace from the first:

So come we after warre, bloudy turmoiles
To bring you peace, which had you sued before,
Thousands that now ly boweld in the earth
Had liv’d to memory what we have done. (H4v)

Such scolding on Clifton’s part rings insincere: after all, he thought it would do Young Bateman good to fight for his queen. Yet Sampson’s emphasis on the reconciliation between France, Scotland, and England still suggests a celebration of peace over war—or, perhaps, a celebration of current peace in 1636, without urging for another war. The play paraphrases the Treaty of Edinburgh, commanding “all manner of persons, borne under their [i.e., Elizabeth, François II, and Mary’s] obeyances, or being in their services, to lay by all hostility either by Sea or Land, and to keepe good peace eyther with other from this time forwards” (H4v-I1r). In the old days, the play suggests, England had joined with Scotland to fight against the insidious incursions of the French; now, thanks to Charles and Henrietta Maria’s marital alliance that unites England, Scotland, and France, peace can reign once more. Indeed, by the time the French are ready to leave, Clifton marvels at their courtesy: “By my Hollidam, they have feasted us. / Not like to
foes but to friends” (I2r). The English tradition of animosity toward France is falling aside in favor of a new friendship between the nations, one that Sampson casts as no Caroline innovation but, in fact, an Elizabethan achievement. Just as Charles I had made peace after the wars of the 1620s, Sampson’s Elizabeth forges peace in the wake of battle—although Elizabeth’s peace resulted from victory, unlike Charles’s. Still, even though Charles’s wars had not proven as successful as the siege of Leith, *The Vow Breaker* depicts England’s peace with its traditional enemies in the 1630s as a desired outcome that Elizabeth had also pursued.

In the context of Caroline Elizabethanism, the two halves of *The Vow Breaker* fit together in a way that illuminates an earlier version of a moderate Elizabeth than scholars have previously recognized. The domestic tragedy subplot critiques the consequences of Elizabeth’s military action against France; the history play subplot supplies historical justification for an Anglo-Franco-Scottish league. Considered together, they map out a path of moderation that enables both celebration of the glorious Elizabethan victory over the French and positive attitudes toward Charles’s current foreign policy. Furthermore, they do so while emphasizing the play’s original performance locations in Nottinghamshire. William Sampson was no courtier poet; he wrote *The Vow Breaker* while serving as part of Sir Henry Willoughby’s household in Derbyshire. Nor is there record of the play’s performance in London. Instead, this provincial play, so invested in the local lore of Nottinghamshire, reflects a surprisingly sympathetic attitude toward Charles’s foreign policy in the early 1630s. Like the other plays examined here, *The Vow Breaker* negotiates among competing ways of thinking about the Elizabethan past,
ultimately balancing on the middle ground between a rabid militarism and an obsequious pacifism.

**Conclusion**

*The Fair Maid of the West, The Emperour of the East, and The Vow Breaker* all pin Elizabethanism to English localities from Cornwall to Nottinghamshire, even while highlighting the imagined national communities of the peaceful years of the 1630s. In this nationalization of the localities, the texts reflect one of Charles’s particular hobby-horses during the personal rule: the importance of traditional forms of government in which local gentry governed in the counties. Kevin Sharpe points out that Charles repeatedly issued proclamations that banished gentry from London and ordered them back to their country estates, arguing that he did so out of a concern to stem the decline of both hospitality and the powers and privileges of the nobility. Instead of congregating at the political and social center, the gentry and nobility dispersed to the localities, to some extent closing the gap between not only the gentry and the working classes but also the provinces and the capital. The plays considered here similarly emphasize the national scale of local concerns.

Furthermore, although these texts indicate that the unique loyalty, love, and virtue of English subjects constituted a national identity rooted in the virtues of the Elizabethan age, they also suggest ambivalent attitudes toward Elizabeth and her reign that prevent

---

68 Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, 414-22, esp. 417. Martin Butler and Thomas Cogswell have pointed out that the policy also might have raised more money for the crown and prevented oppositional gentry from gathering in London. Sharpe discounts their claims based on lack of evidence, but it seems that Charles would have welcomed such side effects.
them from falling into any simplistic version of patriotic nostalgia. All three plays promote a moderate middle ground between the “oppositional” literature that scholars like Martin Butler and Margot Heinemann have discussed and the “decadent” Cavalier drama that Alfred Harbage so famously excoriated. By invoking figures of Elizabeth, playwrights as diverse as Heywood, Massinger, and Sampson produced complex reflections on what it means to be English, how to govern well, and how to celebrate an igenous foreign policy when the most prominent English “golden age” was so frequently associated with militarism.

That the texts treating Elizabeth in such complex ways are all plays further highlights the heteroglossic potentials of Elizabethanism. As we saw in Chapter 1, the ghosts of Elizabethan political and cultural figures were made to voice more or less polemical arguments about the Caroline era; the resurrections of Elizabeth in playbooks of the early 1630s participate more obliquely in similar commentaries. The characteristic multivocality of drama opens up The Fair Maid of the West, The Emperour of the East, and The Vow Breaker to different conversations about the Elizabethan past: not only the nostalgic memories of Elizabethan victories or the contention over the appropriate roles of counselors and favorites, but also anxiety about the deleterious consequences of war, natural for Englishmen and -women keeping tabs on the Thirty Years’ War raging on the Continent. The gestures toward Charles’s peaceful foreign policy of 1630-1636 also appear in other Caroline literature, as Chapter 3 discusses. Overall, however, these plays demonstrate that long before the outbreak of the Civil War, English writers across the political spectrum resurrected Elizabeth to argue for moderate positions.
Moreover, the plays show that although the word “nationalism” may not have existed and the modern polity certainly did not, English writers and publishers of the 1630s were already trying to negotiate a national identity that could reconcile their current king with his legendary predecessor. Elizabeth thus became a legitimating force powerful and flexible enough to represent not only critique of Charles but also a moderate and cautious support for him—or, at least, for certain aspects of his policies—yet without becoming part of a propaganda machine. In this sense, nostalgia for Elizabeth in *The Fair Maid of the West*, *The Emperour of the East*, and *The Vow Breaker* enables a complex array of religious and political beliefs. In these plays, “Queen Elizabeth of blessed memory” conjures a magical construct indeed, remarkable as neither an avatar of protest nor a tool of the state. Instead, via a sort of rhetorical alchemy, “Englands royall B E S S E” turns extremism into moderation in service of the highest stakes of all: the future of the English nation.
Chapter 3

Caroline Arcadias: Adaptations of Sidney at the Caroline Court

In 1635, nine-year-old John Aubrey and his father visited a draper in Gloucester who had hung “in his parlour over the Chimney, the whole description of the Funerall [of Sir Philip Sidney], engraved and printed on papers pasted together.”¹ The document that Aubrey describes is Thomas Lant’s roll of thirty-six engravings depicting Sidney’s funeral.² The draper had arranged the document like a scroll, so that by turning a pin, one could watch “the figures march all in order”—thereby replicating the experience of watching the funeral procession (280). Aubrey writes, “It did make such a strong impression on my tender Phantasy that I remember it as if it were but yesterday” (280). The Gloucester draper’s prominent and elaborate display of the engravings fifty years after the funeral illustrates a persistent regard for Sir Philip Sidney as the ideal Elizabethan courtier and “most accomplished Cavalier of his time,” according to Aubrey (278). Even more, it indicates the ways in which Sidney’s memory was bound closely
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with printed artifacts. The roll of engravings of his funeral helped to form his posthumous reputation as a Protestant war hero, while *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia* and other texts based on and responding to it augmented his legacy in the market for printed romance, poetry, and drama, a legacy that dominated the pastoral revival at the Caroline courts.

During the first four decades of the seventeenth century the *Arcadia* emerged as one of the primary texts in the nascent literary canon, not least because—as Aubrey’s account of the Gloucester draper’s funeral roll indicates—Sidney was remembered as the ideal Elizabethan courtier, even though he had anything but an untroubled relationship with the queen during his lifetime. Moreover, his legacy as the dominant literary figure of the 1590s linked him inextricably with memories of the Elizabethan era. The repeated printings of the *Arcadia* perpetuated Sidney’s reputation as a literary luminary: every edition from 1598 on includes *The Defence of Poesy*, which lays out Renaissance England’s most famous example of literary criticism; *Astrophel and Stella*, which ignited the fashion for sonnet sequences in the 1590s; and *The Lady of May*, which emphasizes Sidney’s elite status by recounting a dramatic production involving Queen Elizabeth herself. Moreover, as Gavin Alexander argues, Sidney, who wrote himself into the *Arcadia* as Philisides and included an Elizabeth figure in Queen Helen of Corinth,

---

3 The *Arcadia* possesses a notoriously tangled textual history. It exists in three distinct early versions: the Old *Arcadia*, extant only in manuscript; Sidney’s incomplete revision, the New *Arcadia*, which leaves off mid-sentence in Book 3 and was published in 1590; and the composite New *Arcadia*, published in 1593, which cobbles the end of Book 3 and Books 4 and 5 of the Old *Arcadia* onto the New. Subsequent editions of the composite *Arcadia* were published in 1598, 1599, 1605, 1613, 1621, 1627, 1629, 1633, and 1638. When I refer to “the *Arcadia*,” I refer to this composite edition. For a complete textual history of *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia*, including title page transcriptions, see Bent Juel-Jensen, “Sir Philip Sidney, 1554-1586: A Check-List of Early Editions of His Works,” in *Sir Philip Sidney: An Anthology of Modern Criticism*, ed. Dennis Kay, 289-314 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), esp. 299-301.
became the most influential practitioner of a specifically English imaginative pastoral mode. Following his lead, Elizabethan and Jacobean authors of pastoral such as Thomas Watson, Samuel Daniel, Michael Drayton, and Gervase Markham further anglicized their classical precedents, blending English names with Greek and Latin and often including characters that represent Sidney himself. In this way, Alexander writes, by the first decade of the seventeenth century, “Arcadia ha[d] been Englished.” During the early Stuart period, its power as an imaginative and ideal space took on both nationalist and nationalizing overtones, providing the most lasting model for the imaginative English pastoral realm that coalesced during the 1580s and 1590s.

The multiple editions, adaptations, and appropriations of the Arcadia demonstrate its importance to English literary culture. In the eleven years between 1627 and 1638, The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia was published four times; in contrast, it had been reprinted only twice in the previous two decades (in 1613 and 1621). By the end of the 1630s, the Arcadia had spawned a long list of imitations, adaptations, and sequels. Sir William Alexander and Sir Richard Beling wrote additions to the Arcadia that were incorporated in subsequent editions. Lady Mary Wroth patterned The Countesse of Mountgomeries Urania (1621) on her uncle’s romance. In Elizabethan and Jacobean England, the various episodes in the Arcadia provided fodder for dramatic adaptations: Mucedorus (1598), the most frequently reprinted play of the sixteenth and seventeenth

---


5 Sir William Alexander’s addition began to be bound with late issues of the 1613 edition and was included in 1621 and after, and Beling’s was included beginning in 1627. For a detailed account, see Juel-Jensen, 295-7 for Alexander and 299 for Beling. Interestingly, both of these additions were first published in Dublin.
centuries, borrowed its main character’s name and the broad brushstrokes of its plot from Sidney; John Day parodied the main plot in *The Isle of Gulls* (1606); Shakespeare famously drew the Gloucester subplot in *King Lear* (1608) from the *Arcadia*; and Beaumont and Fletcher adapted stories from the *Arcadia* in *Cupid’s Revenge* (1615). The 1630s saw a renewed interest in earlier Arcadian works, prompting second editions of both *The Isle of Gulls* (1633) and *Cupid’s Revenge* (1630). Additionally, in 1638 Sir Henry Herbert allowed a play called *The Arcadian Shepherdess* (now lost) for performance at Salisbury Court.6

However, several surviving Arcadian adaptations written during the Caroline era return more explicitly to Sidney’s work than their Jacobean predecessors did, trading on the familiarity of Arcadian plotlines and characters. Francis Quarles (1629) and Henry Glapthorne (1639) drew on one of the most memorable episodes when they adapted *Argalus and Parthenia* to poetic and dramatic forms, respectively, and James Shirley’s *A Pastorall Called the Arcadia* (1640) dramatizes the main plot of the work. All of these writers, Stephen Dobranski argues, “min[ed] Sidney’s romance for source material, but symbolically he validated their works, like a celebrity offering a commercial endorsement.”7 By the time the English Civil War broke out, the *Arcadia* had become an Elizabethan relic, but an updatable one that invited interactions and adaptations.8

---


Examining the literary nostalgia of these Caroline adaptations not only helps us understand how and why Sidney appealed to Caroline writers, but also forces us to reconsider how nostalgia in the 1620s and 1630s might argue for new policies based on a loving union between England and France in the persons of Charles I and Henrietta Maria.

Sidney and the Caroline Politics of Pastoral

The Arcadia occupied a central space in English literary culture, as the multiple adaptations, additions, and appropriations of the text show. Thus, Arcadian politics have drawn special scholarly attention since the theory boom of the 1980s. Alan Sinfield explores the New Arcadia’s critiques of Elizabeth and monarchy itself, arguing that Sidney’s emphasis on “the need to limit royal power” dovetails with his interest in promoting the rights of the nobility and gentry. Scholars such as Blair Worden and David Norbrook examine the political poetics of the Arcadia, drawing parallels between, for example, Basilius’s pursuit of the contemplative life and Elizabeth’s reluctance to pursue a more active foreign policy. Similarly, Worden traces the political implications of the Old Arcadia, fastidiously analyzing the language of the “forward protestants” (including Sidney’s uncle, the earl of Leicester, and father-in-law, Francis Walsingham) to show that Sidney echoes their turns of phrase when discussing political matters.

---


Furthermore, he argues, in the New *Arcadia* (ca. 1582-84), Sidney is concerned with the threat posed by Mary, Queen of Scots, figuring her as the wicked and ambitious Cecropia. If this interpretation took hold in the seventeenth century, it would cast James in a less than flattering light as Cecropia’s noble but morally conflicted son, Amphialus. Worden further claims that the seventeenth century remembered the Sidney who emematized “the tradition and decorum of Cavalier culture” (although, as Worden notes, this association did not “monopolize” Sidney’s memory) but “neglected the Sidney who questioned and opposed.” However, an analysis of the Caroline adaptations of Arcadian stories shows that the *Arcadia* retained more political ambiguity than Worden acknowledges.

David Norbrook focuses more on the *Arcadia’s* “poetic world,” drawing connections between Sidney’s representation of the Arcadian commonwealth and the social pressures of Elizabethan society beyond the court. He suggests that part of the valuable work of the *Arcadia* involves an active imagining of a government that must respond to the demands of more than merely the Crown: “The detached and critical cast of mind that enabled Sidney to conceive of the work of art as a ‘world’ was the same kind of capacity that produced the concept of the ‘commonwealth’ as a complex entity independent of the person of the ruler,” he writes. Norbrook’s nuanced reading of the rebellion scenes in the New *Arcadia* suggests that Sidney espoused theories of “limited

---

11 Worden, *The Sound of Virtue*, 171-83. Unsurprisingly, Caroline adaptations of the *Arcadia* do not refer to Cecropia, even when they talk about her son, Amphialus.

12 Ibid., xxii-xxiii.

rebellion” and “sympathize[d] with noble rebels against tyrannous monarchs.”\textsuperscript{14} Indeed, Shirley in particular picks up these threads in \textit{A Pastorall Called the Arcadia}, which represents rebellion in complicated and ambiguous ways. Norbrook’s work highlights the \textit{Arcadia}’s conflicts regarding matters of governance and opposition, which suggest that the ambiguities of Caroline adaptations align with their source, rather than resulting from the rhetorical or literary clumsiness of Quarles, Glapthorne, and Shirley.

Although many scholars have focused on the \textit{Arcadia}’s connections and resonances in Elizabethan politics, along with its Jacobean adaptations, few have analyzed its roles in Caroline culture. Lisa Hopkins has discussed Sidney’s influence on John Ford, suggesting a fairly simplistic nostalgic relationship between Ford and the “glorious past” of the Elizabethan era, represented in his work by allusions to the \textit{Arcadia}.\textsuperscript{15} Patrick Hogan compares the comic scenes in Sidney’s \textit{Arcadia} with Shirley’s staging of them in \textit{A Pastorall Called the Arcadia}, but he never explores the significance of the changes that Shirley makes or why Shirley would choose to adapt the \textit{Arcadia} in the 1630s.\textsuperscript{16}

Annabel Patterson provides the most influential analysis of the \textit{Arcadia}’s role in Caroline England, contending that the \textit{Arcadia} served such a vital purpose during the reign of Charles I because of its resonance with the king’s own “royal romance” (in both senses of the term). Charles, she suggests, “self-consciously identified himself with a

\textsuperscript{14} Norbrook, \textit{Poetry and Politics}, 89.


spiritualized version of chivalric romance,” while “Henrietta Maria had, as is well known, chosen the pastoral romance as her personal genre.”17 The Arcadia provides such fruitful ground for allusion and adaptation because it blends chivalric and pastoral romance, combining tales of knightly derring-do with the pastoral relocation of the Arcadian royal family. Patterson notes quite rightly that “the Arcadia became, for the Caroline court, the center of a little renaissance.”18 In this context, she briefly points out the existence of the adaptations that I analyze below, but only to criticize them; she marvels in particular that Quarles’s Argalus and Parthenia became so successful, deploring its “great length,” narrow scope, and “execrable verse.”19 Furthermore, although she recognizes that the Caroline texts evince at least some form of “cultural revisionism”—a claim that certainly lies at the heart of my argument—she is not interested in what kind of revisionism they represent or what that might mean for interpretations of the Arcadia as a full-blown Caroline cultural phenomenon.

Other scholars mention the Caroline adaptations as mere background for their primary arguments. Clare Kinney, for example, notes that Shirley’s A Pastorall Called the Arcadia “offers a relatively decorous romantic comedy (although Shirley, like Day, amplifies the comic grotesqueries associated with the clown Dametas).”20 Likewise, she points out that Glapthorne’s Argalus and Parthenia ignores the larger political context of

17 Annabel Patterson, Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), 170.

18 Ibid., 171.

19 Ibid.

Book 3 of the *Arcadia* in favor of focusing on the love story, although she does not discuss the ways in which Glapthorne depicts a different and more ambiguous political situation.21 However, there is little reason for her to do so, since her argument concerns how Beaumont and Fletcher’s *Cupid’s Revenge* whittles away the ambiguities and complexities of Sidney’s romance in adapting the Erona, Plangus, and Zelmane stories.

Gavin Alexander similarly writes off Quarles, Glapthorne, and Shirley’s works as unthinking nostalgia. Although the rest of his book carefully examines the Arcadian discourses that circulate in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England, these Caroline adaptations are relegated to a footnote.22 The sentence that begins the paragraph in which these adaptations are discussed claims, “Nostalgia is the sign that a dead end has been reached,” a sentiment that unfairly shunts Quarles, Glapthorne, and Shirley into a boring and unproductive critical cul-de-sac. However, by focusing on the type of nostalgia that revels in the melancholy pleasure of the idealized past (that is, the type of nostalgia that the Gloucester draper’s funeral roll might have spurred), Alexander ignores the important notion that nostalgia comes in more than one form and can be deployed for different purposes.23

Stephen Dobranski acknowledges the import of nostalgia more clearly, arguing that Arcadian adaptations and sequels demonstrate the collaborative nature of readership in the seventeenth century and construct authorship as a communal rather than an individual enterprise. Still, he points out, “all of these contributions and influences helped

---


22 Alexander, *Writing After Sidney*, 333.

23 For an overview of nostalgia theory, see the Introduction, 20-24.
to advance Sidney’s individual identity” and “reinforced Sidney’s authority as the author of *Arcadia*.” Although Dobranski recognizes the ideological significance of Elizabethan nostalgia as emblematized in the perpetual revisions of the *Arcadia*, he isolates Sidney as its primary focus. Similarly, though he connects Sidneian nostalgia with contemporary politics, he still does not examine Caroline adaptations like Quarles’s, instead focusing his attention on poems attributed to Sidney himself.

The *Arcadia*’s many critics have analyzed the relationships between the Old and New *Arcadias*, between Arcadian characters and Elizabethan figures, and between the *Arcadia* and its imitators in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. Yet few have examined its Caroline adaptations. This chapter addresses the critical gap left open by critics who observe the popularity of these texts but neglect to analyze them. If Caroline adaptations of the *Arcadia* are nostalgic, I argue, then Quarles, Glapthorne, and Shirley’s demonstrate that this form of nostalgia actively reconstructs the literary past, adopting the *Arcadia*’s particularly English pastoral form to reflect cannily on contemporary foreign policy.

**Gentlewomen’s Silken Laps: Quarles and the Queen**

Francis Quarles’s long narrative poem *Argalus and Parthenia*, first published in 1629, became one of the seventeenth century’s most popular poems; it was reprinted in 1630, 1632, and 1635, and it went through another fifteen editions by 1692. Of the Caroline adaptations of the *Arcadia*, it is the most self-consciously literary, and it claims the highest cultural status. From the title page, *Argalus and Parthenia* constructs itself as

---

a monumental work: indeed, the unique, customized engraving depicts a classical monument titled “ARGALVS and PARTHENIA,” with “The Argument of yᵉ History” inscribed below. The argument appears framed by two Corinthian pillars, but a curtain is drawn over it so that only the left and right edges are visible. Fragments of words peep out from the edges of the curtain, recognizable as names and locations from the story. On the facing page, a short poem, “The minde of the Frontspiece [sic],” explains this cryptic arrangement:

Reader, behind this silken Frontpiece lyes
The Argument of our Booke; which, to your eyes
Our Muse (for serious causes, and best knowne
Vnto her selfe) commands should be vnshowne;
And therefore, to that end, she hath thought fit
To draw this Curtaine, twixt your eye and it.²⁵

This coy depiction of the argument as something that needs to be hidden suggests that Quarles envisions the poem as a private space—in fact, a specifically feminine one, guarded by the mysterious (and, of course, female) Muse. The “silken” frontispiece, echoed in the “silken laps” in which, Quarles says, “I know this booke will choose to lye,” suggests that this monument of literature is meant for female readers (A3v). Indeed, in the preface to the reader, he makes his intended audience clear: “Ladies […] my suit is, that you would be pleased to giue the faire Parthenia your noble entertainment: She hath crost the Seas for your acquaintance, and is come to liue and dye with you; to whose

gentle hands I recommend her, and kisse them” (A3v). The seas that she has crossed refer not only to Arcadia’s idyllic Grecian location, but also to the Irish Sea that the book has crossed to be published in London. Quarles wrote the poem during his time in Dublin as secretary to James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, and the preface is signed and dated “Dublin this 4. of March. 1628 [i.e., 1629]” (A3v). Moreover, Quarles’s allusion to a noblewoman who had crossed seas and come to live in England fits into a network of multivalent allusions in the poem that conjure up images of Henrietta Maria, enjoying newfound prominence at court in early 1629.

The dedication to the handsome and controversial Henry Rich, earl of Holland, likewise signals that Quarles wanted Argalus and Parthenia to appeal not only to women of the genteel classes but also to Henrietta Maria’s courtly milieu. Holland enjoyed an impeccable pedigree: he was the son of Penelope Devereux Rich, Sidney’s “Stella”; the cousin of Lady Dorothy Percy, who married Robert Sidney, second earl of Leicester; and a client of the duke of Buckingham. Despite Holland’s reputation for extravagance and womanizing, he valued and worked towards the goals of the Protestant faction largely composed of his network of relatives, descendants of the Elizabethan Devereuxs, Riches, Percys, and Sidneys who had achieved such prominence fifty years before. After Buckingham’s 1628 assassination, Holland’s powerful connections and personal

26 See Karl Josef Höltingen, Francis Quarles: Meditativer Dichter, Emblematicer, Royalist, Eine biographische und kritische Studie (Tübingen, 1978), 58-59. The Sidney family’s connections with Ireland suggest a sharper resonance to Quarles’ writing Argalus and Parthenia in Dublin.


28 Donagan, “A Courtier’s Progress,” 318. On Holland’s spendthrift nature, see ibid., 339; on his womanizing, see Smuts, “Puritan Followers,” 30.
charisma served him well; he became one of the leaders of Henrietta Maria’s party at court, in spite of his religious differences with the queen.\(^{29}\) By 1629 he had known her for five years.\(^{30}\) King James had sent him to Paris in 1624 to lay the groundwork for Charles’s marriage to Henrietta Maria, and Holland’s courtship on Charles’s behalf created a bond with the queen that lasted throughout much of the 1630s.\(^{31}\)

A particularly successful courtier, Holland also enjoyed the king’s favor and garnered a number of offices and honors both before and after Buckingham’s assassination. By March 1629, he was already captain of the king’s guard, gentleman of the bedchamber, chancellor of Cambridge University, and a member of both the Privy Council and the Order of the Garter, as the dedication of *Argalus and Parthenia* notes (A2r). In the months following Buckingham’s assassination, the French ambassador created a coterie with Holland and other courtiers “to push for a renewal of the Anglo-French alliance, in opposition to a rival group more sympathetic to Spain. Together this coterie set about instructing the queen on how to use her personal relationship with Charles to further their purposes.”\(^{32}\) They embarked on this mission in July 1629, a few

\(^{29}\) Donagan, “A Courtier’s Progress,” 323; Smuts, “Puritan Followers,” 27.

\(^{30}\) Melinda J. Gough describes a ballet starring Henrietta Maria that Holland witnessed during his stay in Paris and that seems to have borne directly on his reports to Charles; see “A Newly Discovered Performance by Henrietta Maria,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 65 (2002): 435-47.

\(^{31}\) Indeed, as Donagan notes, “Rumour said that [his friendship with Henrietta Maria] was unduly warm, but it seems more likely that in her difficult first years in England, overshadowed by Buckingham, the queen was grateful for the friendship and solacing charm of someone she had first known in France” (323). Holland strove to ingratiate not only himself but also his wife to the queen; by 1628, Holland had arranged a place for his wife in Henrietta Maria’s household (ibid.).

months after *Argalus and Parthenia* was first published.\(^{33}\) Quarles’s choice to dedicate *Argalus and Parthenia* to Holland suggests that the poet wanted to play on Holland’s Sidneian heritage, revising Sidney’s text to fit remarkably well with an irenic Anglo-French ideology that would soon come to dominate the court.

The dedication to Holland thus connects Quarles’s adaptation of Sidney’s *Arcadia* with the political circle in which Holland moved—a circle that notably included the queen. In this light, Quarles’s assumption in his preface to the reader that his book would appeal to a female audience comments not only on the imagined public market for his work but also a specific female courtly milieu.\(^{34}\) Smuts highlights the particular aptness of Quarles’s choice, remarking that Penelope Rich’s “maternal example helps to explain Holland’s marked penchant for cultivating women as allies in court politics, including not only Henrietta Maria but Lady Carlisle and the Duchess of Chevreuse.”\(^{35}\) Holland enjoyed familial and political connections to both Sidney and the powerful women at court, including Henrietta Maria herself.\(^{36}\)

Given Holland’s personal connections with Sidney, Quarles’s claim in the preface to the reader that he, too, enjoys a Sidneian inheritance suggests a particular kinship with the earl: “I was a Sience [i.e., scion] taken out of the Orchard of Sir Philip Sydney, of

\(^{33}\) See Smuts, “Religion,” 23 n.38. *Argalus and Parthenia* was entered into the Stationers’ Register on 27 March.

\(^{34}\) Intriguingly, Smuts points out that by the mid-1630s, Henry Percy and Viscount Conway knew that Holland consulted with “a council of women […] about political strategy” (“Puritan Followers,” 32).

\(^{35}\) Smuts, “Religion,” 23.

\(^{36}\) Richard Cust notes that Henrietta Maria “comforted [Charles] through the period of mourning and then became a constant companion. By October [1628] it was reported that the couple were doting on each other and the king’s new habit of lying ‘with the queen every night’ seemed set to become ‘the fashion at court.’” See Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (London: Pearson, 2005), 77.
prettious memory,” Quarles writes (A3r).\(^3\) Just as Sidney was memorialized as the ideal blend of Elizabethan aristocratic virtues, especially those of poet and courtier, now Quarles adapts Sidney’s work in a form uniquely suited for the aesthetic and political demands of the Caroline court. He recognizes that *Argalus and Parthenia* represents a new direction, since his previous works all focused on religion.\(^3\) Acknowledging the courtly and political role he is playing by dedicating the book to Holland, Quarles writes, “this Booke differs from my former, as a Courtier from a Churchman: But if any think it vnfit, for one to play both parts, I haue presidents for it” (A3r). Quarles’s consciousness of entering into a newly and explicitly political poetic discourse belies one scholar’s claim that “Quarles’s early poetry [...] contains little that could be construed as commentary on the times.”\(^3\) More than that, Quarles’s consciousness of his courtier-like book indicates that he was carefully negotiating important political matters in early 1629.

Indeed, I contend, even though Quarles savvily revives the *Arcadia* to appeal to Holland’s Elizabethan familial and ideological heritage, *Argalus and Parthenia* actually

---

37 One might wonder why, in that case, Quarles did not dedicate *Argalus and Parthenia* to Leicester. I would argue that his choice to dedicate it to Holland emphasizes the connection between Sidney and Penelope Rich; the relationship that inspired *Astrophel and Stella* seems more fitting for the dedication of a text that focuses on ideal love than the fraternal relationship between Leicester and Sidney would.

38 Quarles’s previous poetical works included *A Feast for Wormes* (1620), which retells the Book of Jonah; *Hadassa, or the History of Queen Esther* (1621), which retells the Book of Esther; *Job Militant* (1624), which retells the Book of Lamentations; and *Sions Elegies* (1624), which retells the Book of Lamentations; and *Sions Sonets* (1625), which retells the Song of Songs. Adrian Streete provides a compelling analysis of Quarles’s Jacobean poetry, debunking the idea that Quarles was a Spenserian poet under Michelle O’Callaghan’s definition of Spenserianism as concerned with a constellation of patriotic virtues centered around nostalgia for an Elizabethan age of glory that was characterized by militarism, Hispanophobia, and a political and geographic sense of religion. See Adrian Streete, “Francis Quarles’ Early Poetry and the Discourses of Jacobean Spenserianism,” *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* 1.1 (Spring 2009), http://www.northernrenaissance.org/documents/uploaded/file/Issue%201%20PDFs/Streete.pdf; Michelle O’Callaghan, *The ’Shepheard’s Nation’: Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612-25* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

opposes the militant anti-Spanish policies that Holland supported.\textsuperscript{40} As a privy councilor, Holland joined Sir Dudley Carleton and the earl of Pembroke in a vociferously anti-Spanish group that favored both a French alliance and a rapprochement with parliament.\textsuperscript{41} But rather than forming a league with France to fight Spain, Quarles urges Holland to go further: alliance with France and peace with Spain, a harmonious foreign policy represented and reflected by the loving relationship between Charles I and Henrietta Maria. As I argue below, Argalus and Parthenia suggests that Quarles envisioned an irenic foreign policy as the English wars of the 1620s wound down—and he adapted Sidney’s Arcadia to reap the benefits of its associations with English political discourse and to rewrite its literary nostalgia for the Elizabethan era.

The story of Argalus and Parthenia embodies the sort of ideal love that would so frequently characterize the literature and drama popular at Henrietta Maria’s court in the 1630s. In the Arcadia, their story only spans a few pages total. Sidney’s Parthenia, a beautiful and virtuous virgin, agrees when her mother urges her to accept a marriage proposal from one of her suitors, Demagoras. Before she formally does so, Parthenia meets and falls in love with Argalus. When she then rejects Demagoras’s proposal, he takes his revenge by throwing poison on her face, disfiguring her horribly. Argalus declares that he still loves her and wants to marry her, but she refuses and runs away. A few months later, a young woman who looks exactly like Parthenia returns. She tells everyone who recognizes her that she is not Parthenia, but rather a distant relative who

\textsuperscript{40} In this, Quarles builds on his Jacobean work, in which, as Streete points out, he “share[s] with the Arminians a scepticism towards the bellicose rhetoric of the militants and an assertion of pacific values” (92).

\textsuperscript{41} Smuts, “Puritan Followers,” 29.
happens to look exactly like Parthenia. In fact, she claims, Parthenia is dead, and her
dying wish was that her lookalike should marry Argalus in her place. Argalus refuses,
again protesting his love for Parthenia. Overjoyed, the newcomer reveals that she is the
real Parthenia, miraculously healed. The couple marries. Just a few months later,
however, Basilius, the Arcadian king, summons Argalus to fight the knight Amphialus.
Amphialus kills Argalus. After Argalus dies, an unknown knight who calls himself the
Knight of the Tomb arrives to fight Amphialus. The Knight of the Tomb suffers a fatal
wound, and when Amphialus removes the helmet, the knight is revealed to be Parthenia.
Argalus and Parthenia are buried in the same tomb with a touching epitaph
memorializing the beauty of their love.

Quarles transforms Sidney’s brief sketch of Argalus and Parthenia’s story into an
independent and self-consciously literary work that claims an epic status in both form and
content. He expands the story to fill 160 pages (not counting paratextual material)—
roughly five thousand lines of poetry. Argalus and Parthenia is divided into three books,
which feature several of the typical trappings of epic: invocations of the Muse, epic
similes, heroic couplets, and the active participation of the gods. But Quarles’s epic is a
particularly pastoral one. The first lines laud the “rurall Art” of “many a Shepherd
swaine,” which “did build to Fame / Eternall Trophies of a pastorall name” (A4r).
Arcadia’s pastoral trophies, associated with (Elizabeth’s) “antique dayes,” give the land
and Sidney’s and Quarles’s books as much a share “in the Daphnean tree” as Virgil had.
Just as Spenser turned chivalric romance into a particularly English epic in The Faerie
Queene, so Quarles claims a similarly epic status for pastoral romance. Argalus and
Parthenia capitalizes on the newly resurgent popularity of pastoral literature at the court of Henrietta Maria to rewrite Sidney’s most idealized romantic relationship. Indeed, by following in the footsteps of both Spenser and Sidney, Quarles builds on Elizabethan foundations to create a pastoral epic that reflects the newly kindled royal romance, condemns war, and represents Henrietta Maria as the fulfillment of Queen Elizabeth.

Like Sidney, Quarles casts Parthenia’s loving marriage as the perfect fulfillment of her previous chastity. However, the royal rhetoric that Quarles uses to describe Parthenia suggests typological connections between (a) the virgin Parthenia and Elizabeth, and (b) the married Parthenia and Henrietta Maria. The name Parthenia derives from the Greek parthenos, which, as one sixteenth-century biblical commentator points out, “properly and fully signifieth a Virgin,” adding yet another level to the allegory: Parthenia as Virgin Mary. The first description of Parthenia uses idealized terms that sound very like the mariological ones often used to describe Elizabeth:

There (if th’ exuberance of a word may swell
So high, that Angels may be said, to dwell)
There dwelt that Virgin, that Arcadian glory,
Whose rare composure did abstract the story
Of true perfection, modelling forth

---

*42* Henry Smith, *Gods Arrowe Against Atheists* (London, 1593; STC 22666), sig. D4r. Notably, he makes this argument about the passage in Isaiah that predicts that the Messiah would be born of a virgin, which is parthenos in the Septuagint. Similarly, 1633 saw the publication of Henry Hawkins’s mariological emblem book Partheneia sacra. *Or The mysterious and delicious garden of the sacred Parthenes symbolically set forth and enriched with pious deuises and emblemes for the entertainement of dewout soules; contriued al to the honour of the incomparable Virgin Marie mother of God; for the pleasure and deuotion especially of the Parthenian sodalitie of her Immaculate Conception* (1633; STC 12958). Charles I declared shortly after the royal marriage that Henrietta Maria was to be known as Queen Mary, giving mariological tributes a convenient double meaning.
The height of beauty, and admired worth. (A4r)

An ideally beautiful virgin who dwells with the angels and is associated with “Arcadian glory” must have conjured both the Virgin Mary and the specter of Elizabeth. A lengthy Petrarchan blazon of Parthenia’s beauty follows, noting the standard complement of rose-and-lily cheeks and pearl-like teeth (A4v). The use of clichéd metaphors to describe female beauty certainly appears elsewhere than in courtly Elizabethan sonnet sequences. However, the Petrarchan tradition popularized the expressions, and Sidney’s *Astrophel and Stella*, of course, famously inaugurated the fashion for sonnet sequences in the first place. Quarles preserves the double vision of Parthenia/Elizabeth by mentioning again “That rare Parthenia, in whose heauenly eye / Sits maiden mildnesse, mixt with Maiesty” (A4v). The alliterative *m*’s draw attention to this line in the midst of a poem that generally does not rely on that particular device. Quarles’s emphasis here on Parthenia’s virginity and majesty produces an unavoidable association with the Virgin Queen.

For Quarles, militarism presents an assault on this form of majesty. Demagoras’s attack on Parthenia signifies an unforgivable eruption of violence. His entry to Parthenia’s bower is compared to a “false Cater” (i.e., provisioner) who “surprises” innocent doves “and sheds / Their guiltlesse blood, and parts their gasping heads / From their vaine struggling bodies” (H2r). Demagoras, the military hero, becomes an agent of unfettered brutality who threatens not only Parthenia’s physical safety but also the chastity so bound up with her name and identity. “My sinfull Page may play the foole, and gather / Thy early fruit into his barne, and father / Thy new got Cyprian bastard,” he
threatens (H2v). His attack on her face corresponds with his attack on her reputation; militarism turns into wanton violence and the threat of a particularly degrading rape by a Cyprian page.

The assault marks a transformative moment: by the time Argalus finds Parthenia, she can no longer claim to be herself. “Alas! it is not I,” she tells him, and he puzzles over her reply: “It is my deare Parthenia’s voice; ah me, / And can Parthenia, not Parthenia be?” (H4r). But she has indeed been transformed into “The truest pourtrait of deformity” (I2r). The ruined “maiden mildnesse mix’d with Maiesty” that once recalled the idealized Elizabeth now evokes the elderly Elizabeth:

That louely face
That was, of late, the modell of all grace
And peerelesse beauty, whose imperious eyes
Rauisht where e’re they lookt, and did surprise
The very soules of men; she, she of whom
Nature her selfe was proud, is now become
So loath’d an obiect, so deform’d, disguiz’d,
As darknesse, for mans sake, was well aduis’d
To cloath in mists. (I2r)

Like Marcus Gheeraerts’ c. 1622 portrait of an old, weary Elizabeth with Time and Death—an image that transforms the celebratory Armada portrait into a grim meditation
on the transience of glory—this complicated representation of Parthenia/Elizabeth defies the typical scholarly narrative of nostalgia. Instead, Demagoras’s violence catalyzes Parthenia’s metamorphosis into a “loathed object” of pity and disgust. In the poem, it is a mark of Argalus’s remarkable heroism that he declares his steadfast love for Parthenia even after the attack. For Quarles, the memory of Elizabethan greatness has been deformed by its association with militarism; likewise, Argalus and Parthenia’s tragic fate warns (with ironic prescience, as it turns out) that even the royal couple’s ideal love could be destroyed by following similarly militant policies.

Quarles further develops the Argalus and Parthenia story for a courtly Caroline audience by highlighting the importance of mutual love based on rhetorical skill. Quarles’s most pervasive change to Sidney’s story is that he gives the characters voices, depicting them delivering speeches and talking to one another in a way that Sidney rarely does. The characters’ high rhetoric blends the epic’s demand for elevated style with the court’s interest in refined and elegant language. Perhaps the most conspicuous example of this interest appears when Parthenia rejects Demagoras’s proposal of marriage. Indeed, Demagoras’s forty-eight-line proposal relies on hackneyed tropes of love as a disease which only Parthenia can cure and of Parthenia’s virginity as a jewel; he concludes by bragging that “The beauties of all Greece haue bin at strife / To winne the name of great


45 In this sense, Quarles echoes the centrality of the art of conversation in the French salons that influenced Henrietta Maria. See Erica Veevers, Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), esp. 14-15.
Demagoras *wife*” (B4r). Demagoras assumes that his trite expressions of love will persuade Parthenia, but she instead finds them insulting. Midway through his speech, he asks why she stands “mute”—but he has given her no chance to answer, and even then he continues to speak for another seventeen lines! When she finally does get to respond, she castigates him for lacking conversational *grazia*:

\[
\text{Had your strong Oratory but the Art,}
\]

\[
\text{To make me conscious of so great desert,}
\]

\[
\text{As you perswade, I should be bound in duty}
\]

\[
\text{To praise your Rhet’ricke, as you prize my beauty.} \quad (B4v)
\]

Parthenia sees rhetorical skill as not only a praiseworthy but also a necessary quality for a suitor; an inattention to appropriate conversational skills proves Demagoras’s uncourtliness. Demagoras then responds to Parthenia in the least gracious way possible: he “replies not, takes no leave, but quits the room” (C1r). Demagoras’s failure to master the basic requirements of social interaction demonstrates that he is unworthy of Parthenia and even actively evil; in his next speech, he claims the rapist Tarquin as a hero (C1v). His villainy first expresses itself in his rude address, evidence of a soul black enough to smear deforming poison on Parthenia’s face and think it fair retribution for her refusing him.

Argalus, on the other hand, balances the masculine virtues of action and contemplation, friendliness and privacy, passion and self-control, in a constellation of virtues that also hints at those of an ideal king. Quarles dwells on Argalus’s many excellent qualities of both mind and body, thereby setting him up as the archetypal
romantic hero (D3r-v). He and Parthenia fall in love at first sight when the beauty of “Partheniaeae face [...] ioy[n]s together / Their yielding hearts,” making Parthenia’s later disfigurement at the hands of Demagoras cruelly ironic (D3v). Their instant attachment also echoes the narrative of love at first sight that sprang up to explain Charles’s transfer of attention and affection from the Spanish Infanta to Henrietta Maria: a cultural myth traced Charles’s love for his queen back to his first glimpse of her dancing a ballet while he stopped over in Paris en route to Madrid.46

However, before Argalus and Parthenia can speak, Parthenia’s mother intervenes; Demagoras has enlisted her to help persuade Parthenia to marry him. In an episode that fully fleshes out a brief line from Sidney’s Arcadia—“by treasons Demagoras and she would have made away Argalus”—Parthenia’s mother conspires with Demagoras to poison Argalus.47 When the plan fails, Parthenia’s mother dies (apparently of vexation), thereby enabling Argalus to “finde a faire accesse / To his Parthenia” (G3r). Finally the silence between the lovers is broken: “Their cheeks are fill’d with smiles; their tongues with chat, / Now this they make their subiect, and now that. / One while they laugh; and laughing wrangle too” (G3r). This image of lively conversation contrasts sharply with Demagoras’s earlier incivility and indicates not only the pair’s mutual love but also their mutual worthiness. Quarles’s portrayal of a quick-witted couple participating in mutually pleasurable dialogue presents an idealized mirror of the loving royal marriage, exalting it over the military success and violence that Demagoras represents.


Furthermore, Quarles suggests that Parthenia, as a chastely loving wife, models the apex of feminine virtue; in this way, Henrietta Maria fulfills the type that Elizabeth had set forth. Not only does mariological language connect Parthenia with the queen whom the English called “Queen Mary,” but Quarles also explicitly describes her as the typological fulfillment of a virginal predecessor: “The chast Diana, and her Virgin-crew,” Quarles writes, “Was but a Type” of Parthenia (B1r). As a virgin goddess, Diana frequently represented Elizabeth; Parthenia here so superlatively embodies chaste virtue that a goddess becomes a type of her. Likewise, as Argalus searches for Parthenia after she flees, he comes across “Diana’s Fountaine,” which features an image of Diana that is, like Parthenia, “of late defac’d”—suggesting that the very mythology of virginity is damaged because of Demagoras’s violence (L3r). In this sense, Parthenia’s restoration replaces one model of feminine virtue—virginity, now defaced—with another: chaste wifeliness. Throughout Book III, Quarles figures Parthenia as an emblem of ideal married love and, therefore, the fulfillment of the incomplete virtues of the chaste and childless Diana/Elizabeth. Diana and her virgin crew even form part of Parthenia’s wedding party, emphasizing the transition from maiden to wife. The wedding thus marks the point at which the restored Parthenia takes on the idealized characteristics of Henrietta Maria.

48 Interestingly, in 1628, Gerrit van Honthorst painted Henrietta Maria twice: once as an Arcadian shepherdess and once as Diana in Mercury Presenting the Liberal Arts to Apollo and Diana. It is unclear whether Quarles could have seen these paintings, but he may have heard about them. In any case, the van Honthorst paintings provide a suggestive glimpse of the ways in which Henrietta Maria was imagined (and/or imagining herself) as part of the Arcadian tradition and as a fulfillment of the type of Diana while Quarles was writing Argalus and Parthenia. See Timothy Wilks, et al., “Stuart, House of,” in Grove Art Online. Oxford Art Online, http://www.oxfordartonline.com/subscriber/article/grove/art/T081917pg7 (accessed 15 July 2009).
Quarles also forges connections with the theatre-loving Henrietta Maria by emphasizing drama in both the form and content of the poem. Quarles’s characters do not merely speak; they deliver full-blown monologues—always set in italics—that are punctuated by dramatic action. David Freeman has pointed out that the poem, “in spite of its relatively late date, follows a typical Elizabethan narrative format,” and Masoodul Hasan notes that the scenes are “held apart by soliloquies, or by debates or conversations usually confined to two persons and consisting of set speeches.” In this way, the poem frequently reads like old-fashioned English dramas such as Gorboduc (1563), which is also notable as the only play that Sidney praised in The Defence of Poesy. Quarles’s choice in Argalus and Parthenia, his only secular work, to use an Elizabethan form to match the adapted Sidneian content suggests that he possessed a sophisticated understanding of the appeal of that era. The theatricalism that Hasan and Freeman identify in the poem similarly links Elizabethan form with an appeal to the interest in drama at Henrietta Maria’s court, a drama that, as Martin Butler and Karen Britland have both pointed out, urged amity between England and France.

Indeed, Quarles’s most significant addition to Sidney’s plot accentuates the importance of theatricalism in Argalus and Parthenia. As noted earlier, most of Quarles’s supplements to Sidney’s version involve set speeches. The longest and most detailed


50 Masoodul Hasan, Francis Quarles, A Study of His Life and Poetry (Aligarh: Aligarh Muslim University, 1966), 102.

51 See Karen Britland, Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 57; Martin Butler, The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 279.
scenes that he added, however, are Argalus and Parthenia’s spectacular wedding and the celebratory wedding masque in Book III. The importance he places on the wedding celebrations highlight the significance of the political valences of love in the poem, especially in the staged spectacle of the masque. Several scholars have recently examined the centrality of masques to Henrietta Maria’s exercise of power. Erica Veevers’s work has prompted a comprehensive reconsideration of the queen’s political and cultural agency, the fruits of which have especially come to bear in the past few years. Britland, in particular, argues that Henrietta Maria’s patronage of court drama and the ostentatious theatrical display for which she has so often been criticized should be read as sophisticated political statements, springing from traditions of politically pointed ostentation at the French courts of Louis XIII and Marie de Médicis. Henrietta Maria had performed in masques and ballets before her marriage, and she continued to do so up

52 He likewise focuses in greater depth on the subplot in which Parthenia’s mother plots with Demagoras to kill Argalus, inventing a maidservant who dies when she mistakenly drinks poison prepared for Argalus. Quarles includes a few other changes that contribute to the dramatic effect of the story (such as Demagoras’s throwing poison on Parthenia’s face on her wedding day instead of several days before). For a list of all of the significant differences between Sidney’s and Quarles’s versions of the story, see Freeman, 20.

53 Erica Veevers, Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainment (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). Since 2006, four books have been published that rehabilitate Henrietta Maria’s reputation as a flighty girl uninterested in politics: Karen Britland, Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria; Michelle Anne White, Henrietta Maria and the Civil Wars (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006); Erin Griffey, ed., Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008); and Rebecca A. Bailey, Staging the Old Faith: Queen Henrietta Maria and the Theatre of Caroline England, 1625-42 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009). See also Caroline Hibbard, “Henrietta Maria in the 1630s: Perspectives on the Role of Consort Queens in Ancien Régime Courts,” in The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders, 92-110 (New York: Manchester University Press, 2006). In 2001, Alison Plowden published the first serious biography of Henrietta Maria since 1972, Henrietta Maria: Charles I’s Indomitable Queen (Stroud: Sutton, 2001); unfortunately, although far more fair-minded than Quentin Bone’s often patronizing Henrietta Maria: Queen of the Cavaliers (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972), it is not as sophisticated as one would like—see especially Britland’s critique in Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria, 1-2.
through the outbreak of civil war. In fact, as Martin Butler has recently observed, as far as we know, Henrietta Maria’s were the only royal masques performed until 1631.\footnote{Butler, \textit{The Stuart Court Masque}, 277.}

Meanwhile, Quarles himself, a Lincoln’s Inn man, appears to have acted in George Chapman and Inigo Jones’s \textit{Maske of the Middle Temple and Lincolns Inne} celebrating Princess Elizabeth’s 1613 wedding.\footnote{Höltgen, \textit{Francis Quarles}, 41-43.} In early 1629, Quarles could not have foreseen just how central Henrietta Maria’s favored forms of Neoplatonic love would become to the aesthetic and artistic tone of the English court over the next decade. However, he certainly understood firsthand the significance of wedding masques as representations of love (and, indeed, marriages as dynastic unions), and his lavish depiction of Argalus and Parthenia’s illustrates the importance of the rhetoric of love, unity, and peace in the poem.

Argalus and Parthenia’s wedding masque is set apart from the rest of the narrative via both typeface and the use of printed marginalia. Although speeches in the rest of the text are set in italics, in the masque section this practice is inverted; the action is printed in italics and the speeches in roman, echoing common printing practices for playbooks. Likewise, throughout the masque, the text uses printed marginalia to approximate the function of speech prefixes: e.g., “Vulcans speech,” “The Goddesse of the Nights speech,” “Venus speech to Morpheus,” and so on. In fact, the first instance of printed marginalia in the book occurs when the masque begins; the title, “The Masque of the Gods,” appears alongside the description of the music that signals its beginning (Q2v).
These textual features highlight the masque as a distinct part of the text, drawing attention to its theatricalism even while Quarles maintains the heroic couplets of the rest of the poem. Between each speech he describes costumes, lighting, staging practices, and even how each part should be acted. Indeed, he provides enough information that readers could potentially stage their own versions of the masque. This remarkable insertion of, in essence, a playbook (albeit one in which even the stage directions adhere to the poem’s meter and rhyme) highlights the spectacular aesthetic so essential to masques, signaling the sorts of visual and rhetorical cues that characterize a masque’s uniquely political nature.⁵⁶

The masque that Quarles gives us, however, describes not decorous orderliness, as one might expect for a wedding masque, but rather comedic chaos. In fact, given the pandemonium that ensues when the gods intrude on the wedding feast, this masque seems to function more as an antimasque than a representation of marital harmony. It opens with the Goddess of the Night calling for nightfall, at which “a sudden darknesse fill’d the Hall: / The light was banisht” (Q3r). At this Vulcan enters, searching for Venus and complaining that both Apollo and the Goddess of the Night sanction Venus’s adultery. He has tapers lit, and Morpheus enters to ask the Goddess of the Night’s bidding. She tells him that this is a night for celebration, “mirth, and time-beguiling sports” (Q4r).

---

Venus then “descend[s] from her vnseen seate aboue,” holding Cupid, and chastises Morpheus, telling him to go away. Angry, she makes Cupid shoot Morpheus, who faints; his wound, Quarles says, causes lovers’ dreams to be “wanton” from that day on (Q4v). The Goddess of the Night, incensed at Venus, “resign[s] her right / Of gouernment” and smears “a duskie fogge” all over Venus’s face and hair, clearly alluding to Demagoras’s attack on Parthenia (Q4v). Mars, enraged at this treatment of his lover, descends to defend her, while Vulcan, portrayed as a despised wittol, ascends from the underworld to make peace. Morpheus awakes and tries to pull the arrow out of his side, but Mars attacks him. Only the Goddess of the Night’s hasty intervention saves Morpheus’s life. Finally, the rest of the gods descend “To nippe this early quarrell in the bud” (R1r). They restore order by imposing punishments on the offenders. They banish Morpheus for the night; Mars they exile; Cupid will be blinded and cursed to wander; and Venus is “confin’d to perpetuall night” (R1v). On this note, the masque concludes with the revels, after which the gods vanish.

This is certainly a strange choice for a wedding masque, especially given the obvious reminder of Demagoras’s assault. Because of the chaotic antimasque sensibility and the notable departure that it represents from the rest of the poem, the scene draws attention to itself as a locus for potential political resonances. Specifically, the masque stages the victory of virtue and decorum over courtly corruption. Venus represents the inverse of Parthenia: the goddess, unlike the mortal, is (in the context of the masque) justly punished for her crime of adultery, whereas Parthenia had been unjustly attacked as a result of her purely honorable behavior. The further emphasis on Venus’s adultery and
the punishments of Cupid and Venus in particular likewise serve as warnings to those who might not embrace the decorum and the model of courtly, ideal love that characterized the royal marriage. However, just because the masque aligns with tradition and decorum does not make it otherwise apolitical. The exile of Mars not only indicates the inappropriateness of fighting at a wedding; in 1629, this anti-martial theme presses for a peaceful foreign policy—primarily with France, with whom England was still at war in early 1629, but also with Spain.

Thus, the gods’ punishments of Venus and Mars imply that a decorous and moral court ought rightly to pursue a policy of peace as well. Indeed, three years later when Quarles dedicated *Divine Fancies* to the infant Prince Charles, he went even further, pressing for a league between France and England: “Let the *English Rose*, and the *French Lilly* flourish in thy louely Cheeke: And let their united *Colours* presage an euerlasting *League.*” The English rose, of course, represents Charles I’s Tudor heritage, blended with Henrietta Maria’s French virtues in the body of their son and heir. However, even before the birth of Prince Charles, Quarles blended Tudor rose and French lily in the figure of Parthenia, “in whose faire face, / *Roses* and *Lillies* [...] had equall place” (B4r). The masque stages the antithesis of Argalus and Parthenia’s virtuous and loving relationship and of the courtly values that the rest of the poem sponsors. It relies on the transformative power of theatrical performance not only to foreshadow the danger of Mars’s ultimate triumph over Argalus and Parthenia’s fate but also to argue for a new foreign policy as a result of Charles and Henrietta Maria’s loving marriage.

---

The tragic ending of *Argalus and Parthenia*, like the beginning’s erotic triangle among Demagoras, Parthenia, and Argalus, echoes the 1626 masque *Artenice*, in which Henrietta Maria broke new ground by performing speaking parts with her ladies on stage. 58 Artenice, like Parthenia, is betrothed by her parents to one man, but breaks the betrothal because she loves another. Both texts model a familiar, idealized romantic relationship in which the lovers’ souls are intertwined to the extent that one cannot live without the other. In *Argalus and Parthenia*, as in *Artenice*, “the Anglo-French union is represented as a single, true love: an idea of particular importance to Caroline iconography that would resonate throughout the court drama of the period.” 59 Quarles writes of Argalus and Parthenia:

So one they were, that none could iustly say,
Which of them rul’d or whether did obey;
He rul’d; because she would obey, and she
In thus obeying, rul’d as well as he; [...]  
A happy paire! whose double life, but one,
Made one life double and the single, none. (S1r-v)

This sentiment, drawn from the *Arcadia*, carries obvious Neoplatonic freight that takes on new significance in the context of the Caroline court. Indeed, Quarles explicitly figures Argalus as a king; when Argalus and Parthenia climb the tower of their home, the Palace of Delight, they can see “A little commonwealth of land, which none / But Argalus durst

58 For a full discussion of *Artenice*, see Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria*, 35-52.

59 Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria*, 48.
challenge as his owne” (S1v). Argalus owes fealty to no one. In this, as in the couple’s mutually adoring relationship, Quarles clearly depicts Argalus and Parthenia as a unified image of ideal love with connections to the ideal royal marriage. “True Honour, Vertue, beauty, are the Centers / To which we point,” Quarles writes at the beginning of Book III (O2r), and the tragic deaths of Argalus and Parthenia serve those Neoplatonic qualities rather than the militaristic goals represented by the villainous Demagoras and his honorable foil Amphialus. Britland argues that the idea of the metaphysical union of lovers’ souls “came to serve as a keystone of Caroline monarchical iconography”;\(^6\) in 1629, *Argalus and Parthenia* fell on the cutting edge of this trend.

In fact, Argalus and Parthenia are set for a happily-ever-after ending until Argalus picks up arms to fight in Arcadia’s war. His death then motivates Parthenia to fight and also be killed. Significantly, by choosing war, both Argalus/Charles and Parthenia/Henrietta Maria come to a tragic end, one that Quarles again emphasizes by referring to the Tudor rose and French lily. As Parthenia dies, Quarles writes,

> The Lillies, and the Roses (that while e’re
> Stroue in her Cheekes, till they compounded there)
> Haue broke their truce, and freshly falne to blows;
> Behold; the Lilly hath o’recome the Rose. (X1r)

Pursuing war—even in an honorable cause, as Argalus does—only leads to disaster, and Quarles implies that for England, the disaster could end in ultimate defeat at the hands of the French. In early 1629, Buckingham’s recent humiliation at La Rochelle and Charles’s

---

\(^6\) Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria*, 48.
trouble raising money to fund the war must have made such an outcome seem not only possible but even likely.

Quarles hit a resonant cultural sweet spot by revising the story of Sidney’s ideal lovers to make a case for royal love and a peaceful foreign policy shortly before Charles embraced that policy. The poem enjoyed a great deal of success in the print marketplace. But its success also derived in part from combining those savvy allusions to court politics and foreign policy with the power of a complex Elizabethan nostalgia. Quarles deploys Elizabethan nostalgia neither merely to critique the court nor simply to praise it, but rather to combine praise and critique in a nuanced appeal for peace directed at the earl of Holland, the queen’s party, and ultimately the royal couple. As it turns out, Quarles chose the right rhetoric and policies to support: England made peace with France in April 1629—mere weeks after Argalus and Parthenia was completed—and then with Spain the following year.

In the peaceful early years of the 1630s, discourses of royal love came to dominate court culture, as Kevin Sharpe discusses.61 Yet Argalus and Parthenia inaugurated that fashion earlier than critics have generally acknowledged. Britland points out that during the 1620s, “Henrietta Maria’s entertainments emphasized her status as a princess of France, [while] Charles’s productions absorbed her into a fantasy of virile masculine heroism.”62 Argalus and Parthenia begins to modulate the two iconographies, on the one hand portraying Henrietta Maria as more English by casting her as the


62 Britland, Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria, 66.
fulfillment of Elizabeth, and on the other urging Charles to pursue love with his wife and
amity with the French instead of the militant path on which he was then embarked.
Moreover, Quarles’s shrewd appropriation of arguably the most prominent text of
England’s seventeenth-century literary canon also encapsulates a striking ecumenicalism:
Quarles, a religious moderate, revised and expanded Sidney, one of the “hotter”
Protestants at the Elizabethan court, and dedicated his work to the Protestant leader of the
Catholic queen’s “puritan” party at court. By appealing to an audience that included both
Protestant and Catholic, English and French, and (explicitly) women as well as men,
Argalus and Parthenia revises the political and religious resonances of Sidney’s “royal
romance” to make a sophisticated and prescient case for a peaceful foreign policy,
especially with France.

Ultimately, then, Quarles does not merely “ransack” or “travesty” Sidney’s
Arcadia;63 instead, by adapting it, he also adapts the meanings of the national past.
Figuring Henrietta Maria as the fulfillment of Elizabeth, Quarles uses nostalgia to expand
the semiotic bounds of Elizabethanism, thereby incorporating the French queen into a
particularly English identity. By doing so he also broadens the forms of English
nationalism to include more ecumenical and cosmopolitan positions. In contrast with the
Sidney that John Aubrey’s Gloucester draper displayed above his mantel—the Protestant
war hero, perpetually mourned via the spectacle of his funeral roll—Argalus and
Parthenia reimagines Sidney as a literary hero whose work could be revised to sanction
new modes of Englishness capacious enough to include religious and political diversity.

63 Alexander, Writing After Sidney, 333.
Twenty years later, Charles I would provide yet another version of Sidney by quoting from the Arcadia on the scaffold, a rhetorical move that John Milton excoriated. But however “royalist” the Arcadia had become by 1649, Argalus and Parthenia reminds us that in 1629, its meanings—and those of the Elizabethan past more generally—could still be negotiated for purposes more nuanced than binary models of court politics might suggest.

Glapthorne: Staging Argalus and Parthenia

In 1639, ten years after the first edition of Quarles’s Argalus and Parthenia, Henry Glapthorne’s play Argalus and Parthenia was published for the first time. The title page advertises that the text inside “hath been Acted at the Court before their Maiesties: and At the Private-House in Drury-Lane, By their Maiesties Servants.” Glapthorne seems to have geared the play toward courtly tastes—masque-like, it calls for the shepherds of the subplot to perform no less than four songs and five dances. Performed sometime between 1632 and 1638, Argalus and Parthenia matches the pattern of pastoral entertainments that characterized Henrietta Maria’s tastes throughout the 1630s, as Julie Sanders has also pointed out. It seems safe to assume that Glapthorne’s play capitalized on the popularity of both Sidney’s Arcadia and Quarles’s previous adaptation of Argalus and Parthenia. Like Quarles’s version, Glapthorne’s is geared toward both courtly and

---

64 Henry Glapthorne, Argalus and Parthenia: as it hath been acted at the court before their Maiesties: and at the Private-House in Drury-Lane, by their Maiesties Servants (London: R. Bishop for Daniel Pakeman, 1639; STC 11908). Cited parenthetically hereafter.

public audiences; indeed, Glapthorne seems similarly concerned with peaceful versions of English courtliness. Glapthorne’s version of the story exalts Caroline courtly values and aesthetics and embraces a version of Elizabethanism that explicitly privileges feminine virtue over military success.

Like Quarles, Glapthorne demonstrates a nuanced understanding of the politics and implications of Elizabethan genres. Throughout the play, he employs different generic tropes and conventions to accentuate the connections between his Elizabethan source material and contemporary court culture. For example, he draws on the familiar theatrical stock character of the miles gloriosus, but by deploying such a figure in a tragedy, he illustrates the problems with traditional militarism. His Demagoras recognizably follows in the footsteps of Othello. However, unlike Shakespeare’s soldier, Demagoras fails to win his beloved precisely because of his inability to discard his militaristic persona. Parthenia’s mother, whom Glapthorne names Chrisaclea, tells Demagoras that “‘Tis not the brave relation of a fight, / Can move the milde brest of a tender mayd / To ought but terrour” (B2r-v). Unlike Desdemona, Parthenia fails to be impressed by Demagoras’s refusal to follow “the nice rules of love,” as he calls them (B1r). His proposal reads hilariously: “I am come, / Confident of my merit, to informe you / You ought to yeeld me the most strict regard / Your love can offer” (B3r).

Unsurprisingly, Parthenia feels no obligation to obey this order; rather, she deserves “a respect / More faire and Courtlike” (B3r). Since Chrisaclea has just described Argalus as “affable and courtly” (B2v), Glapthorne here clearly contrasts Argalus, the representative of courtly rhetoric, with Demagoras, whose “accustomed language” is the “blunt phrase
of war” (B3r). The conflict between Argalus’s easy eloquence and Demagoras’s refusal to play courtly games certainly reflects on similar debates about the value of militarism vs. diplomacy and the virtues of plain speaking vs. sophisticated rhetoric. Like Quarles, Glapthorne invokes Elizabethanism to argue for diplomacy and sophisticated rhetoric.

Glapthorne further emphasizes the value of peace by turning Acts 2 and 3 into a miniaturized revenge tragedy.66 After Parthenia’s rejection, Demagoras, just as jealous as Othello albeit far more calculating, begins to envision himself as the revenging hero. He repeatedly claims the right to take revenge because Parthenia has chosen Argalus instead of himself. She first raises his ire by naming his insufficiently courtly conversation as the reason for her refusal: “These high tearmes,” she says, “were apt to fright an enemy, or beget / Terror in flinty bosoms [...]. You must not perswade my thoughts that you who vary so the Scene of love, can act it perfectly” (B3v). This response, Demagoras says, “deserves [his] utmost scorne” (B3v). Adding insult to his perceived injury, the shepherds who are charged with performing a pastoral in Demagoras’s honor have nothing prepared except the entertainment with which they were planning to honor Argalus. This brief interlude praises a lover who “Hates warres” but instead is “mildly led / By Venus” (C2v). Demagoras interprets this (probably rightly) as a slight on himself:

That fellow
That woo’d with such obsequiousnesse and wonne
His yeelding Mistresse, sure did represent
Effeminate Argalus, The other, who

---

66 Revenge tragedy, of course, remained popular throughout the early modern period, but its origins and most famous exemplar, Kyd’s Spanish Tragedy, were Elizabethan.
With confidence attempting, was repuls’d,
Figur’d my self. This same was an abuse,
Such as no hospitality, nor laws
Of true nobility can suffer. (C2v)\textsuperscript{67}

Demagoras, just rejected for his inability to act the role of the lover, finds himself watching a performance that rewards those skilled at performing exactly the role that he hates. He swears that he will mete out “a sudden and severe revenge” because of “this scorne” (C3r). In fact, during the brief scene in which Demagoras seizes Parthenia and hauls her offstage to smear poison on her face, he mentions revenge three different times; during the later scene in which Argalus confronts and then kills him, he uses the word three more times. Such calculated, almost ritualized, appeals to the revenge tradition formally emphasize Demagoras’s status as revenger.

Moreover, his combination of the braggart soldier and revenger paint an unflattering image of a militaristic man, contrasting sharply with the invocations of Elizabethan valiance that characterize many of the ghost narratives that I discuss in Chapter 1. Here the military man represents uncontrolled violence: in addition to the poison-smearing, which does not happen onstage, the stage direction at the beginning of the scene calls for Demagoras to “Drag[] out Parth[enia]” (D1r). Furthermore, in a change from Sidney, Glapthorne’s Demagoras plans to attack Kalender’s castle, although he has no motive other than his revenge against Parthenia. Demagoras’s version of militarism thus becomes associated with uncontrolled hostility and rebellion—dangerous

\textsuperscript{67} The text gives this speech to Philarchus, an obvious error.
matters when the play was printed in 1639, given outbreak of the first Bishops’ War between England and Scotland.

In spite of his brutish behavior, Demagoras clearly envisions himself as the hero of his own revenge tragedy rather than the antagonist in Argalus and Parthenia’s tragedy of ideal love. He plans to complete his revenge not by fighting Argalus one-on-one, but by igniting a civil war. At this point, Argalus replaces Demagoras as the revenger. When Demagoras meets Argalus just before the planned attack, Argalus begins using the rhetoric of revenge, suggesting that just as he models the ideal balance between valor and courtliness, he also balances the competing demands of justice and revenge. Indeed, he attributes his duty as revenger to providential intervention: “It was / Heavens never-sleeping Justice that directed / My erring person hither to revenge / Parthenia’s murder’d beauty on thy life,” he tells Demagoras (E1r). Like Demagoras in his two previous scenes, Argalus also mentions revenge three different times, invoking the word ritualistically, as Demagoras does. His final invocation attempts to excuse him from the moral ambiguity that often attends revenge heroes: “Revenge, when just, ’s not humane, but Divine,” he claims (E1v). Demagoras’s death in not Act 5 but Act 3 displaces him from the main narrative arc in a way that also indicates how obsolete a figure he has become, both as soldier and as revenger. After his death, the courtly Amphialus and Argalus become the emblematic versions of soldierly valor; their battle sets the example of appropriate knightly behavior. Argalus’s victories over Demagoras in both love and battle stage a triumph of the Caroline constellation of aesthetic and political values (high rhetoric, Neoplatonic love, and silver-tongued “courtliness”) over plain-spoken, old-
fashioned militarism. Glapthorne thus elevates not the bluff rhetoric of war but the civil
and polished eloquence of Argalus’s courtly Neoplatonism as the most successful and
laudable version of chivalry.

Likewise, Demagoras’s deployment of misogynist rhetoric indicates the extent to
which he falls short of Argalus as romantic hero. Dympna Callaghan has pointed out that
in Renaissance drama, “misogyny is both a dramatic agent of violence and a vital
instrument of gender differentiation.”68 Certainly Demagoras’s misogynistic belief that
Parthenia owes him her hand in marriage because of his military successes, no matter
how she might feel about the matter, leads to the violence that he commits against her.
But we also see his overt concern with gender differentiation in the many accusations of
effeminacy that he throws at Argalus. “Though you had not lov’d me,” he tells Parthenia,
“You need not in contempt have throwne your heart / On that effeminate Argalus” (D1v).
To Demagoras, his own obsession with war represents the only acceptable form of
masculinity. He thus associates the discourses of love (and, therefore, Argalus and those
who practice such discourses) with femininity. Even to engage in the unmanly discourses
of love would be unbearable to Demagoras: “[T]o repuls’d / In an effeminate
Skirmish, wounds my soul / Worse than a quiver of sharp Parthian shafts / Could
prejudice my body,” he claims (B1v). Similarly, he tells Argalus that “such things as you
are, / Fit onely for effeminacie and sport, / Doe seldom meet my knowledge,” as if mere
contact with courtiers would taint his masculinity (E1r). Perhaps most significantly,
however, Demagoras refuses “to be esteem’d / A servant to a woman” (B2v)—in sharp
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68 Dympna Callaghan, Woman and Gender in Renaissance Tragedy: A Study of King Lear, Othello, The
contrast to Argalus, whose “wavering Fortune,” according to Chrisaclea, depends on the queen’s favor (B4v). Throughout the play, Argalus aligns with Parthenia and his queen against the narrowly militaristic and misogynistic version of masculinity that Demagoras represents. By making Argalus a courtier dependent on the queen specifically, Glapthorne cements the associations between Argalus and Henrietta Maria’s party at court and represents the triumph of her version of courtliness over soldierly prowess.

If Demagoras serves as one obvious foil to Argalus, Amphialus on the surface would seem to serve as the other: the warrior who surpasses Argalus in the field even while Argalus proves a better lover. However, Glapthorne changes Amphialus’s character and asks the audience to sympathize with him in a way that Sidney never does. Clare Kinney has pointed out that in Sidney’s *Arcadia*, Amphialus’s behavior comments ironically on chivalric values. In both Glapthorne and Sidney, Amphialus kidnaps the Arcadian princesses, Pamela and Philoclea, because he loves Philoclea and wants to marry her. In Sidney, however, this threatens to spur a civil war, while Glapthorne mitigates such dire consequences by having Amphialus and the princesses’ father Basilius agree to settle the matter through single combat. Sidney’s Amphialus exists as an example of the chivalric honor code gone wrong: he is a successful knight and valiant fighter, but he has neglected to behave with honor toward Philoclea, Pamela, and their father Basilius. Kinney argues that Amphialus’s “attempt to translate an anarchic civil conflict born out of passion and deception into a series of aesthetically pleasing encounters from the world of courtly romance results in the destruction of that universe’s

---

most exemplary representative [i.e., Argalus].” For Sidney, Argalus embodies the most laudable chivalric virtues; his death at the hands of Amphialus, as Kinney suggests, critiques the courtly romance’s cult of chivalry as an unsustainable system that kills its best representatives.

Glapthorne, on the other hand, portrays Amphialus as a noble figure placed in an untenable position by Philoclea’s refusal to marry him. In fact, we are apparently meant to see Amphialus as a parallel to Argalus. After Philarchus informs both Amphialus and the audience that the newly injured Parthenia has run away, Amphialus claims empathy with Argalus, since they “are both made up of sorrow” as a result of their unsuccessful suits for love (E2r). Philarchus—otherwise a respectable counselor, Glapthorne’s equivalent to Sidney’s Philanax—tells Amphialus:

I’m none of those strict Statesmen, though I love

My King, that hate your vertues for this fact [i.e., the kidnapping],

Because I know the greatnesse of your spirit

Attempted it not for inveterate hate,

Or for ambition, but to gaine her love. (E2r-v)

According to Glapthorne, then, kidnapping is perfectly permissible, as long as it is done for love! Similarly, although the comic subplot condemns misogyny and Demagoras is punished for his misogynistic words and actions, Glapthorne excuses Amphialus’s crimes against Philoclea, Pamela, and Zelmane. While Sidney and Quarles both emphasize the mystical union of Argalus and Parthenia’s souls, Glapthorne’s only mention of a

metaphysical psychic union comes when Amphialus is talking to Argalus just before they fight. “We two retaine so much / Affinity, by friendship,” Amphialus says, “we must needs be / One individuall substance” (G2r). The homosocial bond of friendship replaces the bond of ideal romantic love that is supposed to be the entire point of *Argalus and Parthenia*. Unlike Sidney and Quarles, Glapthorne only briefly praises the couple’s enduring and noble love. Although the final line of the play reads in large type, “None lov’d like *Argalus* and *Parthenia*,” before that, Sapho delivers a sixteen-line elegy that focuses solely on Parthenia. Overall, Glapthorne’s pattern in the last two acts of connecting Argalus with Amphialus, along with his privileging of Argalus and Parthenia’s individual virtues, pulls back strangely from the ideal representation of a courtly and unifying love that seems to be the whole point of writing about the couple.

The effect, particularly of the elegy for Parthenia at the end, is to illustrate the triumph of female virtue over misogyny and militarism. Indeed, Glapthorne writes militarism nearly completely out of the story when he has Argalus forestall Demagoras’’s rebellion by killing him before the fighting can begin. Even the two single combat challenges that lead to the deaths of Argalus and Parthenia replace the dozens of challenges that Sidney’s Amphialus fights. Likewise, in the *Arcadia*, Demagoras is involved in more battles than in Glapthorne. After attacking Parthenia, Sidney’s Demagoras joins the rebellious Helots, on whose side he fights until Argalus seeks him out and kills him. The Helots then take Argalus captive. The subsequent battle to free Argalus reunites Musidorus and Pyrocles, the princely heroes of the main plot. By not having Demagoras join the Helots, and then by having Argalus kill Demagoras before
Demagoras can even launch the planned attack on Kalender’s castle, Glapthorne removes the Argalus and Parthenia story from the larger context of war and rebellion, privileging not the battles of Sidney’s text but instead the power of virtuous feminine sacrifice—and, in the process, inverting the militant aspects of the *Arcadia* itself.

This interest in forestalling rebellion altogether must speak directly to contemporary events in the spring of 1639. In 1638, a coalition of Scottish lords and subjects had signed the National Covenant, which, as Allan Macinnes points out, “established a written constitution” that “accorded [priority] to parliamentary supremacy within the fundamental context of a religious and constitutional compact between God, king, and people.”71 The Scottish insistence on a religiously mandated parliamentary government was anathema to Charles, especially since the Church of Scotland stood in staunch presbyterian opposition to the hierarchy of the Church of England. From March-June 1639, Charles waged war against Scotland in an attempt to subjugate the Scottish Covenanterers and their religious cause. The so-called First Bishops’ War mostly consisted of Scottish and English troops marching around the border counties and deciding not to fight when they encountered each other.72 Despite Charles’s determination to exert control over his wayward Scottish subjects, the “war” ended in a draw.

---


72 See Mark Fissel, *The Bishops’ Wars: Charles I’s Campaigns against Scotland, 1638-1640* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 3-39. Not even Charles seemed all that interested in fighting. At one point, Fissel writes, “Charles gazed nonchalantly at the Scots’ encampment across the river, remarked that there were not so many as to cause alarm, and retired to dinner” (34).
Nevertheless, the specter of rebellion had been raised, and in this context Glapthorne’s rewriting of the *Arcadia*’s militarism clearly intersects with a contemporary negativity toward not only rebellion but war more generally. Combined with the sophisticated inversion of the tropes of revenge tragedy and the elevation of courtly Neoplatonism over plain-speaking militarism, Glapthorne’s treatment of Demagoras in *Argalus and Parthenia* embodies an Elizabethanism that accentuates both feminine virtue and masculine courtliness. Because the play was performed at court and featured so many characteristics of the drama that Henrietta Maria favored, it participates in similar political discourses to Quarles’s *Argalus and Parthenia*. While Quarles figures Henrietta Maria as the fulfillment of Elizabeth, using the *Arcadia* to write her into an English identity, Glapthorne writes Henrietta Maria’s values into the particularly English pastoral setting of Arcadia—a setting that began to seem threatened by the Bishops’ War of 1639.

**Rebellion and Order in Shirley’s Arcadia**

Unlike the previous two adaptations that I have discussed, James Shirley’s *A Pastorall Called the Arcadia* focuses not on Argalus and Parthenia but on the main plot of Sidney’s *Arcadia*. The tragicomic tribulations of a royal family mostly in love with
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73 There has been some controversy over the authorship of the play, dating back to Alfred Harbage, who argued that even though the play was printed during Shirley’s lifetime with his name on it, and no one had ever questioned the authorship before, a trail of circumstantial evidence that he admits to be “circuitous” suggests that Shirley did not, in fact, write the play (see “The Authorship of the Dramatic Arcadia,” *Modern Philology* 35.3 (February 1938): 233-237). For this reason, it frequently does not appear in studies of Shirley. Paul Addison Ramsey lays out a convincing argument against Harbage in the introduction to his critical edition of the play; see Ramsey, *A Pastorall Called the Arcadia by James Shirley, A Critical Edition*, unpublished Ph.D. diss. (University of Michigan, 1975). For general studies of James Shirley, see Arthur Huntington Nason, *James Shirley, Dramatist: A Biographical and Critical Study* (New York: A.H. Nason, 1915); Robert S. Forsythe, *The Relations of Shirley’s Plays to the Elizabethan Drama* (New York: B. Blom, 1965); Ben Lucow, *James Shirley* (Boston: Twayne, 1981); Sandra A. Burner, *James Shirley: A
the same cross-dressed man serve as the thread that unifies the many stories that compose Sidney’s massive romance. In Sidney’s *Arcadia*, the Argalus and Parthenia story exists only as a sideline to the central tale of Musidorus and Pyrocles. It is their story that Shirley chooses to stage in *A Pastorall Called the Arcadia*. The main plot of the play focuses on Musidorus and Pyrocles’s struggles to win the hearts and hands of the Arcadian princesses, along with the tricks by which Pyrocles (disguised as the Amazon Zelmane) escapes the adulterous attentions of both Basilius and his queen, Gynecia. The rocky royal marriage in the play serves as a foil to Charles and Henrietta Maria’s loving marriage, providing a level of insulation for other less flattering similarities between Charles and the Arcadian king. Indeed, more than either Quarles or Glaphthorne, Shirley emphasizes the importance of governance; unlike Glaphthorne, who writes rebellion out of the story, Shirley focuses extensively on it. Thus, the play’s publication in 1640 carries sharp political resonances: Shirley, playing on Sidney, highlights the problems that arise when a king remains isolated from his subjects and ignores good counsel, even while the play probes the limits to which loyal subjects could venture when disagreeing with their anointed monarch. Shirley plays the rebellion in Arcadia for comic effect, but in doing so he also glances at legitimate concerns regarding commonwealth theory in the 1630s.

The play opens with a plea for Basilius, the king, to leave exile and return to active governance. Philonax and Calender, Basilius’s two wisest counselors, urge him to

---

have greater contact with his subjects. Philonax’s first speech begs the king to fulfill his responsibilities toward his people:

Our duties bind us tell you tis unnaturall
To bury your selfe alive, the people call
For their owne King to governe, the’ile forget
To pray for you if you continue thus
A stranger to em.\(^7^4\)

The brief allusion to prayer in the same sentence in which Philonax calls Basilius a stranger to his people stands out from the rest of the ensuing conversation, which focuses on a king’s responsibility to provide opportunities for good marriages among his nobility. Philonax’s reference to “the people” indicates that he is speaking of more than just the unmarried aristocracy. Significantly, it is at this point in the Arcadia, when Kalender is describing the nation’s unease due to Basilius’s failure to govern properly, that Sidney explicitly states the political import of pastoral, which “under hidden forms utter[s] such matters, as otherwise they durst not deal with.”\(^7^5\) Annabel Patterson points out that Sidney’s revisions make the connections between “hidden forms” and “the problem of political expression” even more explicit in the New Arcadia than they had been in the Old.\(^7^6\) The problem of a king who lived as a stranger to his people has obvious resonance with Charles’s eleven-year refusal to summon a parliament. However, no one in England


\(^7^5\) Sidney, The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia, 24.

\(^7^6\) Patterson, Censorship and Interpretation, 30.
could accuse Charles of failing to govern in the absence of parliament; indeed, his insistence on doing so provided fodder for the people who argued that the king was abusing the royal prerogative. The question of the royal prerogative became even more vital in 1640, the year of both the Short Parliament and the Second Bishops’ War.

Many of Charles’s subjects in Scotland resented both his absentee kingship and Archbishop Laud’s imposition of high church reforms in the Scottish Kirk, the very reforms that had sparked the signing of the National Covenant. Considered in this context, the admonition that the people would forget to pray for Basilius if he continued to isolate himself takes on sharp resonances with the events of 1638-40. Mark Fissel places the blame for the loss of the Bishops’ Wars squarely on Charles’s shoulders, painting a damning portrait of a blinkered king who exiled himself from relevance to his subjects as effectively as if he had indeed retreated to a pastoral cottage. Religious conflict thus spurred a full-fledged constitutional crisis for the three-kingdom Britain, and Charles’s role as absentee Scottish king stood at the center of the crisis. Philonax’s suggestion that the people might refuse to pray for the king indicates a threatening nonconformity when the king was the head of both church and state.

The rebels, unsurprisingly, demonstrate far different concerns than Philonax and Calender do; rather than focusing on the king’s obligations to his courtiers, they focus on his obligations to all of his subjects. Paul Ramsey dismisses the rebels’ calls for populist revolution; “Shirley the Royalist,” he writes, “would of course have the ignorant

Fissel, *The Bishops’ Wars*, esp. ch. 8.
bumpkins advocate such a state.” Stephen Greenblatt, discussing Sidney’s version of
the revolt in the New Arcadia, similarly reads Sidney’s treatment of the rebels as a
cruelly mocking containment of disruptive forces. Shirley’s adaptation of Sidney in
some ways falls in line with Greenblatt’s notion of “cruel laughter.” The rebellion scene
articulates genuine contemporary concerns about government but then turns the holders
of such opinions into objects of derision. However, reliance on a subversion/containment
binary overlooks the complexity with which Shirley handles the rebels.

The rebellion, as Shirley depicts it, begins with drunkenness and ends in chaos. At
the beginning of the scene, the conversation among the rebels echoes legitimate
contemporary concerns. The Captain, in particular, espouses oppositional sentiments.
“We must be valiant,” he tells the rebels; “the King I say agen has left us, and since He
scornes our company for my part I scorne to be his subject” (D4v). This critique of a king
isolated from his people prefigures in comic form a concern that would eventually
contribute to not only the English Civil Wars but also the American and French
Revolutions: the idea that a sovereign’s unwillingness to listen to the people prevented
him or her from governing properly. Shirley voices this concern comically—why
shouldn’t a king scorn the company of rustic clowns, after all?—but Philonax and

78 Ramsey, A Pastorall Called the Arcadia by James Shirley, 213.
79 Stephen Greenblatt, “Murdering Peasants: Status, Genre, and the Representation of Rebellion,”
Representations 1.1 (1983): 1-29. Richard M. Berrong, on the other hand, argues that Greenblatt overlooks
much of the complexity of Sidney’s revision of the episode from the Old Arcadia to the New. See Richard
M. Berrong, “Changing Depictions of Popular Revolt in Sixteenth-Century England: The Case of Sidney’s
strong monarchy, see Martin Raitiere, Faire Bitts: Sir Philip Sidney and Renaissance Political Theory
(Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1984), esp. ch. 3; alternately, on Sidney’s advocacy of a strong
aristocracy, see Richard C. McCoy, Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers
University Press, 1979); Robert E. Stillman, “The Poetics of Sidney’s Pastoral: Mystification and
Mythology in the Old Arcadia,” ELH 52.4 (Winter 1985): 795-814; Alan Sinfield, “Power and Ideology.”
Calender’s earlier conversation with Basilius about his responsibilities toward his people gives this scene a serious underpinning. Besides, Basilius has already collapsed social boundaries by entrusting the care of his daughters to the rustic clown Dametas, who is just as foolish and undeserving as any of the rebels are. Similarly, the Second Rebel claims, “It is time to looke into the government, none but Gentlemen are of his Counsell, I see no reason since the Countrie is ours but we should have a stroake in the state” (D4v). This demand that the common sorts should have a stake in the government just as the gentlemen do reflects a populist impulse that cannot be dismissed simply because one of the comic characters voices it. Arcadia, of course, has no elected governing body, but by the time the play was printed in 1640 such a claim would certainly garner support from English readers clamoring for a parliament, whether the royalist Shirley intended it or not.

The dynamics of the text to some extent support an oppositional reading of the rebels. At the beginning of the scene, Shirley allows the rebels to show a range of opinions. The Captain and Second and Third Rebels voice different levels of opposition to the king and suggestions of how to improve the government, while the only named character, a miller called Tom Thumbe, tries to calm down the increasingly fractious mob: “We met together to drinke in honour of the Kings birthday and tho we have tickled the Cannikins, let vs be merrie and wise[,] that’s my opinion, no treason, the King is an honest Gentleman, and so is the Queene” (D4v). The Captain responds to Thumbe by claiming that the king is “govern’d by Philonax,” and the Third Rebel follows him up by saying, “Who knowes but he has made away the King[?]” (D4v). Even if Shirley
originally intended them to indicate the rebels’ foolishness, these two lines supply a clear image of the problems that ensue when the court is divided from the rest of the country: an invisible monarch undermines the stability of the government, and even good counselors fall under suspicion. Members of the Privy Council often played important roles brokering deals between parliament and the king; this brief interchange highlights the potential misunderstandings that could develop when the king’s counselors had little to no contact with his subjects’ parliamentary representatives, who could at the very least return to their communities from parliament with firsthand news on governmental matters.

The rebels’ first concerns echo the rhetoric of commonwealth principles that began to take on more urgency during the 1630s and 1640s. As Jonathan Scott explains, there were two basic commonwealth principles: first, “whatever its constitutional form, government must be directed toward the common good”; and second, “it must be legal and constitutional [...] rather than the product of the will of a single person.” Thus, when the Captain demands to know why the king is behaving in such unkingly fashion, he appeals to the concept of the commonwealth to criticize Basilius’s behavior: “I will know a reason why hee has left the government without our consents to depose him, ’tis wisely spoken my brave men ’oth common-wealth, we will have other laws and the old shall be executed” (E1r). Again, this is a comic inversion of the trope of rebellion; the rebels are upset with the king for effectively deposing himself rather than waiting for them to depose him. Yet their objection rests on the concept that governments rule by

consent of the people. Likewise, the appeal to the “brave men of the commonwealth” may glance snidely at the type of ideologue who would identify as a “commonwealthsman,” but it also emphasizes subjects’ rights to a government that they agree to support, one that works for the public good rather than the king’s personal desires. Together with the use of the word “commonwealth,” the threat to “execute” the old laws in favor of “other” ones, clearly meant to be comic when the play was written ca. 1632, must have seemed dangerous by 1640 and eerily prescient by 1650.81

As the scene continues, the characters grow increasingly drunk and espouse increasingly implausible positions. The rebels eventually attack not the king but each other, fighting over who will sleep with the queen and princesses once they implement their anarchic utopia. At this point even the previously moderate Thumbe has joined in. That the rebellion erupts during a festive moment during which the people are meant to celebrate the king strikes a fine note of irony and suggests the dangerous potential lurking behind any festival celebrated when a king is not ruling as he ought. Moreover, the fact that the rebellion breaks out in a pastoral green world indicates that Shirley, like Sidney, is deconstructing pastoral, “subjecting its leisure, as well as its romanticized portrayal of the lower sorts, to considerable criticism,” as Tracey Sedinger argues.82 Shirley highlights the republican politics of the rustics, marking a tumultuous departure from pastoral’s
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81 It is unfortunately impossible to know exactly when the play was written. *A Pastorall Called the Arcadia* does not appear in the surviving dramatic records of Sir Henry Herbert, but because so many of them have been lost, this does not necessarily mean anything. Ramsey provides the most extended consideration of the date; he argues that it was probably composed between 1632 and 1634 and inclines toward the earlier date, although he acknowledges that it could have been written anytime up to about 1638. See Ramsey, *A Pastorall Called the Arcadia by James Shirley*, 21-31.

usual gentleman shepherds. Still, the disintegration of the rebellion into broad slapstick comedy (the elderly Basilius, according to the stage direction, runs in to the tiring house and emerges dragging a two-handed broadsword) signals the harmless dispersal of the threatening anarchic energy that the rebels represent.

However, the rebels do not disappear from the play. In Act 4, they return as outlaws whose previous concern with governance has given way to banditry and violence. Whereas their previous battle against Basilius, Musidorus, and Pyrocles had happened by accident when the royal family stumbled across their internal fight, they now vow to pursue a stronger form of opposition. When the Third Rebel wishes he were back at his forge, the Captain replies, “Arcadia shall be thy Anvile smith; and thou maist live to beate / Great men to dust” (F4v). Driven to rob passersby, they waylay the eloping Musidorus and Pamela. Surprisingly, given the strictly comic treatment that the rebels have received thus far, Musidorus actually sympathizes with them: “’Tis the times disease, when merrit thus / Disgrac’d and unrewarded by the state / Makes subjects desperate” (G2r). Perhaps he is only trying to escape here, but nevertheless his sympathy opens up room for a potential reconciliation. The play ultimately does not pursue that particular opening, but its very presence demonstrates a more charitable attitude toward the rebels than one might expect from Shirley.

Considered together, the scenes featuring the rebels represent a form of rebellion that produces laughter but need not end in hanging, drawing, and quartering. The rebels serve as the butt of Shirley’s jokes and conform to anarchic stereotype by valuing drunkenness and not merely a reversal but a complete abolition of anything resembling
the seventeenth-century class structure. Still, Shirley also suggests that such rebels might have legitimate grievances, and Musidorus and Pamela, two of the noblest characters, extend mercy to the rebels they encounter. The disappearance of the rebels in Act 5 may indeed signify a proto-royalist fantasy in which dissenting voices, if allowed to pursue their ideas far enough, would dissipate in drunkenness and lust rather than striving to implement their ideas. However, this fantasy certainly has a darker edge to it, one characterized by real grievance against the Crown. The First Bishops’ War may have fizzled out already when the play was entered into the Stationers’ Register in November 1639, but the commonwealth rhetoric and the connections with the Covenanters remained dangerously relevant. Shirley’s adaptation of the *Arcadia* reflects on the possibilities and potentials of a clash between English commonwealth principles and a king who governs without regard for his subjects. In light of the tumultuous events of 1640, the play’s reflection on English modes of governance becomes even more prominent. Thus, Shirley’s invocation of Elizabethan England by adapting a text that critiques royal isolation highlights the importance of a mutually respectful relationship between an English monarch and his or her subjects.

**Conclusion**

Quarles and Glapthorne’s versions of *Argalus and Parthenia* and Shirley’s *A Pastorall Called the Arcadia* all preserve the political ambiguity of Sidney’s New *Arcadia*. Each reflects a slightly different aspect of the Caroline court: Quarles represents the loving relationship of the royal couple and uses Parthenia to figure Henrietta Maria as
the fulfillment of Elizabeth; Glapthorne likewise targets the queen by privileging female virtue over militarism; and Shirley depicts a comic rebellion that nevertheless glances at commonwealth principles. All three reflect a marked degree of political complexity.

Writing in 1629, just as the royal couple was settling into the loving relationship that would characterize them in the 1630s, Quarles negotiates the complicated rhetorical ground to incorporate Henrietta Maria into a particularly English identity that is based on not only Sidney’s *Arcadia* but also Elizabeth herself. Glapthorne likewise uses the Elizabethan era to illustrate the triumph of Caroline courtly eloquence over militarism, even in the wake of the prayer-book rebellion and the throes of the Bishops’ Wars. Finally, Shirley’s *Arcadia* suggests that given commonwealth principles, rebellion might be justified; a scene that might easily be played purely for laughs onstage remains far more ambiguous on the page.

Thus, even while these texts illustrate the triumph of the courtly over the violent and militaristic, they also rely on the English pastoral setting of Arcadia as a safe and potent space to discuss complex political questions. Arcadia becomes England’s national *alter ego*, made safe by its distance and relevant by its imaginative adaptability. In this way, *A Pastorall Called the Arcadia* and the two versions of *Argalus and Parthenia* contribute to the wide range of contexts in which Caroline writers, audiences, and readers engaged with the Elizabethan era. These new Arcadias foster a discussion of ideal governance and bring Elizabethan literary discourses of political love and rebellion into conversation with the Neoplatonic ideals that characterized the Caroline court. The courtly adaptations of Sidney’s *Arcadia* indicate, like the plays featuring Elizabeth
figures, that Elizabethanism could be deployed in the 1630s for proto-royalist reasons—and, furthermore, that the proto-royalism of Caroline literature ought not to be equated with blind support for every decision the king made. Caroline Arcadias invoke the Elizabethan era in sophisticated and particularly literary ways, demonstrating the capaciousness of Elizabethanism to incorporate adherents of diverse beliefs into a rhetoric of English nationalism. Moreover, the nationalism they encourage is based in a different aspect of shared English past: not only the historical cruxes of the Elizabethan era, as emblematized by the Gloucester draper’s funeral roll, but a shared literary history, as well.
Chapter 4

Shakespearean Comedy and Inns of Court Stationers in 1630-1631: The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Taming of the Shrew, and Love’s Labour’s Lost

This chapter takes root in the churchyard of St. Dunstan-in-the-West. A major secondary hub of the London book trade, St. Dunstan-in-the-West lay on Fleet Street in the heart of London’s legal district.¹ Between Chancery Lane and Fetter Lane, just inside Temple Bar, close to Serjeant’s Inn, the Inner Temple, and the Middle Temple, the church provided a central and easily accessible location to the lawyers and students of the Inns of Court. Thus, it served as a focal point for the dynamic literary culture that flourished among members of the Inns, especially since the famous revels of the Elizabethan era.² Indeed, the connections between Inns of Court students and the drama famously went far beyond the theatrical productions they put on themselves; their frequent presence at the public playhouses inspired commentary and satire among writers of the era. In 1628, John Earle noted in Micro-cosmographie that “Your Innes of Court men were vndone but for [the player], hee is their chiefe guest and imploymet, and the


sole busines that makes them Afternoones men."³ For Earle, the Inns of Court had become so closely linked with the playhouses that the students’ very identity depended on their association with players. In 1636, the poet Abraham Cowley likewise satirized a “Semy-gentleman of th’Innes of Court” and hoped that the man might “Bee by his Father in his study tooke / At Shakespeares Playes, instead of my L[ord] Cooke”⁴—a send-up of Inns of Court reading practices that suggests the particular popularity of Shakespeare’s drama among the young men there, especially the upwardly mobile “semi-gentlemen” aspiring to fit in with their higher-class peers.

Earle and Cowley’s satire of Caroline Inns of Court students’ love for plays—especially Shakespeare’s—fits well with the Shakespearean quartos published by Inns of Court stationers in the late 1620s and early 1630s. By 1631, members of the Inns of Court would have been able to buy several new quartos of Shakespeare’s plays at the neighborhood shops. In 1630 Richard Meighen published the third quarto of The Merry Wives of Windsor, which he sold from his shops at the Middle Temple Gate and in St. Dunstan’s churchyard; in 1631 John Smethwick published the second quarto of Love’s Labour’s Lost and the first quarto of The Taming of the Shrew (previously, only The Taming of a Shrew had appeared in quarto format), both of which advertised his location in St. Dunstan’s churchyard.⁵ Elsewhere in the city, Mathew Law, Richard Hawkins, and Robert Bird were selling Richard III, Othello, and Pericles (respectively), but both


⁵ See the appendices for a complete catalogue of each publisher’s output over the course of his career.
stationers printing comedies operated in close proximity to the Inns of Court. Moreover, Smethwick’s publication of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* and *The Taming of the Shrew* marked the first quarto publications of either play in the seventeenth century (and, indeed, the first quarto publication of *The Taming of the Shrew* at all). Since the First Folio (F1) had already been circulating for several years, looking at quarto publications can provide intriguing information about the demand for Shakespeare’s plays in the early 1630s. Certainly the demand was high enough to spur investment in a second edition of the Folio (F2) in 1632. However, if (as some scholars have suggested) quartos competed with the Folio, why would two stationers who were both members of the F2 publishing cartel print new quarto editions?

This chapter examines the intersections between Inns of Court readers and wit in three Shakespearean quartos published in 1630 and 1631 by stationers with shops in the churchyard of St. Dunstan-in-the-West. In what follows, I suggest that Meighen and Smethwick published several of Shakespeare’s “wittie and pleasant” comedies (as Smethwick advertised both his quartos) in part because, as Michelle O’Callaghan argues, members of the Inns of Court performed various styles of sociability that frequently

---

6 Law’s 1629 quarto of *Richard III* is the first Shakespearean play that we can say with certainty was printed after the publication of the First Folio, although R. Carter Hailey makes a convincing case (based on typography and paper) to confirm the STC’s dating of Smethwick’s Q4 *Hamlet* to 1625; see “The Dating Game: New Evidence for the Dates of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet,*” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 58.3 (Autumn 2007): 367-87. Richard Hawkins published the second quarto of *Othello* in 1630, also from a location convenient to the Inns of Court (his shop was “adjoining to Serjeants’ Inn gate”); Robert Bird sold *Pericles* from Cheapside. In 1632, William Sheares sold *1 Henry IV* from shops both at St. Paul’s and in Chancery Lane near Serjeants’ Inn. It is perhaps unsurprising that Shakespeare’s plays were sold in bookshops around the Inns of Court: after all, the Inns served as a secondary but still major hub of London’s book trade. Yet the fact that in the early 1630s Shakespeare’s comedies in quarto were published by stationers with shops near the Inns of Court but not by the St. Paul’s stationers suggests—as I argue below—that the Inns of Court book trade demanded Shakespearean comedy in a way that the book trade in Paul’s may not have. See Andrew Murphy, *Shakespeare in Print: A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing* (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
privileged wit. More importantly, though, Shakespeare’s Elizabethan comedies modeled forms of English wit that both complemented shifts in the Caroline market for playbooks and featured strong female characters—one of them even a French princess—to reflect both positive and negative perceptions of Henrietta Maria’s increasing power at court.

A Tale of Two Stationers

In 1630, Richard Meighen and John Smethwick ran bookshops in St. Dunstan’s churchyard, in close proximity to the Inns of Court. Smethwick, who around 11 July 1631 became one of the wardens of the Stationers’ Company, had operated a shop in St. Dunstan’s since 1602; Meighen, on the other hand, had opened his in 1625 and would soon close it to consolidate business in his new premises at the Middle Temple gate. Both of these stationers invested more heavily in Shakespeare than did most of their cohort. Smethwick had a long history of publishing Shakespeare, dating back to the 1609 quarto of Romeo and Juliet (a play that he published twice more, in 1623 and 1637). He also partnered with William Jaggard, Edward Blount, and William Aspley to publish the First Folio. Meighen, however, first invested in Shakespeare when he purchased the rights for Merry Wives from Arthur Johnson in January 1630. Both Smethwick and Meighen then joined Aspley, Richard Hawkins, and Robert Allot to form the cartel behind the Second Folio (1632). The early 1630s thus marked a period of significant investment in Shakespeare for Smethwick and Meighen. The question is, why?

7 Arber, IV.223.
For Meighen, investment in Shakespeare coincided with investment in other comedies: he published five in 1630. On January 29, the Stationers’ Register records the transfer to Meighen of the rights for four plays, all comedies, including *Merry Wives.*

His previous publications include legal and other academic treatises, accounts of the criminal life, and books that participated in the *Hic Mulier* controversy, in addition to sermons and the occasional playbook—a catalogue that seems targeted for an Inns of Court readership. The year 1630 proved one of his most prolific in terms of number of books published, and, remarkably, he published only playbooks. This choice to specialize briefly in drama alone—and particularly in comedies—represents a major break from the various genres in which he had previously invested. Such a radical departure indicates that something unique was happening in the months just after Charles dismissed the 1629 Parliament, a cultural shift that, as I argue in Chapter 3, connects with the increasing prominence of Queen Henrietta Maria at court and the attendant resurrection of Elizabethan literary styles.

In fact, Meighen’s new focus on drama was not the only major change he made in 1630: he also opened up a second shop, this one located next to the Middle Temple gate.

---

8 Made free of the Stationers’ Company in 1614, Meighen went into business independently in 1617. From 1614-1617, Meighen worked with Thomas Jones from their shared shop “under” (or “near” or “at”) St. Clements Church. Because they shared most imprints during that time (with the notable exception of Jonson’s First Folio, one issue of which states that it is “to be sold by Rich: Meighen” (STC 14752)), it is dangerous to make assumptions about Meighen’s role in the partnership. For that reason, I focus here on his career as an independent publisher. Over the course of his twenty-five-year independent publishing career (1617-1642), Meighen published and sold a total of nineteen playbooks, investing most heavily in them during an eight-year period at the beginning of Charles I’s personal rule (see Appendix B). In fact, fifteen of Meighen’s nineteen playbooks were published between 1629 and 1636.

9 The only play Meighen published that year for which he did not purchase the rights in January 1630 was Barten Holiday’s university comedy *Technogamia* (details on which appear in the Appendix). See Arber, IV.227.
in Fleet Street. That year he was still doing business from a shop in St. Dunstan’s Churchyard, practically across the street, though there is no indication of it thereafter. By 1630, Meighen had spent the past twelve years moving periodically from shop to shop, often running two at the same time, and always focusing on the area around the Inns of Court. In addition to the shops at St. Dunstan’s and the Middle Temple gate, between 1617 and 1630 he also operated bookshops under (or “at” or “near”) St. Clement’s and at the sign of the Leg near Arundel House in the Strand (close enough to be described as “without Temple Bar”). Once he opened the shop near the Middle Temple gate, however, he remained there for the rest of his career until his death, c. 1642.

Meighen’s focus on the area around the Inns of Court is not surprising; Fleet Street, like St. Paul’s Churchyard, housed a thriving segment of the London book trade. Still, the constituency of Meighen’s retail readership at his Inns of Court location provides an important clue to understanding how *The Merry Wives of Windsor* might have been read in 1630. After all, John Feather notes that until after the Restoration, “as had been the case since Caxton’s time, the publisher sold his books at his own retail bookshop.” Even though title pages may have advertised the location where books could be bought wholesale, selling books retail was a common-sense way for publishers to boost profits in an era before more defined specialization within the book trade.

---

10 At the beginning of his career, from 1618-1620, he also had a shop at Westminster Hall, but even there he would have served retail customers who were courtiers and gentlemen associated with the law. It is difficult to say whether Meighen’s frequent moves were signs of prosperity or dearth: was he outgrowing his shops, or having difficulty meeting rent? On the whole, though, I would argue that his different shops are evidence of prosperity; if he were struggling to make ends meet, I wonder how he found the capital to publish so actively. If anything, his publishing activity *decreases* once he works out of the single Middle Temple gate location.

Meighen’s books had to appeal to his retail customers, and the locations of his various shops meant that many of those customers would be members of the Inns of Court.

Perhaps the catalyst for this explosion of playbooks came from the publication of Meighen’s first play since 1620: the 1629 second edition of John Fletcher’s *The Faithful Shepherdess* (first printed c. 1610), newly relevant again due to Henrietta Maria’s interest in pastoral entertainments—and, arguably, capitalizing on the same wave of interest in Arcadian stories that precipitated Quarles’s *Argalus and Parthenia*. Although we cannot know precisely how well or quickly *The Faithful Shepherdess* sold for Meighen, it certainly succeeded well enough to induce him to seek out more plays (and to publish a new edition in 1634). On 29 January 1630, Meighen had the rights for four of Arthur Johnson’s plays assigned to him: *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (first printed in 1602), Edward Sharpham’s *Cupid’s Whirligig*, and Thomas Middleton’s *Michaelmas Term* and *The Phoenix* (all first printed in 1607). Meighen then published those four, in addition to Barten Holiday’s university comedy *Technogamia* (first printed in 1618). If Peter Blayney is correct that the average print run for one reprinted play would require an expenditure of nearly £7, then in 1630 alone, Meighen would have invested nearly £35 in publishing plays—a considerable sum. Meighen had already shown himself sensitive to

---

12 In spite of (or because of?) Meighen’s previous involvement with the Jonson First Folio (see n.8 above), he only published one play between 1617 and 1629: *Swetnam the Woman-Hater* (STC 23544), a first edition in 1620. Even this might demonstrates less of an interest in playbooks than in the *Hic Mulier* controversy; in 1620 he also published *Muld Sacke, Or the Apologie of Hic Mulier* (STC 21538).

13 Meighen never purchased the rights to *Technogamia*; it was entered in the Stationers’ Register to John Parker on 20 April 1618 and transferred from Parker to John Haviland and John Wright, Senior, on 4 September 1638.

14 Peter W.M. Blayney calculates that for a run of 800 copies, paper and printing would cost £6. 19s. Of course, if Meighen chose larger print runs—as he well might, for previously printed plays—it would
the public’s demands when he published works that participated in the *Hic Mulier*
controversy in 1620; his expenditure of such a substantial amount of money in 1630
suggests that he now recognized an even more voracious demand for comedies.

In fact, the London playbook trade as a whole experienced an enormous comedy
boom in 1630-1631. In these two years, London stationers published a total of 62
different editions of plays, nearly as many as in the previous nine years combined (see
Figure 4.1). More significantly, the number of comedies skyrocketed. In 1630, more
comedies were printed than there had been total plays in any year since 1619. Of the 62
plays published in 1630-1631, 34—that is, 55%—were comedies or tragicomedies, and
only 12 were tragedies. The Caroline era is typically associated with the rise of romance
and pastoral, but in the early 1630s comedy dominated the print market. The quarto
publications of Shakespeare’s comedies in 1630-1631, then, participate in a specifically
print-based revival of interest in plays.15

Indeed, in this revival of interest, as Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser suggest,
Caroline England saw the book trade “split” into two different markets, one for old plays
and one for new—a division which signaled the development of a discrete canon of
classic plays.16 As Figure 4.1 illustrates, at the same turning point, the market was

---

15 None of these plays had been recently performed, as far as we know. For performances of plays, see

16 Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser, “Canons and Classics: Publishing Drama in Caroline England,” in
*Localizing Caroline Drama: Politics and Economics of the Early Modern English Stage, 1625-1642*, ed.
permeated with comedies.\textsuperscript{17} Perfectly situated to capitalize on both of these trends, Elizabethan comedies came back in vogue. In 1630 and 1631, in addition to the three Shakespeare plays I discuss below, London stationers published new quartos of \textit{Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay} (written ca. 1589), \textit{Fair Em the Miller's Daughter} (ca. 1590), \textit{Mucedorus} (ca. 1590), \textit{Englishmen for My Money, or A Woman Will Have Her Will} (1598), \textit{The Shoemakers' Holiday} (1599), \textit{I The Fair Maid of the West} (ca. 1600), \textit{How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad} (1601-02), \textit{Wily Beguiled} (1601-02), and \textit{The
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\caption{Number of Editions of Playbooks by Genre, 1621-1631}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{17} To arrive at these numbers, I used \textit{DEEP} to search playbooks published by year; Farmer and Lesser, in turn, base their genre categorizations on the \textit{Annals}. I have counted collections—such as F1, Samuel Daniel's \textit{The Whole Works}, and the second volume of Ben Jonson’s \textit{Works}—as one playbook. When the collection includes mixed genres, I counted it as “Other,” but since the second volume of Jonson includes only comedies, I counted it as one comedy. In cases where the play’s title page claims a genre different than the \textit{Annals}, I have used the title page attribution, since title pages provide our best evidence of early modern marketing practices. Thus \textit{Richard III} is counted as a tragedy, not history (as the \textit{Annals} has it); \textit{Technogamia} is similarly counted as “comedy” rather than “other.” The “Other” category includes “occasional” plays (such as civic pageants and masques) and miscellaneous genres and types.
Merry Devil of Edmonton (ca. 1602).\textsuperscript{18} In other words, as many Elizabethan comedies were published in these two years as tragedies of all eras.\textsuperscript{19} Thus, Meighen’s choice to publish a twice-printed comedy like Merry Wives—thrice-printed, if we count the First Folio—makes sense not only in light of his current preference for second-plus editions (on which see Appendix B), but also in the context of an increased general interest in comedies. An Elizabethan comedy by Shakespeare hit on the two most important trends in the playbook market of 1630.

Unlike Meighen, John Smethwick’s investments in drama were always—and, to modern eyes, fascinatingly—limited to one author: Shakespeare. By the time Smethwick published The Taming of the Shrew and Love’s Labour’s Lost in 1631, he had already published quartos of Romeo and Juliet (1609 and 1623) and Hamlet (1611 and 1625), and he had formed part of the First Folio cartel. Smethwick built a very different career than Meighen’s. Unlike Meighen, he remained at the same location his whole life. Smethwick also exercised a certain amount of caution in his publications; over the course of his long career, the second-plus editions he published outnumber the first editions 3:1.\textsuperscript{20} The caution he typically practiced suggests that he recognized Shakespeare as a solid

\textsuperscript{18} With the exception of I The Fair Maid of the West, which, because of its references to the earl of Essex, I believe was written before the Essex “rebellion” of 1601, these dates come DEEP. Farmer and Lesser, following the Annals, list the date of I Fair Maid as 1604, although they also include a range from 1597-1604.

\textsuperscript{19} Admittedly, Mucedorus had been more or less continuously in print since its first Elizabethan publication, but it was the single most reprinted playbook of the Renaissance. More significant is the number of Elizabethan plays that were printed or reprinted for only the first time in 1630-1631: Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay had only been printed once before, in 1594; Fair Em the Miller’s Daughter had likewise only been printed once, most likely in 1591; I The Fair Maid of the West had never been printed before.

\textsuperscript{20} See Appendix A; he published 73 second-plus editions to 23 first editions.
investment. Certainly both *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* had proven to be moneymakers, since he had published two editions of each. However, the comedies suggest a different story. Even though the rights for all four plays—*Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet, Love’s Labour’s Lost,* and *The Taming of a/the Shrew*—were transferred to Smethwick at the same time in 1607, he did not publish either of the comedies in quarto until 1631. With *The Taming of the Shrew* (never previously printed in quarto) and *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (which had not been published in quarto since 1598), Smethwick was perfectly poised to take advantage of the revived interest in old-fashioned comedies.

Moreover, both Meighen and Smethwick printed the Folio versions of the plays, not the previous quarto versions. Thomas Berger has argued that the publication pattern of Shakespeare’s Caroline quartos can be explained by copyright concerns, pointing out that no play published for the first time in F1 was published in quarto afterwards. Berger suggests that once Heminges and Condell sold the rights to the publishers, “it served [the publishers’] purposes not to publish quarto editions of those plays whose rights they owned in order to maintain sales of the much, much more expensive Folio.”[21] However, as Berger later notes, “a number of ‘deals’ may have been negotiated” to allow the printing of post-Folio quartos, including Q3 *Merry Wives,* Q2 *Love’s Labour’s Lost,* and Q1 *Taming of the Shrew.*[22] Based on Smethwick’s publication of *Taming of the Shrew* although he owned the rights to *Taming of a Shrew,* Berger suggests that the rights came as a “package deal.” If this is the case, then Meighen seems to have negotiated a similar

---


22 Ibid., 326.
deal for *Merry Wives*, since in 1630 he published not the “bad” quarto that had circulated in 1602 and 1619 (and to which he technically held the rights) but rather the longer and more courtly version printed in F1. Nevertheless, the question remains: as investors in F2, why would Smethwick and Meighen bother to negotiate these deals? Perhaps the quarto comedies were meant as a sort of *amuse-bouche* to the forthcoming Second Folio. Yet the choice of these particular plays still invites speculation: why would these particular comedies serve as strong selling points in 1630 and 1631? I suggest below that the three plays emphasize not only Shakespeare’s Elizabethan wit but also the renewed relevance of that wit to Smethwick and Meighen’s Inns of Court customers who kept their fingers on the pulse of Caroline literary and dramatic tastes, which were newly bending to the fashions set by the queen.

**Wit and the Inns of Court Reader**

In addition to attending plays in vast numbers, members of the Inns of Court composed one of the most socially mobile and powerful networks in England. Although technically open to men of any rank, the cost of membership ensured that the Inns of Court were dominated by the upper echelons. According to Wilfrid Prest’s history of the Inns, between 1610 and 1639, 50.1% of entrants were sons of peers, baronets, knights, and esquires.\(^{23}\) At the Middle Temple, which kept the most meticulous records, an even higher proportion of the entrants came from this group (55.6%); at Lincoln’s Inn the number rises to 61.9%. Across the four Inns, though, the number of entrants whose

fathers belonged to the bourgeois and professional classes or lower remains remarkably steady, ranging from 8.4% at Lincoln’s Inn to 11.8% at the Inner Temple. Furthermore, each Inn developed relationships with particular families and regions; the Middle Temple, for example, drew most of its members from the South, Southwest, and Northamptonshire. The Inns thus cultivated a rarefied and well-connected atmosphere in which each generation’s leaders built lasting relationships with one another and negotiated both regional and national patronage systems.

Furthermore, the Inns of Court had long been linked with literary and theatrical experimentation, as well as performative wit. According to Michelle O’Callaghan, the golden age of witty Inns of Court social clubs coincided with the relatively frequent parliaments of the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean eras, ending with the dissolution of the Addled Parliament in 1614. However, she points out, continuities and institutional memories persisted even after the early societies appear to have fallen by the wayside. One textual example is the Wykehamist commonplace book that preserves a long history of libels, satires, and other works connected to the wits of early seventeenth century London. By far the more famous example, though, is the “Tribe” (or “Sons”) “of Ben,” the literary society over which Ben Jonson presided in the Apollo Room of the Devil and St. Dunstan tavern, located on Fleet Street at Temple Bar—just around the corner from Smethwick’s and both of Meighen’s shops. There Jonson “formulated an English

---


25 Ibid., 37.

26 O’Callaghan, *The English Wits*, 164-5. Malone 19, the manuscript that she discusses in depth, is only one of the Oxford manuscript miscellanies bearing evidence of connections to seventeenth-century societies.
symposiastic poetic tradition in dialogue with Anacreon, Horace and Martial that was then transmitted via his poetic sons to the eighteenth-century gentlemen’s clubs.”27 For O’Callaghan, the Tribe of Ben models a similar form of witty sociability to the earlier societies at the Inns of Court. In all of these groups, men forged relationships with one another through “friendship, pleasure, and play”—relationships that could be as strong as or even stronger than the kinship bonds that dominated early modern English society, especially among the upper classes.28 As the remainder of the chapter argues, _The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Taming of the Shrew_, and _Love’s Labour’s Lost_ take on a topical freshness when we consider the locations of their publishers’ shops, highlighting both the long history of Inns of Court wittiness and the preponderance of members that belonged to the upper echelons of society—that is, the men most likely to be in touch with and interested in changing dynamics at court.

_The Merry Wives of Windsor in Caroline London_29

The conjunction in 1630 of the opening of a new shop at the Middle Temple gate with the beginning of a period of heavy investment in drama suggests that Richard Meighen was making strategic moves to capitalize on the interests of his Inns of Court clientele. I am not arguing here that Meighen _only_ wanted to sell to law students or

---

27 O’Callaghan, _The English Wits_, 166.

28 Although female wits became popular, they did not participate in the social clubs. See O’Callaghan, _The English Wits_, 177.

29 An early draft of this section was presented for the “Shakespeare’s Stationers” seminar at the 2008 meeting of the Shakespeare Association of America in Dallas. I am grateful for the feedback I received, particularly from Alexandra Halasz, Adam Hooks, and Lindsay Reid.
envisioned them as his sole customer base; obviously, he would have wanted to sell as many books as he could, to whoever would buy them. However, given the locations of his shops, I suggest that his retail business kept the interests of the law students close to his heart and affected when and for which books he would open his purse. In this context, Meighen’s publication of playbooks, especially *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, indicates that he read them as marketable to his Inns of Court retail customers, who would particularly appreciate legal satire and Latin in-jokes.

Reading *The Merry Wives of Windsor* in the context of Richard Meighen’s Middle Temple and St. Dunstan’s bookshops highlights a different set of themes than we usually associate with the play. In fact, it shares legal and university connections with the other plays Meighen published that year and incorporates allusions that would have appealed to the heavily theatrical and satirical culture of the Inns of Court. Although an in-depth comparison of the themes of *Merry Wives* with those of the other plays that Meighen published in 1630 would range beyond the scope of this chapter, I will point out here that all of these comedies have in common some connection to law or the universities. Edward Sharpham, author of *Cupid’s Whirligig*, was a Middle Temple man. Middleton’s *The Phoenix* satirizes the legal profession in the form of the hyperlitigious Tangle, and the title of *Michaelmas Term* showcases its connections with the calendar of the legal courts and the schools.\(^{30}\) *Technogamia*, the only 1630 play that Meighen did not purchase from Arthur Johnson, is a university play that advertises its Oxford pedigree: it was

\(^{30}\) Although *Michaelmas Term* begins with a prologue featuring the four legal terms and a discussion of how they fleece people, Middleton also says explicitly that “he that expects any great quarrels in Law to be handled here, will be fondly deceived.” See Middleton, *Michaelmas Terme* (London: T[homas] H[arper] for Richard Meighen, 1630; STC 17891), A3r.
“Written by Barten Holiday, Master of Arts, and Student of Christ Church in Oxford” and performed “by the Students of the same House.”31 The Merry Wives of Windsor aligns with the tone and themes of the other plays Meighen published in 1630, winkingly addressing an insider audience and turning a sidelong satirical glance on the law without focusing extensively on it. Instead, Shakespeare’s merry wives themselves enforce justice in the play, combining legal discourses with an emphasis on strong, active women and connections between the two “fairy queens,” Elizabeth and Henrietta Maria.

The Merry Wives of Windsor begins with a promise of legal action that is never fulfilled. Its opening depicts an outraged Justice Shallow threatening to take Falstaff to court. “I will make a Star-Chamber matter of it,” he says, and Slender eagerly agrees, providing a somewhat mangled list of Shallow’s qualifications as a Chief Justice in Gloucester.32 Throughout this first scene of the play, Shakespeare mocks the foolish lawyer and his even more foolish kinsman. In the much expanded version of the scene that appears in F1 and Meighen’s 1630 quarto (Q3),33 Slender delivers a series of Latin

31 Perhaps significantly, Meighen published two more university plays by Thomas Goffe shortly thereafter: The Raging Turk, or Bajazet the Second (1631) and The Courageous Turk, or Amurath the First (1632). In 1635 he went on to publish Davenant’s The Triumphs of the Prince D’Amour, which had been performed at the Middle Temple. Meighen’s interest in university plays suggests that for him, at least, they proved to be more profitable than they are generally considered to be.


33 Merry Wives exists in two distinct versions. Q1 (1602) is a classic “bad quarto,” much shorter than the version published in the First Folio (1623). Q2 (1619) reprints Q1; Meighen’s Q3 uses the F1 text, as does F2.
malapropisms in jokes targeted toward an educated audience. The legal satire that drives the action in 1.1 suggests the inefficacy of the legal system in Windsor altogether and appears most clearly in the treatment of Shallow and Slender. Their cases against Falstaff, Bardolph, and Pistol never come anywhere near the Star Chamber. Instead, Sir Hugh Evans persuades them to allow him to arbitrate the matter in his role as a clergyman. When confronted, Falstaff admits to having committed the deeds of which Shallow accuses him, but then he baffles the justice that Evans, Shallow, and Slender attempt to pursue by refusing to follow the conventions that Evans tries to enforce. In this parody of an arbitration, Falstaff simultaneously confesses his deeds and takes over from Evans the role of questioner: “Slender, I broke your head: what matter haue you against me?” (A3v/1.1.114-5) Falstaff thus becomes both defendant and arbitrator, embodying the comic upheaval that will require the wives’ intervention.

34 In F Slender says “Rato lorum” for Rotulorum (1.1.7). In Q3, however, this mistake is corrected, an odd change which gets rid of the joke on Slender in favor of restoring accurate Latin. Although not the most sophisticated editorial change, overlooking humor in favor of correctness, it otherwise corresponds with other emendations that Q3 makes to F, which generally tend to correct perceived errors, going along with the title page’s claim that the text is “Newly corrected.” This claim is unclear: might Meighen be advertising his use of the F1 text, rather than Q1/Q2? Or is he claiming to have corrected that? Or both? Of course, we cannot know whether Meighen himself edited the text before sending it to be printed, or whether the corrections were made by the printer, Thomas Harper, or one of his employees. Still, this attention to detail suggests that Meighen may have wanted to establish himself as a resource for accurate plays. To summarize the corrections made in Q3: in addition to the one already mentioned, Q3 also corrects F’s “Gater” for “Garter” at 1.1.131, substitutes “rightly” for F’s “tightly” at 1.3.76 (a case in which either reading could work, and “rightly” could easily be seen as an improvement), and reads “Villaine” for F’s “Villanie” at 1.4.63 (which has the virtue of being parallel to the second term of opprobrium that Caius uses, the French larron, “thief”). Q3 makes the beginning of 2.1 more grammatical by adding the “I” to Mistress Page’s first line, “What, have I scaped love-letters in the holiday-time of my beauty...” (2.1.1). It also changes F’s “enchange” in 2.2.223 to the more appropriate “exchange” (Ford, disguised as Brook/Broome, has just given Falstaff money to try to seduce Mistress Ford). Q3 adds Fenton’s speech prefix at 3.4.12 and corrects F’s “Master Fenter” at 3.4.66 to “Master Fenton.” It also adds a sensible “not” to Mistress Ford’s pretend plea on behalf of Falstaff in disguise as the old woman of Brainford/Brentford: “Nay, good sweet husband—good gentlemen, let him not strike the old woman” (4.2.170-1), and when Ford proceeds to rain down insults on the old woman, Q3 has him call her “Hagge” instead of F’s “Ragge” (4.2.175). Finally, it sets 4.4.26-7 as verse instead of prose (going along with the rest of Mistress Page’s verse speech about Herne the hunter).
Meanwhile, Evans tries valiantly to set up an arbitration that exercises at least some authority by selecting three “umpires”: himself, Master Page, and the Host of the Garter Inn (A3v/1.1.127). In a legal context, an umpire was “a third person appointed or called upon to decide a matter submitted to arbitrators who cannot agree.”

Evans’s call for three umpires suggests a level of bafflement and obstinacy far beyond the normal. And yet it turns out that not even one would be necessary, since no judgment is ever made. This quickly fragmenting arbitration begins, in the best farcical manner, to deconstruct the legal principles on which justice is supposed to rest. The word of eyewitnesses in Windsor means just as little as the confessions of the criminals. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* thus begins by not only mocking the pretensions of legal language, but also removing judicial power from the space and the procedures of a court of law.

In place of the justice represented by the Star Chamber and the arbitration that Evans tries to conduct, the play turns to the merry wives, Mistress Page and Mistress Ford, who will mete out justice in the end. In fact, the play turns to them quite literally, in this case, since they interrupt the arbitration to bring out wine. Page (who has not had a line since acknowledging his role as umpire) seizes on their intrusion as a chance to stop the proceedings and go eat dinner. His solution to the problem involves venison pasty and “drink[ing] downe all vnkindnesse”—a cheery sentiment, but hardly a just one (A4v/1.1.182). The first scene has thus overturned expectations of justice from every angle: Justice Shallow abandons the Star Chamber, Parson Evans mismanages his

---

35 *OED*, “umpire,” *n.*
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arbitration, and the umpire Page decides to invite everyone to dinner instead of making a judgment. In this way Shakespeare opens up the potential for the wives to enact a festive and particularly female fantasy of justice that is embodied in popular ritual and linked with both the folklore of fairies and the more elevated allegory of Elizabeth as Faerie Queene.

Emblematizing an interest in the active women of the play, Meighen’s 1630 edition became the first quarto to title the play not *Sir John Falstaff and the Merry Wives of Windsor* but rather *The Merry Wives of Windsor. With the humours of Sir John Falstaffe*. By inverting the title, Meighen’s quarto also emphasizes the centrality of the “merry wives” who dominate the middle-class society of Windsor. The vengeance they take on Falstaff for his presumption in trying to seduce them both—using the same letter, no less—drives the plot and the comedy as they use folk ritual to “teach him to know Turtles from Iayes” (E4v/3.3.35-37). Jeanne Addison Roberts has described the wives’ treatment of Falstaff as a scapegoating, and Leah Marcus links it with skimmingtons, the communal shaming rituals enacted primarily against adulterous and “froward” women.36 By the end of the play, the wives have relocated justice from the official public space of Star Chamber to the local spaces of Windsor: Datchet Mead, where Falstaff is ducked; the Fords’ house, where he dresses up as the old witch of Brainford; and Herne’s Oak, where he gets his ultimate comeuppance during the fairy masque.37

---


37 Of course, the first two quarto editions locate the action in a more generalized urban environment that identifies far fewer locales than F1/Q3. See Marcus, *Unediting*, 84-88.
In the fairy masque, a group of women and children not only triumph over Falstaff but also dupe Anne Page’s suitors so that she can marry Fenton. The masque clearly evokes Queen Elizabeth: “Our radiant Queene, hates Sluttery,” declares Pistol as Hobgoblin (K1r/5.5.46). The Fairy Queen of the masque further flatters Elizabeth in her instructions to the fairies:

Search Windsor Castle (Elues) within, and out:

Strew good lucke (Ouphes) on euery sacred roome,

That it may stand till the perpetuall doome,

In state as wholesome, as in state ’tis fit,

Worthy the Owner, and the Owner it. (K1r/5.5.56-60)

The orderliness of the household of Windsor Castle mirrors the orderliness of the realm under the “radiant queen” who hates sluttery, both in the early modern sense of untidiness and the modern sense of sexual promiscuity. The fairies police not only domestic cleanliness but also sexual behavior, particularly Falstaff’s impositions against the sexual order of Windsor. By burning him with a candle, the so-called fairies prove that he is “[c]orrupt, corrupt, and tainted in desire” (K1v/5.5.90). Their subsequent song emphasizes his sexual impropriety: “Fie on sinnefull phantasie: Fie on Lust, and Luxurie. Lust is but a bloudy fire, kindled with vnchaste desire” (K1v/5.5.93-6). Falstaff’s attempted sexual transgressions may only directly threaten the merry wives and the domestic world of Windsor over which they preside, but by connecting the events in Windsor with the fairy queen, the masque highlights the extended impact of those

---

38 F1 reads “sluts and sluttery.” The 1979 BBC production of the play dresses the Fairy Queen in a white costume clearly based on the Ditchley Portrait of Elizabeth I.
transgressions on the realm as a whole. The play’s emphasis on sexual integrity and especially on wifely chastity must have resonated keenly with the decorous court over which Charles and Henrietta Maria ruled and with which many of Meighen’s Inns of Court customers could have been familiar.

Furthermore, as Marjorie Swann has pointed out, the 1620s and 1630s featured a more general poetic revival of fairylore associated particularly with the Stuart court. Swann delineates three distinct “categories” of early modern fairylore: “popular fairy beliefs, courtly mythography, and Shakespearean miniaturization,” a tradition based on Shakespeare’s tiny fairies, such as Queen Mab in *Romeo and Juliet* or the Peaseblossoms and Moths of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Intriguingly, the fairy masque in *Merry Wives* connects with all three of these categories. First, as in popular fairy beliefs, the fairies of the masque primarily monitor and regulate appropriate domestic behavior: they examine chimneys and hearths, clean the chairs of the Order of the Garter, and make sure that “maids” say their prayers before bed. Second, the associations with Elizabeth as Faerie Queene connect these fairies to Spenser, that most famous of courtly mythographers; moreover, the Order of the Garter material further emphasizes the text’s courtliness. Finally, as in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, the fairies of the masque have “miniaturized” names like Cricket and Bead, even though the play makes clear that they are miniaturized only inasmuch as they are played by the children of Windsor merely dressed as fairies.

---

Fairylore itself used nostalgia to comment on contemporary social changes. Wendy Wall links fairylore with “sexualized domestic nostalgia,” suggesting that in the English cultural imagination [fairies’] attachment to domestic work made them multifaceted emblems of vernacular culture. For elite audiences they signified the exotic or vulgar hominess of serving women; for the middle part of the population they simply marked a ‘familiarity’ inscribed in the rural roots of Londoners, native traditions, or the mythological space of childhood itself.40

The ambiguity of fairylore mirrors the ambiguity of the masque: a performance that simultaneously rehearses, mocks, and glorifies beliefs in fairies. It serves a multivalent function in the play, providing the final scapegoating ritual by which Falstaff’s erotic disruptions are purged from the Windsor community, even while it enshrines domestic stability through the marriage of Anne Page and Fenton—itsel itself a rebellion against Anne’s parents. Nevertheless, this scapegoating ritual borrows from old traditions to create a new and improved status quo, one in which domestic virtues triumph over the debauchery associated with Falstaff by reaching back to the legend of Herne the Hunter (which, paradoxically, seems to have been invented by Shakespeare).

Considered in this light, the choice to draw on fairylore for the masque highlights the recuperative role of nostalgia in the play. As Swann notes, “Both folkloric and courtly representations of fairies were rooted in visions of an unchanging, precapitalist society

---

Thus, references to fairylore connect *The Merry Wives of Windsor* with early myths of “Merry England,” characterized by not only the fairies but also frequent references to an English past that conflates the memories of Henry V’s reign with Elizabeth’s. Fenton, like Falstaff, has “kept companie with the wilde Prince, & Pointz,” and *Merry Wives* relocates many of the Eastcheap tavern’s regulars to Windsor for the play (E4r/3.2.65-6). At the same time, however, characters frequently allude to Elizabethan literature, including *Doctor Faustus*, “The Passionate Shepherd to His Love,” and “Greensleeves.” In 1630, these references to Elizabethan literature, peppered throughout a play about Henry V’s most famous comrade and capped with a fairy masque, connect nostalgic views of England’s national past with the merry policing of sexual and domestic behavior that the fairies perform. Thus, *Merry Wives* embodies a Caroline version of the myth of Merry Old England: a place of festivity and virtue together, where “Wiues may be merry, and yet honest too” (H1r/4.2.100), and where sexual license is punished by the members of the community in accordance with national folklore.

The upshot of this particular version of the Merry England myth remains ambiguous at the end of the play. Peter Erickson and Richard Helgerson argue that the play ultimately privileges the role of the court and the nobility by reinscribing royal

---


42 In this context, it seems significant that at least two more plays featuring fairies were published in the early 1630s. Meighen himself published Fletcher’s *The Faithful Shepherdess*, once in 1629 and again in 1634 (see Appendix B), which also features fairies that punish licentious behavior. In 1632, Edward Blount printed new editions of six of John Lyly’s comedies, including *Endimion*, which similarly includes fairies who pinch mortals to keep them from ogling the Queen of Stars.
authority and aristocratic privilege at the end—a position difficult to square with the court’s satirical treatment in Q1/Q2. Wendy Wall, on the other hand, argues that the final fairy scene merely mocks courtly values:

> Indeed in *Merry Wives* Shakespeare parodies the assimilation of popular forms and courtly lineage seen in *Dream*. As a garrulous laundress directs native fairies to sing chants about the Virgin Queen, the play may be said to produce an ‘Englishness of everyday life’—one that nominates the values of the emergent middle class as the foundational world for which everyone supposedly yearns. Elite citizens, whether in the [first] quarto town or the folio Windsor, use the popular discourse of country value to position Englishness as the preserve of townspeople.

Nevertheless, as invested in proto-middle-class Englishness as the ending may be, the F1/Q3 version in particular also remains open to more favorably courtly interpretations. Most of these, as Richard Dutton points out, center on the allusions and attitudes toward the Order of the Garter: “[T]he level of Garter detail which we find in Q1—light but legible—is […] more appropriate for [its] ‘humorous’ satire of an unknighthly buffoon than the elaborately foregrounded material which celebrates the Order in F.”

---


45 Richard Dutton, “A Jacobean *Merry Wives*?” *Ben Jonson Journal* 18.1 (2011): 1-26, 10. For Dutton, the differences between Q1/Q2 and F1 indicate two separate versions of the play. In this view, Q1 represents not a garbled memorial reconstruction of the F1 text (as the editorial tradition since W.W. Greg has held)
Dutton, the F1 version balances Q1’s satire of a degraded knight of the Order by reaffirming the courtly values associated with the Garter.

Indeed, I argue, the famous “Garter Speech” that appears in the F1/Q3 version of the fairy masque strikes a particular resonance with the Caroline courts of 1630. During the masque, the Fairy Queen orders the fairies to tidy Windsor Castle and specifically to prepare for an investiture ceremony of the Order of the Garter. The speech highlights the sort of ceremony that might have delighted the decorous and traditional Charles I:

The seuerall Chairs of Order, looke you scowre
With iuyce of Balme, and euery precious flower;
Each faire instalment, Coate, and seu’rall Crest,
With loyall Blazon, euermore be blest.
And Nightly-meadow-Fairies, looke you sing
Like to the Garters-Compasse, in a ring.
Th’expressure that it beares: Greene let it be,
More fertile-fresh than all the Field to see;
And, *Hony Soit Qui Mal-y-Pence*, write
In Emrold tuffes, Flowres purple, blew, and white,
Like Sapphire-pearle, and rich embroidery,
Buckled below faire Knight-hoods bending knee. (K1r/5.5.61-72)

This passage has often been read (alongside Q1’s references to Count Mömpelgard, the German aristocrat who begged to Elizabeth to make him a member of the Order but rather a “very poor rendition” of a lost Shakespearean original—the original that Shakespeare then revised for the recorded performance at court on 4 November 1604, from which the F1 text derives (16).
failed to show up for his investiture) as evidence that *Merry Wives*—or at least an
entertainment including the fairy masque and other more “courtly” parts of the play—was
first performed at the Garter Feast at Westminster on 23 April 1597, despite a complete
lack of historical evidence for such a performance.\(^{46}\) Instead, I want to draw attention to
the speech’s emphasis on courtly show and ceremony in the context of the 1630 Order
investiture of Richard Weston, then Baron Weston of Nyland and Lord Treasurer of
England. Although the Order emphasized the ideals of chivalry and valor, the role of
Garter knights in Caroline England was largely *pro forma*. In fact, as one of the leaders of
the pro-Spanish party at court, Weston helped to orchestrate the peace between England
and Spain in 1630.\(^{47}\) Richard Cust points out that Charles’s efforts to “distance himself
from the Elizabethan military tradition that had become something of an embarrassment
with the pursuit of peace” focused on his reformation of the Order of the Garter:

> Under Elizabeth and James, the Order had retained its associations with
> martial valour, and its main ceremony was a parade through Whitehall by
> the knights of the garter and their retinues. Charles changed this by
> reviving the practice of holding parades in the more private surroundings
> of Windsor Castle and stressing their civil and spiritual aspects.\(^{48}\)

---

\(^{46}\) Of course, the Garter speech only occurs in F1/Q3, and the mockery of Mömpelgard only occurs in
Q1/Q2. For a rehearsal of the arguments for and against associating part or all of *Merry Wives* with this
particular Garter Feast, see Giorgio Melchiori’s introduction to the Arden edition, 18-30, and Dutton, “A
Jacobean *Merry Wives*?” 5-11.


\(^{48}\) Cust, *Charles I*, 160.
The fairy masque’s emphasis on the Order as a courtly gathering of England’s splendidly dressed “fair knighthood,” more concerned with coats of arms and the language of flowers than with war, similarly downplays the martial. In the masque, the Order and its motto appear within the domestic context of the fairies’ cleaning duties: the Order appears traditional, noble, and, above all, ceremonial.

In this way, the play fits in with the ceremonial role that the Order played in Caroline England. As Charles returned the Garter parades to Windsor, so *Merry Wives* associates the Order of the Garter with its ancient seat. Thomas Carew’s 1634 court masque *Coelum Britannicum* similarly culminates in “a troop of fifteen stars, expressing the stellifying of our British heroes; but one more great and eminent than the rest […] figured his Majesty. And in the lower part [of the ‘firmament’ backdrop] was seen afar off the prospect of Windsor Castle, the famous seat of the most honourable Order of the Garter.”49 Furthermore, these aspects of the Order—and Charles’s increased emphasis on the role of the litany in the parades—reflect the increasing emphasis on liturgy and ceremony in the Church of England. Indeed, the Laudian polemicist Peter Heylyn published a current list of the Order of the Garter (as of May 1630) in his history of St. George, which Laud presented to Charles in February 1631.50 For Meighen, the folio *Merry Wives*’s depiction of an Order of the Garter that emphasizes peaceful ceremony


50 Peter Heylyn, *The historie of that most famous saint and soouldier of Christ Iesus; St. George of Cappadocia asserted from the fictions, in the middle ages of the Church; and opposition, of the present. The institution of the most noble Order of St. George, named the Garter. A catalogue of all the knights thereof untill this present* (London: [Bernard Alsop and Thomas Fawcet] for Henry Seyle, 1631; STC 13272), 346-7.
over military prowess must have resonated remarkably well with the increased emphasis on peace in 1630.

Thus, the Elizabethanism of *Merry Wives* not only echoes Charles’s reformations to the Order of the Garter but also intersects with Stuart fairylore to foreground both common and courtly female power. However, Mistress Ford and Mistress Page exercise their power only to reinforce their chastity. The play’s motto, after all, is that “Wiwes may be merry, and yet honest too” (H1r/4.2.100). In Shakespeare’s Windsor, English wives exercise their ingenuity on behalf of their husbands to reinscribe the values of companionate marriage, values that the royal marriage increasingly demonstrated. The play concludes by reintegrating Windsor into a merry world of country festivity and fertility in which marriages are preserved, social class temporarily ceases to matter, and Ford’s jealousy is abated. In 1630, this representation of social unity and limited female sovereignty as particularly linked with loving marriages certainly would have highlighted Henrietta Maria’s conflicting loyalties. As Karen Britland points out, “During the late 1620s, Henrietta Maria’s familial and political allegiances remained with her mother, and with her mother’s Catholic cause,” even while her status as wife demanded submission to Charles.\(^{51}\) Henrietta Maria had to learn to negotiate her rights as a sovereign and a princess of France while still submitting to her royal husband—a process that made the early years of the royal marriage far less halcyon than the decade following Buckingham’s assassination. In the context of shifting Caroline court politics, *The Merry*

---

*Wives of Windsor* models how wives might achieve social power by channeling forms of Englishness that cross both geographical and class boundaries.

Shakespeare’s place in Meighen’s bookshops, therefore, not only accentuates his appeal to Caroline Inns of Court students; it also emphasizes various discursive contexts in which *The Merry Wives of Windsor* intersected with shifting social and political dynamics in 1630. As a “classic” comedy and as a bit of legal satire, as part of a larger interest in fairylore, as a reflection on gender roles and the politics of marriage as Henrietta Maria emerged as a major power at court, *Merry Wives* capitalized on a wide range of new or renewed interests that characterized the dramatic, political, social, and economic investments of members of the Inns of Court and their kinship networks. As the first Shakespearean comedy to be printed in quarto since the abortive Pavier collection of 1619 (which also featured the second quarto of *Merry Wives*), the play highlights a different version of Shakespeare than had circulated most prominently among the quartos of the 1620s. Instead of the writer of tragic works like *Othello* (1622), *Richard III* (1622 and 1629), *Romeo and Juliet* (1623), *The Rape of Lucrece* (1624), *Hamlet* (1625), and even to some extent *Venus and Adonis* (1620, 1627), Shakespeare once again becomes a comic writer. The 1630 quarto of *Merry Wives* picks up on the chaotic, joyful energy of the tavern scenes in *1 Henry IV* (last printed in quarto in 1622) and locates that comic exuberance in a particularly English fantasy world in which the court simultaneously looms over the proceedings (in the forms of Falstaff, Fenton, Windsor Castle, and the Order of the Garter) and is subjugated to the machinations of the merry wives.
Overall, though, the play’s greatest appeal in 1630 may have been, as Marcus notes that it was centuries later, “the ‘Myth of Merry England’: a timeless vision of court and countryside in harmonious alliance, of simple rural folk and their superiors, nay even the queen herself, as working reciprocally for mutual prosperity and betterment.”52 The cultural edifice of Shakespeare as national poet, which would flourish in the eighteenth century and achieve virtual apotheosis in the nineteenth, took seed in the print culture of the 1630s as Shakespeare’s plays continued to circulate in quarto (and, of course, in the Second Folio of 1632). The Elizabethanism of *Merry Wives* did not need to be prefaced with stories that claimed Shakespeare wrote it in fourteen days because Elizabeth wanted to see Falstaff in love53; rather, the allusions to Elizabethan literature and the fairy queen masque quite firmly associated *Merry Wives* with the Elizabethan era already. The applicability of the play’s concerns to Caroline reformations of the Order of the Garter and to Henrietta Maria’s rising prominence at court must have breathed new life into it. Indeed, *The Merry Wives of Windsor* contributes to the Elizabethanist discourse of moderation that characterizes other works published at the beginning of the personal rule.

“Vengeance of Ginny’s case”: Translating Sex

By 1631, Smethwick and Meighen must have had some sort of working relationship, even if they had not enjoyed one previously, since both were involved in the

---

52 Marcus, *Unediting*, 70-1.

publication of F2 in 1632. In this context, the publication of three Shakespearean comedies in these years of the comedy boom look like an advertising strategy, geared specifically for their Inns of Court customers. Not only do all three plays fit in with current publishing trends, but they also all feature Latin-English translation scenes, for which the well-educated members of the Inns of Court would constitute the ideal audience. The translation scenes in *The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Taming of the Shrew*, and *Love’s Labour’s Lost* function in different ways, as I explore below, yet in all three plays, these scenes transform the dry intellectual activity of “constering” into a sexually charged endeavor characterized by transgression.

The clearest emphasis on the potential sexiness of translation appears in the Latin lesson in *Merry Wives* (4.1), which only appears in the folio version of the text. In this scene, the Welsh pedant Evans tutors the boy William through the process of double translation, while Mistress Quickly grows increasingly scandalized by the bawdy implications of the Latin words. Quickly’s jokes about the translations from Latin to English culminate in the exchange about the genitive case:

*Euan.* What is your *Genitiue case plurall* (*William*)?

*Will.* *Genitiue case?*

*Euan.* I.

*Will.* *Genitiue horum, harum, horum.*

---

54 Indeed, since both operated shops in St. Dunstan’s churchyard, it is tempting to speculate that Meighen’s geographical proximity to Smethwick first established the relationship that would enable Meighen to join the F2 cartel.
Qui. Vengeance of Ginyes case; fie on her; neuer name her (childe) if she be a whore.

Euan. For shame o’man.

Qui. You doe ill to teach the childe such words: hee teaches him to hic, and to hac; which they’l dwell fast enough of themselues, and to call horum; fie upon you.

Euan. O’man, art thou Lunatics? Hast thou no vnderstandings for thy Cases, and the numbers of the Genders? Thou art as foolish Christian creatures as I would desires. (G3r-v/4.1.50-64)

Throughout this scene, Mistress Quickly performs a sideways kind of translation, in which cognates and puns translate Latin grammar into English bawdiness. Translation itself is gendered: Evans, in his stage Welsh accent, continually refers to Quickly as “woman” throughout the scene, and he perceives Quickly as foolish primarily because she does not understand “cases” (slang for female genitalia) or “the numbers of the genders.” Although Evans means grammatical cases and genders, the play is clearly making a joke about his own translations from Welsh into English bawdiness, whether he intends to or not. Elsewhere in the play, translation similarly becomes a sexual metaphor. Talking about Mistress Ford, Falstaff tells Pistol, “I can construe the action of her familiar stile, and the hardest voice of her behauior (to be english’d rightly) is I am Sir John Falstafs” (B2v/1.3.42-5). Pistol replies, “He hath studied her will; and translated her will out of honesty, into English” (B2v/1.3.46-7). Here, as in the Latin lesson, translation into English is an inherently sexual process. If, as Richard Helgerson observes, Merry
Wives uniquely “works at its Englishness, insists on it, makes it fundamental to the definition of a domestic space that court and town can share,” then it also uses the Latin lesson to celebrate a particularly English sexuality, virtuous and festive, and linked in the play with the merriness of the honest wives.⁵⁵

The Latin lesson in The Taming of the Shrew (3.1) similarly connects translation with sex by staging the educational space of Bianca’s Latin tutorial as a cover for romantic dalliance. In this case the misinterpretations are purposeful, as Lucentio and Bianca use the cover of translation to play courtship games. Moreover, in a play that centers so distressingly on taming strong women, this scene provides one instance in which a woman exercises power. Since Bianca is both student and woman, she ought from an early modern perspective to exert the least authority in the scene. Yet she immediately takes control of the squabbling Lucentio and Hortensio:

Why Gentlemen, you do me double wrong,
To striue for that which resteth in my choice:
I am no breeching scholler in the schools,
Ile not be tied to houres nor pointed times
But learne my Lessons as I please my selfe.⁵⁶

Her determination to learn as best pleases her quickly turns into her being wooed instead of taught.⁵⁷ Lucentio begins his so-called tutorial by unveiling his identity as suitor rather

---
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than tutor. In fact, Lucentio might have unmasked himself as primarily a lover even without confessing his true identity to Bianca, since her Latin appears to be better than his. Leonard Barken points out that “[Bianca’s] translation at least has the virtue of keeping the Latin clauses logically together,” while Lucentio’s translation is “idiosyncratic.”58 By defending her autonomy to dictate the terms of her own education, and by extension her courtships, Bianca uses the Latin lesson both to keep Lucentio at arm’s length and to grant him permission to court her further:

Now let me see if I can conster it. *Hic ibat simois*, I know you not; *hic est sigeria tellus*, I trust you not; *hic staterat Priami* take heede he hear vs not; *regia* presume not; *Celsa senis* dispaire not. (E3r/3.1.40-3; Latin errors original)

Bianca refuses to be seduced easily, but she ultimately consents to Lucentio’s courtship. Here the Latin lesson provides her the space to get to know one of her suitors; his relatively successful “constering” (especially as compared to Hortensio’s clichéd poem disguised as a “gamut,” or scale, for the music lesson) helps Bianca to choose Lucentio as a suitor. The sexual tension that underlies the Latin-to-English translations between Bianca and Lucentio mirrors the bawdiness that Mistress Quickly sees lurking around every Latin pronoun. In these plays, translation opens up the transgressive possibilities of multivalent meanings. By dealing with the multiplicity and slippage of language, the

---

57 The extent to which Bianca knows or suspects that her tutors are more interested in courting her remains open to interpretation.

process of translation also enables innuendo and deception. Both plays suggest that the act of translating is itself dangerous and even sexually exciting.

In *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, translation is equally slippery and sexually charged. Barkan calls the play “Shakespeare’s monument to the problems of grammar and rhetoric” and notes that nearly every scene features “exercises in semantics or translation or else larger theories of language.”\(^{59}\) Indeed, almost any scene featuring Holofernes might count as a translation scene, since the pedantic schoolmaster lectures nearly everyone he encounters about the appropriate use of language (and pronunciation and orthography, too). However, one scene in particular emphasizes translation between Latin and English: the conversation between Dull, Holofernes, and Nathaniel in 4.2. The comedy of the conversation hinges on Dull’s misperceptions of Holofernes’s Latin:

\[\text{Hol.}\]\(^{60}\) The Deare was (as you know) sanguis in blood ripe as a Pomewater, who now hangeth like a Iewell in the eare of Celo the skie; the welken, the heauen, and anon falleth like a Crab on the face of Terra, the soyle, the land, the earth.

\text{Curat. Nath.} Truly M. Holofernes, the epithithes are sweetly varied like a scholler at the least: but Sir I assure ye, it was a Bucke of the first head.

\text{Hol.} Sir, Nathaniel, haud credo.

\text{Dul.} ’Twas not a haud credo, ’twas a Pricket.

\(^{59}\) Barkan, “What did Shakespeare read?” 38.

\(^{60}\) The quarto sometimes uses the speech prefix “Ped.” (“Pedant”) for Holofernes; this is one instance of it, which I have changed for clarity.
Hol. Most barbarous intimation: yet a kinde of insinuation, as it were in via, in way of explication facere: as it were replication, or rather ostentare, to show as it were his inclination after his vndressed, vnpolished, vneducated, vnpruned, vntrained, or rather vnlettered, or ratherest vconfirmed fashion, to insert againe my haud credo for a Deare.

Dul. I said the Deare was not a haud credo, 'twas a Pricket.61

Whether Dull misunderstands the Latin or, as editors of the play have suggested, simply mishears it as “auld grey doe,” his sideways mistranslation shares much in common with Mistress Quickly’s.62 As another commoner who speaks no Latin, Dull assumes that haud credo describes the deer in a way consonant with Nathaniel’s erroneous claim that the deer “was a Bucke of the first head.” Dull may not know Latin, but he knows deer; still, his attempt to correct his companions only highlights the sexual undertones to many conversations about hunting deer/dear. His insistence on the word “pricket,” with its punning bawdiness, prompts Holofernes to deplore the word’s “most barbarous intimation,” although the schoolmaster might unintentionally emphasize that bawdiness further if he pronounces “facere” with the hard classical c that would suggest “fuck.” In any case, Holofernes’s insistence on using Latin terms and translating them into various English meanings accentuates the multiplicity and instability of language, even while he


62 See Woudhuysen, Love’s Labour’s Lost, 4.2.12n.
tries to pin down those meanings. His euphuistic rhetorical flourishes similarly multiply possibility, albeit with little rationale behind them—as Moth later quips, Holofernes and Don Armado “haue beene at a great feast of Languages, and stolne [the] scraps” (F4r/5.1.35-6). Holofernes’s practice of translating words into and out of Latin, like the translation scenes in *Merry Wives* and *Taming of the Shrew*, ends up producing bawdiness and laughter instead of the scholarly *gravitas* he intends.

In all three plays, translation from Latin to English generates a sexual energy that not only highlights the generative powers of language but also derives from conflict between different social groups. In *Merry Wives*, that conflict arises from the differences in gender and status between Parson Evans, William Page, and Mistress Quickly; in *Taming of the Shrew*, the conflict stems from Lucentio’s disguised courtship of Bianca; in *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, the class distinctions between Holofernes and Dull form the basis of the comic mistranslation. The emphasis in all three plays on the mischievous, pedantic, and dangerous aspects of translation as specifically arising from social difference is only exacerbated by the Inns of Court context—the arena of social advancement for each upcoming generation of noblemen, gentlemen, MPs, and other important figures in the realm. Of course, members of the Inns of Court would have been more than familiar with the type of pedant that each play parodies, as well as the social and even legal dangers of “misconstruing.” Beyond that, though, the scenes of translation and language instruction seem to carry particular weight in 1630-1631 as courtiers needed to translate their wit and political ambitions into the court milieu—and even into French—to catch the ear of the increasingly powerful queen and her party. Alternately, the plays’ depictions of the comic
dangers of mistranslation might justify the choices of those members of the Inns who might prefer avenues of patronage less associated with court politics or the Catholic queen. In other words, merely by dealing with the potential misprision that attends translation, these comedies highlight the rhetorical skill required for anyone at the Inns of Court to pursue their goals.

_The Taming of the Shrew_ and _Love’s Labour’s Lost_

While _The Taming of the Shrew_ and _Love’s Labour’s Lost_ address the pressing importance of rhetorical savvy for Caroline readers at the Inns of Court, they also invoke the Elizabethan past in which they originally appeared. Although set on the Continent, both plays make specific references to Elizabethan literature and history that could be refiltered through the nostalgic lens of the intervening decades to create a version of English literary history that simultaneously spoke to the Caroline present. As in _Merry Wives_, the primary point of intersection for Smethwick’s plays centers on the resonances between their strong female characters and Henrietta Maria. The Elizabethanism of both _The Taming of the Shrew_ and _Love’s Labour’s Lost_ unite disparate concerns—past and present, England and the Continent—but in doing so, their different treatments of strong women imply very different readings of Henrietta Maria.

The induction of _The Taming of the Shrew_ immediately highlights its own self-conscious participation in the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatrical milieu. Christopher Sly and “Sincklo” the player share last names with actors listed among the King’s Men in F1, and within the first ten lines of the play, Sly alludes to _The Spanish Tragedy_ twice.
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Moreover, the play advertises its connections with Shakespeare himself. Sly comes from a Warwickshire village near Stratford-upon-Avon: “Am not I Christopher Slie, old Slies sonne of Burton-heath by byrth a Pedler, by education a Cardmaker, by transmutation a Bear-heard, and now by present profession a tinker. Aske Marrian Hacket the fat Alewife of Wincot, if shee know me not” (A4r/Ind.2.16-21). Families named Hacket and Sly lived in Wincot and Stratford (respectively), and Shakespeare’s aunt, Joan Lambert, lived in Barton-on-the-Heath. The Warwickshire setting of the Induction quickly gives way to the Italian setting of the play-within-the-play that forms the main plot. However, the blatant allusions to Shakespeare’s own origins provide a compelling link to a bygone era. By 1631, the fifteenth anniversary of his death, Shakespeare had already been enshrined as the “Sweet Swan of Avon” in Ben Jonson’s prefatory poem to F1. If Shakespeare was as popular among Inns of Court students as Abraham Cowley suggests in the satire quoted at the beginning of this chapter, part of Shrew’s appeal for a cautious investor like Smethwick might derive from its clear connections to its author. In other words, part of what Smethwick might be selling is the icon of Shakespeare himself. (Perhaps this is partially why the only plays Smethwick ever published were Shakespeare’s—although naturally that must remain speculation.) The title page of The Taming of the Shrew certainly advertises that the play was “Written by Will. Shakespeare.” If F1 marked the first concerted effort to construct Shakespeare as a monumental author, then the post-F1 quartos, including Smethwick’s Shrew, might suggest that Shakespeare had become monumental enough to support an expanded niche in the book trade: not only were his quartos in continued demand, but even the folio was going into a second edition.
In any case, certainly the familiar patriarchal appeal of seeing a “shrewish” woman “tamed” could account for any decision to print or stage *The Taming of the Shrew*, especially at a shop so close to the intensely homosocial clubs and networks that characterized the Inns of Court. Yet Smethwick had held the rights to the play since 1607 without publishing it. To understand what changed for Smethwick, and at the risk of arguing anachronistically, it might help to rehearse the conflict that would arise two years later when *The Taming of the Shrew* was performed at court with John Fletcher’s sequel, *The Woman’s Prize, or The Tamer Tamed*.  

According to the records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, the two plays went over quite well. Herbert notes, “On tuesday night at Saint James, the 26 of Novemb. 1633, was acted before the King and Queene, The Taminge of the Shrew. Likt.” Two nights later, Herbert writes, “On Thursday night at St. James, the 28 of Novemb. 1633, was acted before the King and Queene, The Tamer Tamd, made by Fletcher. Very well likt.” These two entries hardly indicate the conflict that *The Tamer Tamed* had spawned a month before, when Herbert had suppressed the King’s Men’s public performance of the play “upon complaints of foule and offensive matters conteyned therein.” Richard Dutton argues that the differences between the manuscript and printed versions of *The Tamer Tamed* result from Herbert’s subsequent censorship of the play to remove potentially offensive material. Dutton points out that the deleted passages connect
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63 Because the records continually refer to the play as *The Tamer Tamed*, emphasizing the play as a response to *The Taming of the Shrew*, I also do so here.


65 Bawcutt, *Control and Censorship*, 182.
what Herbert calls “ribaldrye” with anti-Catholicism and explains the import of the changes between the two versions:

In 1633 it would not take an over-active imagination to link a dominant woman, and anti-Catholic satire, with Queen Henrietta Maria’s open Roman Catholicism and its supposed effect both on the Church of England and on other members of the royal family—especially since Petruccio’s dominant second wife in the play is called Maria.66

If *The Tamer Tamed* ran into trouble in 1633 because it represents a dangerously insubordinate woman in connection with anti-Catholic satire, *The Taming of the Shrew* in 1631 aligns (perhaps, from a modern perspective, depressingly well) with the submissive roles prescribed for Henrietta Maria as queen consort—and especially for a foreign and Catholic consort.

During and after the Civil War, Henrietta Maria would be blamed for much of the political conflict that led to the events of the 1640s; in fact, until very recently, the parliamentary and post-war representations of the queen would continue to dominate scholarly discourse about her.67 However, as I noted in Chapter 1, Caroline Hibbard


67 Up until the 1980s, and even to some extent after, scholars often treated Henrietta Maria with a staggering level of sexism. Either she is the demon leading Charles astray, or she is flighty and uninterested in politics. For example, several scholars accuse her of caring only for politics if it were a family matter, as if familial concerns could be easily separated from political ones when one’s brother is the king of France and one’s mother is fighting for political influence over him. Kevin Sharpe, for example, claims, “Charles left the queen in nominal charge during his progress to Scotland, and the Council waited on her weekly, but Henrietta wielded little direct political power. Rather her court took on an importance as an alternative home for those whose policies or persons were not in favour. In 1634 Sir Thomas Roe described, with only slight exaggeration, her majesty as ‘the most gracious and needy sanctuary of those who have no other support’” (*The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 173). This claim seems contradictory: why would out-of-favor
argues that Henrietta Maria modeled precisely the virtues that a queen consort was supposed to exhibit: “fecundity, mediation, and generosity.”\textsuperscript{68} Queens consort were not to assume the aggressive, independent role often referred to as “shrewish” any more than their female subjects were. Instead, Hibbard writes, consort queens “were intercessors, conveyors of charity and mercy, and these traditional virtues outlasted the Marian imagery through which they were formerly elaborated.”\textsuperscript{69} As the king’s wife, Henrietta Maria had responsibilities to ensure that the court ran smoothly, and as Malcolm Smuts has pointed out, she did precisely that by providing a space for discontented and out-of-favor courtiers.\textsuperscript{70}

\textit{The Taming of the Shrew}, of course, does not depict a queen consort in an \textit{Ancien Régime} court, nor do I suggest that Katherina or Bianca equals Henrietta Maria in any sort of simple one-to-one allegory. However, Katherina’s sermon on wifely duty at the end of the play strikes a number of resonances with Henrietta Maria’s growing power at court by highlighting the precise limits of the type of power any seventeenth-century woman ought to hope for. As such, it is worth quoting at length:

\begin{quote}
Fie, fie, vnknit that threatening vnkind brow,
\end{quote}

courtiers turn to someone who had no power to help? Given the patronage-based power system of the early modern English court, it seems that Sharpe is using a problematically narrow definition of what it means to wield political power—a definition that has until recently prevented the political work of early modern women from being recognized.

\textsuperscript{68} Caroline Hibbard, “Henrietta Maria in the 1630s: Perspectives on the Role of Consort Queens in \textit{Ancien Régime} Courts,” in \textit{The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era}, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2006, 92-110), 94.

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid.

And dart not scornfull glances from those eies,
To wound thy Lord, thy King, thy Gouernor. […]
Thy husband is thy Lord, thy life, thy Keeper,
Thy head, thy soueraigne: […]
Such dutie as the subiect owes the Prince,
Euen such a woman oweth to her husband;
And when she is froward, peeuish, sullen, sower,
And not obedient to his honest will,
What is she but a foule contending Rebell
And gracelesse Traitour to her louing Lord?
(I4r-v/5.2.142-4, 152-3, 161-6)

The terms by which Katherina shows herself tamed would certainly please a notoriously authoritarian king who indeed saw himself as a sovereign to whom every subject owed unquestioning duty and obedience. While Bianca has become a “headstrong wom[a]n” by the end of the play, Katherina delivers a virtual sermon on wifely submission that would impress St. Paul (I4r/5.2.136). The utter subjection of wife to husband that Katherina urges in this speech emphasizes the ideal hierarchy that structured early modern society. More than that, though, the speech maps the domestic politics of any marriage onto the power structures of the kingdom itself. Katherina repeatedly compares wives to subjects and husbands to sovereigns, so that ultimately shrewish behavior becomes equivalent to treason. Nor does it matter what qualities the woman has that might elevate her to a higher status. “My minde hath bin as bigge as one of yours,” Katherina says, “My heart
as great, my reason haplie more, / To bandie word for word, and frowne for frowne; / But now I see our Launces are but strawes” (I4v/5.2.176-9). Even the weapons that women think they can wield turn out to be useless. Resistance is futile; even froward women will be assimilated.

In 1631, though, Henrietta Maria was politely resisting complete assimilation to England and her husband’s religion, if not necessarily to the queenly ideals that Hibbard discusses. As Karen Britland points out in regard to Charles’s masques, and as previous chapters of this dissertation argue in regard to Elizabethanist works, many texts of the late 1620s and early 1630s work to incorporate Henrietta Maria into a particularly English identity. The queen herself, on the other hand, held tightly to her French identity; while her subjects knew her as Queen Mary, she always signed herself “Henriette R.”

Similarly, Britland argues, Henrietta Maria’s masques and entertainments “emphasized [her] national origins, constructing her identity as both a queen of England and a princess of France.” In other words, for the queen, national identification was not either/or but both/and.

Indeed, in an analysis of Ben Jonson’s masque Chloridia—which was written for Henrietta Maria, and in which she performed on 22 February 1631—Britland demonstrates how the queen negotiated both French and English identities. According to Britland, the masque “[synthesizes] continental and English cultural motifs upon the Whitehall stage by representing Henrietta Maria as Chloris in a manner compatible with

71 Britland, Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria, 73. Indeed, this seems to call for a change in naming practices; as we have respected Anna of Denmark’s preference for Anna rather than Anne, shouldn’t we extend the same respect to Henriette?

72 Ibid., 74-5.
her position as the English queen and at the same time providing her with an iconography that draws upon her familial heritage.”

But it is not iconography alone that draws on Henrietta Maria’s French identity. *Chloridia* also makes specific references to French politics, illustrating Henrietta Maria’s engagement with the realignment of political power at the French court in the wake of the Day of Dupes (10 November 1630). On that day, the tensions between the queen mother, Marie de Médicis, and Cardinal Richelieu came to a head. Richelieu burst in on a meeting between Louis XIII and his mother, a humiliating mistake that he managed to overcome with such *savoir-faire* that he eclipsed Marie de Médicis altogether. The events of the Day of Dupes engineered the power reversal which would eventually precipitate the queen mother’s exile from court in February 1631, immediately before *Chloridia* was performed. Henrietta Maria’s intense interest in the politics of her brother’s court emphasizes that her religion—so conspicuously different from her husband’s, so *French*—served as only part of her fashioning a hybrid French-English identity. Rather, her political activities in the early 1630s reinforce her unwillingness to relinquish her identification as a princess of France. In this sense, she has more in common with Bianca than Katherina, remaining notoriously “untamed” in her Frenchness and Catholicism. Perhaps that is why *The Taming of the Shrew* was only “likt” when performed before the court in 1633, while *The Tamer Tamed*, with its defiant Maria, was “very well likt.”
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73 Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria*, 79.

74 By English reckoning, this took place on 31 October 1630. For the detailed analysis that I merely summarize here, see ibid., ch. 4.

75 Ibid., 82.
If *The Taming of the Shrew* might connect with concerns in 1631 about Henrietta Maria’s assimilation into English (and Protestant) society, *Love’s Labour’s Lost*—which features a French princess visiting the court of Navarre—engages even more explicitly and fortuitously with Henrietta Maria’s Bourbon legacy. The play was first printed in 1598, the year her father Henri of Navarre converted to Catholicism to become Henri IV of France. The battles of the French wars of religion are translated into the skirmishes of wit between the men of Navarre and the women of France. In addition, the play reflects some common preoccupations at the Inns of Court: wittiness, the mockery of study, and, of course, flirtation. Furthermore, the play situates these concerns in a particularly Elizabethan setting, characterized by the ludicrous Spaniard Don Armado, whose name is closely linked to the Armada; the pompous schoolmaster Holofernes, a clear descendant of Sidney’s Rombus in *The Lady of May*; and the emphasis on the sonneteering literary culture of the 1590s. As in Caroline adaptations of Sidney, *Love’s Labour’s Lost* also intersects with the pastoral mode, primarily in the final songs. All of these characteristics lend the play a multivalent resonance that simultaneously recalls the Elizabethan past and intersects with some of the most pressing concerns of the Caroline present: the role of the queen, her relationship to the king, and the restoration of peaceful relationships with France in the wake of a war.

Indeed, one key to understanding Smethwick’s decision to publish *Love’s Labour’s Lost* in 1631 might be found in its connections to *Chloridia*. Jonson’s masque focuses on Henrietta Maria as a figure of Spring: young, fresh, and fertile. As Chloris, the masque concludes, she is “the Queene of Flowers; / The sweetnesse of all Showres, /
ornament of Bowres, / The top of Par-amours.” Chloridia thus culminates in explicit praise for Henrietta Maria as chaste and fertile, a reputation that Poesy, History, Architecture and Sculpture will immortalize. Of course, the allegory does not only apply to Chloris. Britland makes a careful and cogent argument that the masque allegorizes Richelieu as Cupid and Marie de Médicis as Juno, the two figures who drive the masque’s primary conflict. Most significantly, she suggests, Chloridia privileges the role and importance of women at court and “demonstrates that a space could be opened upon the Caroline court stage in which Henrietta Maria could articulate her own concerns, inhabiting a political position that was potentially different from that of the king.” The masque subordinates Chloris/Henrietta Maria to Charles (it “was to bee stellified on Earth, by an absolut decree from Iupiter,” i.e., the king), and, as Erica Veevers has argued, it also symbolizes the concord of the royal marriage. However, for Britland, Chloridia models how Henrietta Maria might exercise her continental political interests while still adopting the persona of virtuous wife and, by extension, virtuous English queen.

Love’s Labour’s Lost, on the other hand, defies the typical comedic resolution in which women are subjected to men in marriage. By postponing the promised marriages
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77 Britland, Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria, 88.

78 Jonson, Chloridia, sig. A2r.

for a year, the play ends with separation rather than union. “You that way; we this way,” reads the final line, ambiguously; but no matter which groups the “you” and “we” indicate, onstage or off, the ending divides them (K2r). As in Chloridia, the conclusion of the play emphasizes spring, here through the personified Ver who sings the first stanzas of the final song. However, Shakespeare associates spring not with faithfulness but with the threat of infidelity. Ver’s bird, the cuckoo, connotes cuckoldry, and the refrain of the song makes this explicit: “Cuckow, cuckow: O word of feare, / Vnpleasing to a married eare” (K1v/5.2.889-90). Similarly, the first stanza describes “Ladie-smockes all siluer white,” flowers which transform by the second stanza into the “summer Smockes” or green-gowns that the maidens need to “bleach,” presumably after their tumbles in the hay (K1v/5.2.883, 894). However, while Chloridia ends with the Queen of Flowers and her ladies dancing in a lush celebration of spring, Love’s Labour’s Lost raises the images of spring only to overwrite them with images of winter—and not among the rarefied court society that the play has focused on. Instead, the song ends with an unromantic glimpse into the lives of common shepherds, for whom winter means that “blood is nipt and waies be fowle” and “coffing drownes the Parsons saw” (K2r/5.2.904, 910). Rather than featuring an apotheosized version of the queen, as Chloridia does, Love’s Labour’s Lost ends with “greasie Ione [keeling] the pot” (K2r/5.2.908). Poverty, dirt, cold, and disease have taken center stage at the end of the play in a move that appears to be the direct inverse of Jonson’s in Chloridia.

Not only does Love’s Labour’s Lost enter into dialogue with Chloridia, but the biographical resonances between Henrietta Maria and the Princess also seem startlingly
close for a play written roughly thirty years before Charles I married his own French princess. The play’s Princess is young and witty, like Henrietta Maria; even the sudden death of her father, the king of France, recalls the assassination of Henri IV (although, of course, Henrietta Maria was still an infant when her father was killed). Indeed, in 1631 the allusions to Navarre would have evoked the French wars of religion, just as in the 1590s when the play was first performed and published. As Gillian Woods points out, Elizabethan English subjects followed the military and religious twists and turns of the French wars with some trepidation:

Morning and evening prayers feature petitions to God for the success of the Protestant King in winning his country from the Catholic League, the English Government sent money to assist this operation, and families sent loved ones as soldiers to protect the Protestant faith generally and England specifically.

For Woods, the vow-breaking that drives the plot mirrors the perceived betrayal of Henri of Navarre’s conversion to Catholicism to win the throne: an uneasy parallel, since (as Berowne recognizes immediately) the vow requires too much of its makers. The text’s topicality is augmented by the characters’ names; as Woods notes, the men of Navarre all share names with Henri’s supporters. Berowne corresponds with one of Henri’s generals, Armand de Gontant, Marshall Biron (indeed, many modern editions spell Berowne’s name “Biron,” although it is “Berowne” in Q1, F1, and Q2); Longaville is Henry of
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80 Although the king is ill at the beginning of the play and the Princess immediately guesses what Maricade’s news is, the death still shocks the audience by disrupting the denouement of the play.

Orleans, duke of Longueville, “a loyalist Catholic who came to fight against the [Catholic] League with Navarre”; Dumaine is Charles of Lorraine, duke of Mayenne; and Boyet is Boyset, the Huguenot commander.  

Similarly, Woods suggests, the ending of Love’s Labour’s Lost “mirrors the mid-1590s situation with Navarre being forced to undertake Catholic tasks in order to win France/the French queen.” By 1631, France must have seemed poised for another outbreak of hostilities as tensions between Cardinal Richelieu and Marie de Medicis drew to a head. In this sense, it is not only the French princess who evokes Henrietta Maria, but also Navarre. Henrietta Maria’s very existence would have provided a daily reminder of French conflicts and the lasting consequences of Henri IV’s conversion.

Meanwhile, the arc of Navarre’s character—in which an overly zealous vow of chastity needs to be overturned—also slyly suggests that the decorous Charles might just need to loosen up, too. The King similarly suggests parallels with the famously refined tastes of the English royal couple: “Our Court shall be a little Academe,” he says, “Still and contemplatiue in liuing Art” (A2r/1.1.13-14). The resonances are, naturally, not perfect, nor am I arguing that by some miraculous second sight Shakespeare predicted the courtly dynamics of the next generation of monarchs. Nevertheless, enough similarities exist that it seems unlikely that Smethwick or other readers in 1631 might miss such fortuitous connections. Indeed, Love’s Labour’s Lost invites readings that make sense of its densely layered jokes and wordplay by pinning them to contemporary figures and
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events. The play invites reflection on Henrietta Maria without provoking scandal, perhaps most notably because the Princess of France remains witty and virtuous throughout the play.

Like the Arcadian adaptations discussed in Chapter 3, *Love’s Labour’s Lost* uses the characteristic literature of the Elizabethan era to pin these supposedly French events to English national identities. In fact, the play frequently echoes Sidney himself. Holofernes shares the pedantry and rhetorical impenetrability of Sidney’s schoolmaster Rombus in *The Lady of May*, an entertainment sprung on Queen Elizabeth as she was taking a stroll in Wanstead Garden during a stay with the earl of Leicester in May 1578. Like Holofernes’s, Rombus’s language is peppered with Latin tags and expansive flights of rhetorical elaboration. In addition, Glynne Wickham points to the structural similarities between *Love’s Labour’s Lost* and Sidney’s 1581 tiltyard entertainment *The Four Foster Children of Desire*. Sidney’s entertainment was written for what turned out to be the final visit of the Duc d’Alençon, still courting Elizabeth and still widely despised among her subjects, including Sidney. In the entertainment, four knights try to assail the Castle of Beauty, where dwell four paragons of feminine virtue, symbolizing Elizabeth and her ladies. The knights fail, as Sidney hoped Alençon’s courtship would fail. Wickham notes, “[T]he whole of Shakespeare’s play revolves around four such
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84 The most famous modern attempts to “decode” the allusions in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* connect with the so-called “School of Night” theories propounded by Arthur Acheson, Frances Yates, and M.C. Bradbrook, in which each character is supposed to represent a particular Elizabethan figure. Although these theories are now largely discredited, some of the allusions these scholars point out undoubtedly make sense if scaled back. For example, Holofernes’s pedantry and Armado’s euphuistic style were clearly meant to parody some of the pedantic excesses of the 1580s and 1590s. Caroline audiences might have recognized the euphuistic satire (so strongly associated with Elizabethan England) even if they did not recognize Gabriel Harvey or Sir Walter Ralegh in the characters.
foster children and their attempt to storm the defenses of the Princess of France and three of her ladies-in-waiting.”  

Besides, the play seems to name-drop Alençon: Katherine and Rosaline first met Dumaine and Berowne “at the Duke Alansoes,” which editors frequently interpret as a phonetic spelling of Alençon (B4v/2.1.61). For Wickham, the similarities between the two works illustrate Shakespeare’s efforts to “establish[] himself in London as an actor-come-poet [sic]” by responding to the literary aesthetic that Sidney so influentially molded.  

In 1631, though, the connections between a potential Anglo-French match of fifty years before and the current Anglo-French marriage point to a different set of concerns, albeit ambiguously. Do the play’s links with The Four Foster Children of Desire highlight potential opposition to Henrietta Maria as a French Catholic interloper, or do they demonstrate that alliance between France and England has serious Elizabethan precedent, even if that first marriage never panned out?

Even if political readings in this context prove inherently ambivalent, the literary connections to Sidney still make an implicit case for the value of Love’s Labour’s Lost as part of the first notions of an English literary canon. In fact, Woudhuysen argues that Love’s Labour’s Lost might specifically refer to one of the most important articulations of early modern English literary theory, Sidney’s Defence of Poesy:

It is almost as if Shakespeare were replying to Sidney’s theoretical work and showing that indecorous juxtapositions and satirical characters can be funny, can be made to work on the stage. Love’s Labour’s Lost is
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Shakespeare’s first extended and focused treatment in a comedy of life at court: perhaps it is fitting that its presiding spirit […] is Sir Philip Sidney, who, in his life and even more after his death, came to represent the figure of a perfect courtier.87

Richard Proudfoot likewise suggests that the character types in Love’s Labour’s Lost derive from Sidney: the King, his lords, and Boyet are “busy louing Courtier[s]”; Don Armado is the “awry-transformed Traueller”; Holofernes is the “selfe-wise-seeming schoolemaster.”88 And the allusions to Sidney do not stop with the Defence of Poesy; the play’s emphasis on sonnets likewise evokes the writer whose Astrophel and Stella famously ignited the sonneteering vogue of the 1590s. Love’s Labour’s Lost includes six sonnets, two of which are included in the love letters that the King and Longaville write to the Princess and Maria, respectively (4.3.23-38, 57-70). Moreover, even the love plots share more in common with a sonnet sequence than with a comedy. Comedies end in marriage, as Berowne points out: “Our wooing doth not end like an old Play: / Iacke hath not Gill: these Ladies curtesie / Might well haue made our sport a Comedie” (K1r/5.2.862-4). As in the typical Petrarchan sonnet sequence, though, at the end of Love’s Labour’s Lost each lord has been put off by his beloved. Instead of consummation, the play requires a year of penitential work followed by the promise—or perhaps even merely the possibility—of marriage. Most of the sonnet sequences of the 1590s hinged on unrequited love; perhaps most memorably of all, Astrophel never earns

87 Woudhuysen, Love’s Labour’s Lost, 6.

more than a kiss from Stella. Whether or not *Love’s Labour’s Lost* is meant to interact explicitly with *Astrophel and Stella* itself, the frequency of sonnets and their prominence in the plot certainly highlights the play’s original Elizabethan context. In this sense, the play resurrects the idea of a particular literary genre by which courtiers negotiated relationships with a queen. As sonnets provided a vocabulary by which Elizabeth’s courtiers could code their political ambitions under a female monarch, so the courts of Henrietta Maria required a genre, and pastoral would occupy that place.

Finally, the play’s allusions to Elizabethan literary genres, tropes, and texts unite with its publication context in 1631 through its links to Elizabethan Inns of Court revels. Scholars have pointed out the ways in which *Love’s Labour’s Lost* refers to the famously chaotic Gray’s Inn revels of 1594-5, primarily suggesting that the masque of Muscovites alludes to the visit of a Russian embassy to the Prince of Purpoole’s court in the revels.89 Likewise, Lynne Magnusson has argued persuasively that the performance in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* of a style of wit associated with the Inns of Court illustrates “how injurious speech reception can contribute to a politics of social differentiation even at the moment when a unifying national language is being conceived.”90 For Magnusson, the play’s emphasis on wit as a social performance that elevates one party while denigrating another (seen most clearly in the lords’ mockery of Holofernes during the Pageant of the Nine Worthies [5.2.530-710]) maps onto the “scoff power” by which members of the Inns of Court negotiated social dynamics, both against outsiders and among themselves. “*Love’s

89 However, Frances Yates has also noted several further allusions; see *A Study of ‘Love’s Labour’s Lost’* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), 156.

Labour’s Lost,” she argues, “dwell[s] on some of the same kinds of sports, verbal displays and jests, scornful distinction-making, and performance situations that are typical of Inns of Court society, especially during revels but also while engaged in their everyday pursuits.”91 The type of witty performance that characterizes the elite spaces of the Inns of Court may have changed between the 1590s and 1630s, but, as O’Callaghan demonstrates, the intense value placed on wit as a form of social capital remained constant.

Moreover, the continued academic practices of the Inns, which included training in performing legal argumentation, would have encouraged a continued premium on quick-witted verbal sparring. Members of the Inns of Court thus not only valued wit, but they specifically valued it, as Magnusson suggests, as a way to gauge social difference, especially since the Inns enabled social mobility. At stake in the unresolved ending of Love’s Labour’s Lost is, in part, the fate of those who use English to distance themselves from those below them. The clearest demonstration of the distancing powers of language and mockery occurs during the pageant of the Nine Worthies. However, Shakespeare uses this scene to call into question the appropriateness of courtly mockery. As the pageant progresses, all the members of the court make fun of the performers. Even the Princess teases “Pompey” and “Alexander.” When Holofernes appears as Judas Maccabeus, only to be mocked mercilessly by Berowne, Holofernes rebukes him: “This is not generous, not gentle, not humble” (I2r/5.2.623). At this point, the Princess stops teasing the performers altogether. “Alas poore Machabeus,” she responds, “how hath he

91 Magnusson, “Scoff Power,” 204.
beene baited” (I2r/5.2.625). After this, while the lords mock Armado as Hector, she comes to his defense: “Speake braue Hector, we are much delighted” (I2v/5.2.662). The play has shown her to be witty, but unlike the men of Navarre’s court, she rejects the use of wit to enforce social difference.

This emphasis on the proper function of wit as a unifying force only takes on greater importance in the play’s final moments. As the Princess (now Queen) prepares to depart with her ladies, Rosaline imposes a penance on Berowne. “[A] man repleate with mockes, / Full of comparisons, and wounding floutes,” Berowne must turn his wit to charity if he wants to marry Rosaline:

To weed this Wormewood from your fruitfull braine,
And therewithall to win me, if you please,
Without the which I am not to be won:
You shall this twelmoneth terme from day to day,
Visite the speechlesse sicke, and still conuerse
With groaning wretches: and your taske shall be,
With all the fierce endeour of your wit,
To enforce the pained impotent to smile. (K1r/5.2.831-2, 835-42)

Rosaline requires a reformation of wit in which Berowne will need to abandon the exclusive, mocking style popular at the Inns of Court and instead practice an inclusive, celebratory style to comfort the “groaning wretches” at the bottom of the social order. His wit is bitter “Wormewood,” but caring for others will sweeten it—and him—in Rosaline’s eyes.
As Berowne’s penance makes clear, *Love’s Labour’s Lost* explores the ramifications of using language to mark difference. In fact, as Magnusson suggests, the very emphasis on the role of language also voices “a tension between constructing a national English as heterogeneous, copious with possibilities for functional variation within the language, and, at the same time, constructing a national English as homogenous, its language capital shared out equitably among an English-speaking people.”92 Given the play’s Inns of Court connections in both the 1590s and the 1630s, one might expect it to elevate a Berownean style of “heterogeneous” English that emphasizes social difference. Instead, the ending of the play works toward a more “homogenous” national English, in which language bridges social difference to unite those of a common tongue. Until snobbish mockery is abolished, the future remains in limbo. In the wake of the King of France’s death, what matters is not how cleverly the lords can mock the foolish, but how Berowne’s witty language might comfort the afflicted, or how poetry itself in the final songs can mirror the mixture of joy and fear, love and grief, that characterizes each specifically English season.

The type of wit that *Love’s Labour’s Lost* privileges, then, reconciles rather than dividing: France to Navarre, elite to “impotent,” and, eventually, men to women. The persistent references to Elizabethan literary culture, especially to Sidney and the Inns of Court revels, build on this reconciling wit to highlight the unifying potential of the English language itself as rooted in the literature of the Elizabethan past. Furthermore, by ending in a way that foregrounds the strong female characters while denying a typical
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comic resolution, the play emphasizes the ways in which elite women might exert some form of power, albeit limited. Given the play’s setting at the court of Navarre and the starring role that a French princess plays, it seems entirely plausible that Caroline readers might have connected these strong female characters with Henrietta Maria. The play thus reaches back to the Elizabethan past even while potentially reflecting on present court dynamics, including not only Henrietta Maria’s increasing power but also the attendant importance of performative language and courtly wit.

**Conclusion**

The quarto editions of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *Love’s Labour’s Lost* published in 1630-1631 represent a different form of Elizabethanism than the other chapters in this dissertation analyze. Unlike the texts discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, these works were not written during Charles I’s reign; unlike the Elizabethan ghost narratives in Chapter 1, their republication participates in the developing English literary canon. Intriguingly, these texts all derive from the F1 versions of the plays, a fact that matters far less for *Love’s Labour’s Lost* than for *Merry Wives* and *The Taming of the Shrew*. As I have argued, all three plays preserve specific links with Elizabethan England even while suggesting new Caroline contexts. Primary among those are the negotiations that Inns of Court readers needed to make in order to process changing power dynamics at court in which Henrietta Maria was growing increasingly powerful, along with the styles of performative wit and conversational grace that she brought over from the salons of the French court. At the same time, the market
for English playbooks began to develop two runaway trends: older and especially
Elizabethan “classics,” and comedies. Shakespearean comedy united those two trends,
creating a niche that John Smethwick and Richard Meighen capitalized on as a way to
play on the tradition of wit at the Inns of Court. In doing so, they also further established
Shakespeare as a literary classic and linked his specific brand of comedy with burgeoning
conceptions of Englishness deriving from the Elizabethan era.

While Meighen chose to publish a Shakespearean comedy that vaunted the
merriness and attendant social power of two chaste wives, emphasizing the power that
women could exert, Smethwick chose two comedies that remain far more ambiguous on
the question of gender roles. Intriguingly, while troubling misogyny characterizes The
Taming of the Shrew, Kiernan Ryan argues about Love’s Labour’s Lost that “[n]one of
Shakespeare’s comedies confounds more effectively the still widespread view that they
are congenitally disposed to disempower women and protract the subjection of placket to
codpiece.”93 The ambiguous ending, dictated by the female characters, accentuates
feminine self-determination. In this sense, Smethwick’s publication of Love’s Labour’s
Lost in such close conjunction with The Taming of the Shrew counterbalances the view of
women that Shrew so controversially provides—as The Tamer Tamed likewise countered
the Shrew in performance in 1633. The reprinted quartos of Shakespearean comedies in
the 1630s suggest that part of what turned Shakespeare into the cultural monument that
he eventually became was the continued topical resonance of his plays. While readers
today often praise Shakespeare’s “timelessness,” this analysis of the Shakespearean

comedies published in 1630-1631 shows that in fact Shakespeare’s *timeliness* is precisely what Meighen and Smethwick valued.

Furthermore, the Caroline resonances of these plays forged a connection between Shakespeare’s native wit and English nationalism that would persist into the Restoration. Indeed, in *The History of the Worthies of England*, Thomas Fuller illustrates the extent to which Shakespeare by 1662 had already become a figure of English nationalism. Fuller, a clergyman, earned his B.A. from Cambridge in 1625 and his M.A. in 1628; the members of his Cambridge cohort who then attended the Inns of Court would have been part of the group for whom Meighen and Smethwick were publishing these plays. In the following passage, Fuller recalls the glory days of the pre-Civil War theatre, contrasting Shakespeare’s comedy with Jonson’s:

> Many were the wit-combats betwixt [Shakespeare] and Ben Johnson [*sic*], which two I behold like a Spanish great galleon and an English man-of-war. Master Johnson (like the former) was built far higher in learning; solid, but slow, in his performances. Shake-spear, with the English man-of-war, lesser in bulk but lighter in sailing, could turn with all tides, tack about and take advantage of all winds, by the quickness of his wit and invention.94

This remarkable passage juxtaposes Spanish galleon and English man-of-war in a way that recalls the Armada battle of 1588. For Fuller, Jonson’s education and rhetorical skill made his work formidable but ponderous; aligning Jonson with the Spanish also recalls
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his conversions to and from Catholicism. Shakespeare, on the other hand, becomes the agile and adaptable English man-of-war, his memory linked with Elizabethan greatness and English national pride precisely because of his quick wit and invention. This association between English nationalism and Shakespearean wit takes shape in the Shakespearean comedies reprinted in the early 1630s. *The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Taming of the Shrew,* and *Love’s Labour’s Lost* invoke thriving Elizabethan worlds of aristocratic wit and middle-class virtue, where women can exert some forms of control (although they may not always escape punishment for doing so) and where language itself offers generative possibilities. Above all, the emphasis on the power of language—especially through acts of translation, mockery, and wit—intersects with the plays’ contemporary resonances to link Elizabethan negotiations of gender roles with Caroline ones.

Finally, as Abraham Cowley’s satire of Inns of Court students suggests, by the 1630s a knowledge of Shakespeare’s plays could prove even more useful to the upwardly mobile “semi-gentleman” than studying the fine points of the law could. Membership at the Inns was more about the development of social networks than studying, and an integral part of belonging in those networks involved appropriately performing wit and knowledge. The drama in general and Shakespeare’s works in particular formed essential literary spheres of knowledge—spheres that, alongside other already-classic works like Sidney’s *Arcadia,* constituted the core of a burgeoning English literary canon.
Conclusion

Elizabethanisms

As this dissertation has argued, the Elizabethanism of Caroline print culture negotiated what it meant to be English by appealing to the cultural memories of Elizabeth I’s reign. Elizabethan texts and figures were resurrected in association with a variety of different political, religious, and social positions: militant and irenic, Protestant and Catholic, insular and cosmopolitan. From the ghost narratives of the mid-1620s to the poetry and drama of the 1630s (whether newly written or newly reprinted), Caroline writers, readers, and publishers looked to the Elizabethan era to model forms of English nationhood that could be broadened and adapted to suit present needs. For this reason, as the title of this conclusion indicates, it is more appropriate to talk about plural Caroline Elizabethanisms than to treat invocations of the era as a unified phenomenon. As Englishmen and -women wrangled over the meanings of their national past, their versions of Elizabeth and her subjects multiplied, rather than being condensed to one mythology with one particular set of social, political, and religious implications. Militarism, parliamentarianism, and English Protestantism may have won out after the Civil Wars and the Glorious Revolution of 1688, but during the reign of Charles I, the cultural
valences of Elizabeth and her era were still being contested. Had war not broken out in 1642, today’s memories of Elizabeth might look quite different.

Moreover, much of the contest over the Elizabethan era took place in the wake of Buckingham’s assassination and the conclusion of the wars with France and Spain in 1629 and 1630, respectively. Many of the texts I analyze here were published between 1629 and 1632: Quarles’s *Argalus and Parthenia* (1629); *Tarltons Newes out of Purgatory* (1630); Shakespeare’s *Merry Wives of Windsor* (1630), *The Taming of the Shrew* (1631), and *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (1631); Heywood’s *The Fair Maid of the West* (1631); the Catholic treatise titled *Rawleigh his Ghost* (1631); and Massinger’s *The Emperour of the East* (1632). Shakespeare’s Second Folio and the collection of John Lyly’s Elizabethan court comedies were also published in 1632. This cluster of Elizabethanist texts highlights the popularity of the Elizabethan era just as (and just after) England made peace with Spain and France. Indeed, as I have argued, many of these texts reach back to the Elizabethan era for a model of queenship that might be stretched to accommodate even the French Catholic Henrietta Maria. Yet the vast majority of these texts are not written by courtiers, and they certainly were not published by courtiers. Instead, they raise questions about Englishness, gender roles, governance, and religion that reached from the court to all segments of society and from London to the provinces.¹

A second cluster of texts appeared ten years later in the turbulence of the Bishops’ Wars and the Short and Long Parliaments. These texts intersected with hotter debates
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¹ *Tom Nash his Ghost* claims to have been originally published in York; *The Vow Breaker*’s title page indicates that it had been performed in Nottinghamshire—not to mention the invocation of localities in a number of the texts analyzed above.
over militarism, religion, the role of favorites, and rebellion: Glapthorne’s *Argalus and Parthenia* (1639), Shirley’s *A Pastorall Called the Arcadia* (1640), Leicester’s *Commonwealth* (1641), Leicester’s *Ghost* (1641), Naunton’s *Fragmenta Regalia* (1641), and *Tom Nash his Ghost* (1642). Like the others I discuss in this dissertation, these texts shape appropriate Englishness by situating contemporary concerns in an Elizabethan context. With this in mind, I would like to return to the case study with which I began—the shifting representations of the earl of Leicester—to look at one final example. This last version of Leicester appears in *The Varietie*, a play first performed by the King’s Men in 1641. Written by William Cavendish, earl of Newcastle, a patron of Jonson’s and a royalist during the Civil Wars, *The Varietie* invokes Leicester for a decidedly different purpose than any of the other texts I have discussed so far. While a Machiavellian Leicester schemes and seduces his way through the other texts that circulated in 1641, here he appears as the noble embodiment of a masculine, warlike golden age. In this version of Elizabethanism, the queen is relegated to passing mentions, and the play focuses instead on the masculine virtues of Leicester and those like him.

The romantic hero of the play is the honorable but somewhat eccentric character Manly, who likes to dress up like Leicester and is tricked into coming in costume to dinner at Lady Beaufield’s house. When mocked for his clothing, he refuses to retreat to the safety of his own home. Instead, he wins over Lady Beaufield by standing his ground and delivering a lengthy speech to defend his choice of costume. These fashions, he claims, are honorable because they represent “those honest dayes, when Knights were Gentlemen, [and] when men of honor flourish’d, that tam’d the wealth of Spaine, set up
the States, help’d the French King, and brought Rebellion to reason.” Indeed, he continues, “it was never a good time since these cloaths went out of fashion; oh, those honourable dayes and persons!” (C8v) Manly’s militant anti-Spanish sentiments sound like the familiar strand of Elizabethan nostalgia that had persisted since the beginning of James’s reign. His nostalgia is directed toward a time when “Every Knight had his hundreds” who would drink “to the honour of their Lords”—not, strikingly, to the honor of the queen (C9r). This Elizabethanism rewrites the era as one of masculine dominance (after all, the Elizabethanist character is named “Manly”), while Elizabeth herself figures most prominently in association with a style of starched apron that rumples easily, or as the incidental employer of a dancing master whom Manly is supposed to resemble.

I bring up The Variety because, in light of the preceding chapters, it illustrates so clearly the continuing contest over the legacy of the Elizabethan era. In many ways, the play seems to share more in common with the ghost narratives of the 1620s than with the courtly, even proto-royalist, Elizabethanisms of the Elizabeth plays, the Sidney adaptations, or even the Shakespeare comedies. Yet Newcastle is hardly a prime candidate for oppositional writing. He had always played the courtly game—not entirely successfully, but enough so to win the position of governor to the future Charles II. During the Interregnum, he remained loyal to Charles II and even served on the exiled king’s privy council. For his services to both kings, he was made duke of Newcastle in 1665. However, Anne Barton suggests that “[d]espite his close association with the future

2 William Cavendish, earl of Newcastle, The Variety (London: Humphrey Moseley, 1649), sig. C8r. Cited parenthetically hereafter. The Variety is printed in a two-play book, The country captaine and the Varietie, two comedies written by a person of honor ; lately presented by His Majesties servants at the Black-Fryars (London: Printed for Humphrey Robinson and Humphrey Moseley, 1649). Although the book includes both plays, each has its own title page and separate pagination.
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Charles II and, during the Civil War, his conspicuous and ruinous loyalty to the crown, Newcastle was never able to overcome his long-term distrust of the Stuarts and their policies.\textsuperscript{3} She thus implies that The Varietie joins a line of nostalgic Elizabethanist works that “became increasingly identified with the opposition, with those critics of Charles and his court whose voices were to gather strength throughout the decade of the 1630s.”\textsuperscript{4} Yet the title page advertises that the play was performed by the King’s Men. Are we to believe that in 1641, one of Charles’s staunchest supporters—one of his privy councilors, who had raised a troop of 120 men and given £10,000 to support the war effort with Scotland, who was the governor of Charles’s son and heir\textsuperscript{5}—wrote an Elizabethanist play to oppose the king, and that the king’s own company of players performed it?

It is not impossible. But it makes far more sense, I argue, to read The Varietie in the context of the multiple Elizabethanisms that characterized the Caroline era. The play’s emphasis on the vigorous dominance of the (male) aristocracy during Elizabeth’s reign might indeed highlight a fantasy of the past, but it is not necessarily an oppositional one. The Varietie uses Elizabethan nostalgia to exalt tradition and history, as embodied by Elizabeth’s greatest favorite. Indeed, Manly’s imitation of Leicester transforms the favorite from Machiavellian villain to a legendary figure of chivalric virtue; Lady

\textsuperscript{3} Anne Barton, Ben Jonson, Dramatist (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 318.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., 312.

Beaufield compares the costumed Manly to “one of Arthurs Knights of the round Table” (C7v). At the end of the play, the wealthy Lady Beaufield marries Manly. His courageous embrace of anachronism in spite of the mockery leveled against him has won her heart, and the union of past and present provides resolution to the comedy. In this sense, the play fits into the complex process by which the cultural memories of the Elizabethan age were being continually negotiated and redefined throughout Charles’s reign. Here, the glorification of militant masculinity emphasizes yet another form of Elizabethanism: one that supports the crown’s recent militarism and that idealizes the court favorite.\textsuperscript{6}

In 1936, Alfred Harbage published his influential study of Caroline drama, which he held in deep loathing. “Nearly all Cavalier plays are inferior in quality,” he writes; “their artistic weakness is so manifest that it is hard to concede the point with play after play without subjecting all to a monotonous drizzle of sarcasm.”\textsuperscript{7} Their association with Henrietta Maria degraded them triply: she was French, she was Catholic, she was a woman—“amiable enough,” he says dismissively, but without “a jot of literary taste.”\textsuperscript{8} Thankfully, his views of the monolithic inferiority of Caroline drama have been thoroughly exploded in the past thirty years, although Caroline literature nevertheless remains among the most likely of any period to be skipped over in the classroom. This dissertation joins efforts to reclaim and nuance the literary and political sophistication of

\textsuperscript{6} For more detailed analysis of the intersections between The Varietie and representations of favoritism, see Curtis Perry, \textit{Literature and Favoritism in Early Modern England} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 47-53.


\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., 10-11.
Caroline literature, including poetry and popular print genres as well as the drama. By contesting the pervasive scholarly narrative that casts the Elizabethan era as perennially opposed to the decadence of the Stuarts, it shows how some forms of Caroline Elizabethanism sanctioned a proto-royalist literary and political culture and ideology that extended well beyond the court. Finally, especially in chapters 3 and 4, it reveals how Caroline writers and publishers began the process of literary canon formation as a way to negotiate what it meant to be English. In all of these ways, we can see how English subjects during the reign of Charles I began to link nationhood with England’s literary heritage in debates that continue to resonate today.
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</tr>
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<td>1</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>[6787.7?]</td>
<td>Robert Devereux, second earl of Essex. <em>To maister Anthonie Bacon. An apologie of the earle of Essex, against those which falsly taxe him to be the onely hinderer of the peace of his countrey.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>3685</td>
<td>Nicholas Breton, <em>A poste with a packet of madde letters. Newly inlarged. (See 1602.)</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[6535]</td>
<td>Thomas Dekker, 1603. <em>The wonderfull yeare. Wherein is shewed the picture of London lying sicke of the Plague.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21496.5</td>
<td>H.S., <em>Elizaes losse, and King Iames his vvelcome.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21497</td>
<td>H.S., <em>Queene El’zabeths losse, and king James his welcome. With additions.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data comes from the STC and Wing, excluding issues, variants, and entries for which there is a note but no edition published (i.e., the batch of books for which Smethwick bought the rights in 1607 but did not publish that year). Playbooks are highlighted with gray background and bold typeface.

1 Although his name does not appear on the title page, Smethwick was fined (along with Nicholas Ling and John Browne) for printing this book without license: “YT IS ORDERED that they shall pay x* A pece for their fines for printinge a booke called the wonderfull yere without Authoritie or entrance, contrary to th[e] ordonnances for pryntinge[..] Also that they shall forbeare and neuer hereafter entermedle to printe or sell the same book or any parte thereof[..] Also that they shall presently bringe into the hall to be vsed accorinde to th[e] ordonance in yat behalf so many of the said booke as they or any to their vse haue left in their hands[..] And their ymprisonment for this offence is respited till further Consideracon and order herein be had.” See Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640 A.D.*, 5 vols. (London: privately printed, 1875-94), II.837, 840.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>6788</td>
<td>Robert Devereux</td>
<td>An apologie of the earle of Essex. Penned by himselfe in 1598. (See 1600.)</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23614</td>
<td></td>
<td>F.T.</td>
<td>The case is altered How? Aske Dalio, and Millo.</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>3691.2</td>
<td>Nicholas Breton</td>
<td>A poste with a packet. The second part.</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25967</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Woodhouse</td>
<td>The flea: sic parua componere magnis.</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>3691.3</td>
<td>Nicholas Breton</td>
<td>A poste with a packet. The second part. (See 1605.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>3687</td>
<td>Nicholas Breton</td>
<td>A poste with a packet of madde letters. The fourth time enlarged. (See 1602, 1603.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15686.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Ling</td>
<td>Politeuphuia wits common wealth.</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>3688</td>
<td>Nicholas Breton</td>
<td>A poste with a packet of madde letters. The fourth time enlarged. (See 1602, 1603, 1607.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3691.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Breton</td>
<td>A poste with a packet. The second part. (See 1605, 1606.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12228</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Greene</td>
<td>Ciceronis amor. = Tullies loue Wherein is discoursed, the prime of Ciceroes youth.</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16669</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Lodge</td>
<td>Rosalynde. Euphues golden legacie.</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22324</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>The most excellent and lamentable tragedie, of Romeo and Juliet As it hath beene sundrie times publiquely acted, by the Kings Maiesties Servants at the Globe. Newly corrected, augmented, and amended.</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22739</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Smith</td>
<td>Three sermons made by M. Henry Smith.</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22862</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Smith, <em>The common-wealth of England and the maner of governement thereof. Compiled by the honourable Sir Thomas Smith, Knight, Doctor of both lawes, and one of the principal secretaries vnto two most worthy princes, King Edvard, and Queene Elizabeth.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard, “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12274</td>
<td>Robert Greene, <em>Greenes Arcadia. Or Menaphon: Camillaes alarum to slumber Euphues in his melancholy cell at Silexedra Wherein are deciphered, the variable effects of fortune, the wonders of loue, the triumphs of inconstant time. A worke worthy the yongest eares for pleasure, or the grauest censures for principles.</em> By Robertus Greene, in Artibus Magister.</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15687</td>
<td>Nicholas Ling, <em>Politeuphuia wits common wealth.</em> (See 1608.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25222.5</td>
<td>John Weever, <em>An Agnus Dei.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Robert Greene, <em>Ciceronis amor. = Tullies loue Wherein is discoursed, the prime of Ciceroes youth.</em> (See 1609.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12229</td>
<td>Robert Greene, <em>Greenes neuer too late both parts : sent to all youthfull gentlemen, deciphering in a true English historie, those particular vanities, that with their frostie vapours, nip the blossomes of eyery braine, from attaining to his intended perfection : as pleasant as profitable, being a right pumice stone, apt to race out idlenesse with delight, and folly with admonition.</em> (See 1607.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Clocke”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12255.5</td>
<td>Sir David Murray, <em>The tragicall death of Sophinisba.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18296</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, <em>The tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22277</td>
<td>Henry Smith, <em>Three sermons made by M. Henry Smith.</em> (See 1609.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Churchyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>16670</td>
<td>Thomas Lodge</td>
<td><em>Euphues golden legacie.</em> (See 1609.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22863</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Thomas Smith</td>
<td><em>The common-wealth of England and the maner of gouernement thereof.</em> Compiled by the honourable Sir Thomas Smith, Knight, Doctor of both lawes, and one of the principal secretaries vnto two most worthy princes, King Edvard, and Queene Elizabeth. (See 1609.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard, “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>3691.7</td>
<td>Nicholas Breton</td>
<td><em>A poste with a packet. The second part.</em> (See 1605, 1606, 1609.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7080</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Dove</td>
<td><em>The conversion of Salomon. A direction to holiness of life; by way of commentator upon the booke of Canticles.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7221</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Drayton</td>
<td><em>Poems: by Michaell Draiton esquire. Newly corrected by the author.</em> (See 1608, 1610.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15687.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Ling</td>
<td><em>Politeuphuia wits common wealth.</em> (See 1608, 1610.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22741</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Smith</td>
<td><em>Three sermons made by M. Henry Smith.</em> (See 1609, 1611.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>No entries.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>4792</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Catascopos, A surveigh and critique censure of the christian world.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15687.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Ling</td>
<td><em>Politeuphuia wits common wealth.</em> (See 1608, 1610, 1613.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>7221.5</td>
<td>Michael Drayton</td>
<td><em>Poems: by Michaell Draiton esquire. Newly corrected by the author.</em> (See 1608, 1610, 1613.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12230</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Greene</td>
<td><em>Ciceronis amor. = Tullies loue Wherein is discoursed, the prime of Ciceroes youth.</em> (See 1609, 1611.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Greene</td>
<td><em>Greenes neuer too late both parts.</em> (See 1607, 1611.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Call No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>No entries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>24698</td>
<td>John Vicars, <em>A prospectuie glasse to looke into heauen, or The coelestiall Canaan described.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18993</td>
<td>John Owen, <em>Epigrams of that most witte and worthie epigrammatist Mr. Iohn Owen, Gentleman. Translated by John Vicars.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22743</td>
<td>Henry Smith, <em>Three sermons made by M. Henry Smith.</em> (See 1609, 1611, 1613.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>3689</td>
<td>Nicholas Breton, <em>A poste with a packet of madde letters. The fourth time enlarged.</em> (See 1602, 1603, 1607, 1609.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15688</td>
<td>Nicholas Ling, <em>Politeuphia wits common wealth.</em> (See 1608, 1610, 1613, 1615.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>3670</td>
<td>Nicholas Breton, <em>The mothers blessing.</em> (See 1602.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22864</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Smith, <em>The common-wealth of England and the maner of gouernement thereof. Compiled by the honourable Sir Thomas Smith, Knight, Doctor of both lawes, and one of the principall secretaries vnto two most worthy princes, King Edvvard, and Queene Elizabeth.</em> (See 1609, 1612.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>No entries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>16672</td>
<td>Thomas Lodge. <em>Euphues golden legacie.</em> (See 1609, 1612.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22325&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, <em>The most excellent and lamentable tragedie, of Romeo and Iuliet As it hath beene sundrie times publikey acted, by the Kings Maiesties Servants at the Globe.</em> (See 1609.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>Henry Burton, <em>A censure of simonie, or a most important case of conscience briefly discussed.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10458a</td>
<td>Desiderius Erasmus, <em>Utile-dulce: or, trueths libertie. Seven witty-wise dialogues.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19886</td>
<td>Anonymous, <em>A pleasant and delightfull poeme of two louers, Philos and Licia.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyall”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22744</td>
<td>Henry Smith, <em>Three sermons made by M. Henry Smith.</em> (See 1609, 1611, 1613, 1616, 1619.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, <em>The tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke. Newly imprinted and inlarged, according to the true and perfect copy lastly printed.</em> (See 1611.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22278&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24558</td>
<td>Anonymous, <em>Vsurie araigned and condemned. Or A discoverie of the infinite injuries this kingdome endureth by the vnlawfull trade of vsurie.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Francis Bacon, <em>Essays.</em> Rights assigned to Smethwick by E. Jaggard 24 February 1626, but not published by him.</td>
<td></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3404</td>
<td>Giovanni Botero, <em>The cause of the greatnesse of cities.</em> Rights assigned to Smethwick by E. Jaggard 24 February 1626, but not published by him.</td>
<td></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>2</sup> The STC dates this quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* to 1622, but R. Carter Hailey makes a convincing argument for 1623. See Hailey, “The Dating Game: New Evidence for the Dates of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet,*” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 58.3 (Autumn 2007): 367-87.

<sup>3</sup> This date of this quarto of *Hamlet* is queried in the STC, but Hailey confirms it; see “The Dating Game.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Entry ID</th>
<th>Title and Author</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1609a</td>
<td>Pierre Du Moulin the Elder, <em>The anatomy of Arminianisme;</em> or, <em>The opening of the controverses of these times (formerly handled in the Low-Countries) concerning the doctrine of providence, of predestination, of the death of Christ, of nature and grace, &amp;c.</em> by Peter du Moulin, minister of the church at Paris.</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15689</td>
<td>Nicholas Ling, <em>Politeuphia wits common wealth.</em> (See 1608, 1610, 1613, 1615, 1620.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyal”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>No entries.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Robert Greene, <em>Ciceronis amor.</em> = <em>Tullies love Wherein is discoursed, the prime of Ciceroes youth.</em> (See 1609, 1611, 1616.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyal”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15689.5</td>
<td>Nicholas Ling, <em>Politeuphia wits common wealth.</em> (See 1608, 1610, 1613, 1615, 1620, 1626.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyal”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22745</td>
<td>Henry Smith, <em>Three sermons made by M. Henry Smith.</em> (See 1609, 1611, 1613, 1616, 1619, 1624.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>No entries.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Michael Drayton, <em>Poems by Michael Drayton Esquyre.</em> With omissions. (See 1608, 1610, 1613, 1616, 1619.)</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11947.5</td>
<td>Francis Godwin, <em>Annales of England Containing the reignes of Henry the Eighth. Edward the Sixt. Queene Mary. Written in Latin by the Right Honorable and Right Reverend Father in God, Francis Lord Bishop of Hereford. Thus Englished, corrected and inlarged with the author's consent, by Morgan Godwyn.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15690</td>
<td>Nicholas Ling, <em>Politeuphia wits common wealth, newly corrected and amended.</em> (See 1608, 1610, 1613, 1615, 1620, 1626, 1628.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “under the Dyal”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17756</td>
<td>John Mayo, <em>The vniuersall principle the common iustice of the world, and the royall law of love: deliuered in a sermon at the assises in Dorchester, the 23. Day of Iuly, anno Dom. 1629.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Robert Greene, <em>Greenes neuer too late both parts.</em> (See 1607, 1611, 1616.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Dyal”</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Heliodorus, <em>An Æthiopian historie written in Greeke [</em>] Englished by T. Underdoune.*</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22169</td>
<td>John Selden, <em>De successionibus in bona defuncti, seu iure haereditario, ad leges Ebraeorum quae, florente olim eorum republica, in vsu, liber singularis, ex sacris literis, vtroque Talmude, &amp; selectioribus rabbinis, id est, ex iuris Ebraici fontibus, pandectis, atque consultissimis magistris, desumptus.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22295</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, <em>Loves labours lost A vvittie and pleasant comedie, as it was acted by his Maiesties Servants at the Blacke-Friers and the Globe.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22327</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, <em>A wittie and pleasant comedie called The taming of the shrew As it was acted by his Maiesties Servants at the Blacke Friers and the Globe.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “vnder the Diall”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, <em>Mr. William Shakespeares comedies, histories, and tragedies Published according to the true originall copies.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard (labeled only on issue 22274e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22274</td>
<td>Henry Smith, <em>Three sermons made by M. Henry Smith.</em> (See 1609, 1611, 1613, 1616, 1619, 1624, 1628.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Smith, <em>The common-wealth of England and the maner of gouernement thereof. Compiled by the honourable Sir Thomas Smith, Knight, Doctor of both lawes, and one of the principall secretaries vnto two most worthy princes, King Edvvard, and Queene Elizabeth.</em> (See 1609, 1612, 1621.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard, “vnder the Dyall”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Thomas Lodge. <em>Ephues golden legacie.</em> (See 1609, 1612, 1623.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Smith, <em>The common-wealth of England and the maner of gouernement thereof. Compiled by the honourable Sir Thomas Smith, Knight, Doctor of both lawes, and one of the principall secretaries vnto two most worthy princes, King Edvvard, and Queene Elizabeth.</em> (See 1609, 1612, 1621, 1633.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Gervase Markham, <em>Markhams maister-peece.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>7225</td>
<td>Michael Drayton</td>
<td>Poems by Michael Drayton[en] Esquire. Collected into one volume. (See 1608, 1610, 1613, 1616, 1619, 1630.)</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22279</td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>The tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark. Newly imprinted and enlarged, according to the true and perfect copy last printed. (See 1611, 1625.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “under the Diall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22326</td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>The most excellent and lamentable tragedie, of Romeo and Iuliet As it hath beene sundrie times publikely acted, by the Kings Maiesties Servants at the Globe. (See 1609, 1623.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “under the Dyall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22747</td>
<td>Henry Smith</td>
<td>Three sermons made by M. Henry Smith. (See 1609, 1611, 1613, 1616, 1619, 1624, 1628, 1632.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>6550</td>
<td>G. Delamothe</td>
<td>The French alphabet teaching in a very short time, by a most easie way, to pronounce French naturally, to reade it perfectly, to write it truly, and to speake it accordingly. Together with the treasure of the French [t]ongue, containing the rarest sentences, proverbs, parables, similies, apothegms, and gol[d]en sayings of the most excellent French authors, as well poets as orators.</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12232</td>
<td>Robert Greene</td>
<td>Ciceronis amor. = Tullies loue Wherein is discoursed, the prime of Ciceroes youth. (See 1609, 1611, 1616 1628.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “under the Dyall”</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>15690.3</td>
<td>Nicholas Ling</td>
<td>Politeuphia wits common wealth. (See 1608, 1610, 1613, 1615, 1620, 1626, 1628, 1630.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “under the Diall”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22867</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Smith</td>
<td>The common-wealth of England and the maner of gouernement thereof. Compiled by the honourable Sir Thomas Smith, Knight, Doctor of both lawes, and one of the principal secretaries vnto two most worthy princes, King Edvard, and Queene Elizabeth. (See 1609, 1612, 1621, 1633, 1635.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Wing L2336</td>
<td>Nicholas Ling</td>
<td>Politeuphia wits common wealth. (See 1608, 1610, 1613, 1615, 1620, 1626, 1628, 1630, 1640.)</td>
<td>St. Dunstans Churchyard “under the Diall”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Works Published by Richard Meighen, 1617-1642
Table B.1. Works Published by Richard Meighen, 1617-1642

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>STC/Wing Number</th>
<th>Work (Author and Title, when both are available)</th>
<th>Shop Location(s)</th>
<th>Edition Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>10641</td>
<td>I.F., <em>The necessitie and antiquitie of catechizing.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>20328</td>
<td>Sampson Price, <em>The beauty of holines: or The consecration of a house of prayer, by the example of our Saviour.</em></td>
<td>St. Clements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24025</td>
<td>Thomas Thompson, <em>Antichrist arraigned in a sermon at Pauls Crosse, the third Sunday after Epiphanie. With the tryall of guides, on the fourth Sunday after Trinitie.</em></td>
<td>St. Clements; Westminster Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>18606</td>
<td>John Norden, <em>An eye to heauen in earth A necessarie watch for the time of death, consisting in meditations and prayers fit for that purpose.</em></td>
<td>St. Clements; Westminster Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>21538</td>
<td>Hic Mulier, <em>Muld sacke: or The apologie of Hic Mulier: to the late declamation against her Exprest in a short exclamation.</em></td>
<td>St. Clements; Westminster Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23544</td>
<td>Anonymous, <em>Sveetnam, the vwoman-hater, arraigned by women A new comedie, acted at the Red Bull, by the late Queens Servants.</em></td>
<td>St. Clements; Westminster Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>Thomas Blundeville, <em>M. Blundeuile his exercises contayning eight treatises, [... on] cosmographie, astronomie, and geographie, as also in the art of navigation.</em></td>
<td>St. Clements</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22634</td>
<td>William Slatyer, <em>The history of Great Britanie from the first peopling of this island to this present raigne of or [sic] happy and peacefull monarke K: Iames.</em></td>
<td>St. Clements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>Thomas Blundeville, <em>M. Blundeuile his exercises contayning eight treatises, [... on] cosmographie, astronomie, and geographie, as also in the art of navigation. (See 1621.)</em></td>
<td>St. Clements</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>4494</td>
<td>University of Cambridge, <em>True copies of all the Latine orations, made and pronounced at Cambridge, on Tuesday and Thursday, the 25. and 27. of Februarie last past 1622.</em></td>
<td>Leg in the Strand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data comes from the STC and Wing, excluding issues, variants, and entries for which there is a note but no edition published (i.e., *The sermons of Master Henry Smith gathered into one volume*, for which Meighen bought the rights in 1624, only appears in 1628, when he published it). Playbooks are highlighted with gray background and bold typeface.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Editions</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>No entries.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>12635.5&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Joseph Hall, <em>The works of Joseph Hall.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>No entries.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>3770a</td>
<td>John Brinsley the Elder, <em>A consolation for our grammar schools. More specially for all those of the inferior sort, namely, for Ireland, Wales, Virginia, with the Sommer Ilands, that all may speake one and the same language.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21219a</td>
<td>Richard Rogers, <em>Seven treatises, containing such direction as is gathered out of the holy scriptures, leading and guiding to true happines.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>John Barclay, <em>John Barclay his Argenis, tr. out of Latine into English: the prose by sir R. Le Grys: the verses by T. May. With a clavis annexed to it.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5369</td>
<td>John Clavell, <em>A recantation of an ill led life. Or a discoverie of the high-way law.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5370</td>
<td>---. Second edition, with additions corrected and amended by the authour.</td>
<td>Leg in the Strand; St. Dunstans</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22731.5</td>
<td>Henry Smith, <em>The sermons of master Henrie Smith, gathered into one volume.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23052</td>
<td>Robert Speed, <em>The counter-scuffle.</em></td>
<td>St. Dunstans</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>John Barclay, <em>John Barclay his Argenis, tr. out of Latine into English: the prose by sir R. Le Grys: the verses by T. May. With a clavis annexed to it.</em> (See 1628.)</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>13618</td>
<td>Barten Holyday, <em>Τεχνογαμα or the marriages of the arts. A comedie.</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate; St. Dunstans</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>5</sup> STC suggests a date of 1628 in spite of the title page’s claim of 1625. If this is the case, then it is a 2+ edition rather than part of the first run.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17891</td>
<td>Thomas Middleton, <em>Michaelmas terme</em>. Newly corrected.</td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate; St. Dunstans</td>
<td>Newly corrected.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17893</td>
<td>Thomas Middleton, <em>The phoenix</em>.</td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate; St. Dunstans</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22301</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, <em>Merry wives of Windsor</em>. Newly corrected.</td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate; St. Dunstans</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22383</td>
<td>Edward Sharpham, <em>Cupids whirligig</em>.</td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate; St. Dunstans</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Thomas Goffe, <em>The raging Turke, or Bajazet the second. A tragedie</em>.</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23340</td>
<td>John Stow, <em>The chronicles of England, from Brute unto this present yeare 1580. Continued unto 1631. By E. Howes.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Thomas Goffe, <em>The courageous Turke, or, Amurath the first. A tragedie.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22274d</td>
<td>William Shakespeare, <em>Mr William Shakespeares comedies, histories, &amp; tragedies. Published according to the true originall copies. The second impression. Variant specifying “printed by Tho. Cotes, for Richard Meighen, and are to be sold at the middle Temple Gate in Fleetstreet, 1632.”</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23340</td>
<td>Second imp of Stow’s <em>Chronicles</em> (see 1631).</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Thomas Goffe, <em>The tragedy of Orestes</em>.</td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13517</td>
<td>Hipolito, <em>The true history of the tragick loves of hipolito and Isabella, Neapolitans</em>. Englished [from Les amours of Meslier.] Second edition.</td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17442</td>
<td>Shackerley Marmion, <em>A fine companion. [A comedy.]</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>John Clavell, <em>A recantation of an ill led life. Or a discoverie of the high-way law. (See 1628.)</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11070</td>
<td>John Fletcher, <em>The faithfull shepheardess. Third edition, with addition.</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Michel Baudier, <em>The history of the imperiall estate of the grand seigneurs. Tr. out of French by E. G(rimeston).</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6308</td>
<td>Sir William Davenant, <em>The triumphs of the prince d’Amour. A masque.</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22175</td>
<td>John Selden, <em>Joannis Seldeni mare clausum seu de dominio maris libri duo.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>6305</td>
<td>William Davenant, <em>The platonick lovers. A tragaecommaedy.</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>6309</td>
<td>William Davenant, <em>The witts. A comedie, presented in Blacke Fryers.</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11706.6</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>John Gee, <em>New shreds of the old snare.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22175.3</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>John Selden, <em>Joannis Seldeni mare clausum seu de dominio maris libri duo.</em> (See 1635.)</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22176</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>---. <em>Joannis Seldeni mare clausum seu de dominio maris libri duo.</em> Enlarged. (See 1635.)</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>William Austin, <em>Devotionis Augustinianae flamma, or, certain meditations. Set forth, by his wife Mrs. A. Austin.</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11706.6</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>John Gee, <em>New shreds of the old snare.</em> (See 1636.)</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>6042</td>
<td>Robert Crofts, <em>The lover: nor, nuptial love. Written, by R. Crofts, to please himselfe.</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10187</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Archdeaconry of Chichester.</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23444</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Sussex. Articles of enquiry to be ministred concerning the admiraltie in the county of Sussex.</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>15119</td>
<td>Ladies. <em>The ladies cabinet opened: wherein is found experiments in preserving, cookery and huswifery.</em></td>
<td>Middle Temple Gate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>10188</td>
<td>Archdeaconry of Chichester.</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14754</td>
<td>WingB298</td>
<td>Ben Jonson, *The workes of Benjamin Jonson. The second [and third] volume. Containing these plays, viz. 1 Bartholomew fayre. 2 The staple of newes. 3 The divell is an asse. “Includes the sheets of 14753.5 [#2&amp;3] w. the original tpp, reissued by Meighen.” (STC)</td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>WingB298</td>
<td>Francis Bacon, <em>The historie of the reigne of King Henry the Seventh.</em></td>
<td>Inner [sic] Temple Gate</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>WingC4948</td>
<td>Edward Coke, <em>The second part of the Institutes.</em></td>
<td>None listed.</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>