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Abstract

This thesis explores the presentation of the war over the Rhine Palatinate in British printed pamphlets of the 1620s, looking at the relationship between writing and reading about the conflict and notions of religious and civic duty. It examines how printed news pamphlets, sermons and polemics dealt both with developing events in the Palatinate and with changes in British foreign policy. The importance of this conflict to British culture and politics has been widely debated. However, there has not been a study specifically charting the development of discourse about the Palatinate in cheap print. This thesis explores such texts within multiple contexts: political and military developments, Calvinist theology, and the British print market. It argues that pamphlets dealing with the Palatinate articulated subject positions which challenged royal notions of decorum, and promoted a model of active Protestant subjecthood.

The first chapter contextualises the significance of the Palatinate to British Protestants, through an overview of the relationship between the two countries: from the 1613 marriage of the Elector Frederick V to Elizabeth, daughter of James I and VI, through Frederick’s doomed bid for the Bohemian crown and the resulting battle to recover his ancestral lands. James’s attempts to deal with the crisis through diplomacy met with dissatisfaction from many British subjects, who pushed instead for direct military action. The two central chapters deal with the period 1620-23, in which the defence of the Palatinate was largely in the hands of British volunteers; first examining the connection forged through printed ‘news from the Palatinate’, and then the ways in which polemical texts and printed sermons relate the conflict both to Calvinist eschatology and notions of subjecthood. The fourth and final chapter considers how these ideas developed through preparations for war with Spain in 1624, and the military and domestic upheavals during 1625-26.
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Conventions and transcriptions

Transcription

A consistent transcription policy has been followed for both printed and manuscript sources. Spelling (including i/j/y and u/v graphs) has not been modernised, with three exceptions: uses of ‘æ’ have been modified to ‘ae’, uses of long s (ſ) have been modified to ‘s’, and any occurrences of ‘VV’ for ‘W’ have been modified to ‘W’.

Abbreviations have been expanded, and indicated with italics. Deletions have been removed, and superscript insertions lowered, with the exception of ‘M’ for ‘Master’, ‘S’ for ‘Sir’, and ‘Ma:ae’ for ‘Majestie’. Catchwords have been omitted. Quotations from long italicised sections have been non-italicised for readability. Any material enclosed within square brackets has been inserted by me.

Print provenance

I deal in this thesis with a large number of anonymous texts, to which I have taken slightly different approaches to referencing, according to the forms they take and the amount of information known about their provenance.

If the author is well-known and generally agreed upon by the ESTC and by critics, I attribute it to them in both the body of the text and in footnotes: the first footnote has the author’s name in square brackets, but I do not use these in later notes. So, for example, the first footnote to Thomas Scott’s *Vox Populi* reads ‘[Thomas Scott], *Vox Populi.*’, but the pamphlet is thereafter referred to as ‘Scott, *Vox Populi*’.

In cases where authorship is disputed, I follow the STC and my own judgement: although *A Tongue-Combat* (1623) has been attributed to Scott by some critics, the ESTC attributes it to Henry Hexham, which agrees with the initials appended to the pamphlet’s dedication and does not conflict with what is known of Hexham’s life and publications. Accordingly, I have attributed the text to Hexham; my first footnote reads ‘Henry Hexham [H.H.]’, and the following footnotes ‘Hexham, p.[n]’, as it is the only text by Hexham to which I refer.
In contrast, some critics have attributed *The Interpreter* to Thomas Scott, but this is on the basis of its argument rather than a clear indication in the text. I have been conservative in the case of this text and those like it. I note the possible attribution in the body of the text, and in the first footnote (e.g. ‘[Thomas Scott?], *The Interpreter’*) but thereafter simply reference with the title (‘*The Interpreter*, p.[n]’). If the author is unknown – for example, in the case of the large number of news pamphlets I reference in my second chapter – I refer to the text in footnotes by its title only.

For the sake of clarity, I have included STC numbers (and when relevant, reference numbers for Dahl’s *BEC*) but not the names of publishers in footnotes. Where these are known or conjectured, I have included this information in the bibliography. All provenance information supplied in square brackets has been taken from the *STC*. I have not attempted to replicate the (sometimes erratic) capitalisation of seventeenth-century title pages: I have put the short title of each text in title case, and the rest of the long title in lower case.

**Dates**

I have treated 1 January as the start of the year, although when this conflicts with the date stated in a text (for example, a letter dated ‘1 February 1621’) I have indicated this in the footnote (‘1 February 1621/22’).

However, as I refer to a large number of news texts which include a date in their titles, I have not ‘modernised’ the dates of these (and of the events surrounding them) from the Julian to the Gregorian calendars. In other words, a pamphlet published in 4 July 1622 was, to those who followed the Gregorian calendar, actually published on 14 July; while to English men and women, who followed the Julian calendar, Heidelberg fell to Tilly not in 19 September 1622 but on 9 September. In all dates of events on the continent, or quotations from continental sources, I have given both dates, e.g. ‘9/19 September’.

**Names and places**

In order to avoid confusion when discussing texts in English, I use the Anglicised forms of the names of figures from non-Anglophone countries, where these were and are in use: ‘Frederick V’ rather than ‘Friedrich V’, ‘Anne’ rather than ‘Anna’ for James I and IV’s
Danish-born Queen, ‘Philip IV’ rather than ‘Felipe IV’, and so forth. Similarly, I use the English form of ‘Stuart’ rather than the Scottish ‘Stewart’ for the British royal family. Exceptions to the rule are when use of the Anglicised form is unusual or may cause confusion. When a name is Anglicised in more than one way, I use the form most commonly used in English. I have taken a similar approach with place names, using ‘Prague’ rather than ‘Praha’, ‘The Hague’ rather than ‘Den Haag’ and so forth.

All Bible references and quotations are from the King James (Authorised) Version of 1611.
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The coast of Bohemia

John Taylor, London’s self-styled ‘Water Poet’, was no stranger either to international travel or to courting publicity. In 1617 he travelled to Hamburg, funded by public subscription, and published a comical account of his journey (of which he gave copies to his backers) upon his return.¹ In the following years Taylor made a series of such trips. In 1618 he went on a ‘pennyles pilgrimage’ from London to Scotland, relying on the kindness of people he met on the way.² In 1619 Taylor and a friend sailed down the Thames in a boat made from brown paper: this particular adventure proved so popular with readers that the original 1620 pamphlet was reprinted twice in 1623.³

In the early autumn of 1620, he embarked upon his most ambitious, and most serious, journey yet. He travelled from London to Bohemia in order to visit the court of Bohemia’s new King and Queen: Frederick, also Elector Palatine of the Rhine, and Elizabeth, daughter of James I of England and VI of Scotland.⁴ Upon Taylor’s return in October, he described being unable to ‘passe the streets’ without being questioned about foreign affairs – and subjected to some alarming acts of geographical dissolution.

First John Easie takes me, and holds mee fast by the fist halfe an houre, and will needes torture some newes out of me from Spinola, whom I was neuer neere by 500 miles; for hee is in the Pallatinate country, and I was in Bohemia. I am no sooner eased of him, but Gregory Gandergoose, an Alderman of Gotham catches me by the goll, demaunding if Bohemia bee a great towne, and whether there be any meate in it, and whether the last fleet of shipps be arieued there: his mouth being stop’d, a third examines mee boldly, what newes from Vienna, where the Emperorus army is, what the Duke of Bauaria doth, what is become of Count Buquoy, how fares all the Englishmen; Where lies the King of Bohemiaes forces, what

² John Taylor, The Pennyles Pilgrimage, or the money-lesse perambulation (London: 1618, STC.23784).
Bethlem Gabor doth, what tydings of Dampeier, and such a tempest of inquisition, that it almost shakes my patience in pieces.\(^5\)

Like Shakespeare in *The Winter’s Tale*, Taylor’s ‘Gregory Gandergoose’ gives the landlocked Bohemia a coast, while ‘John Easie’ and Taylor’s unnamed third character both envisage Bohemia abutting places that were, in reality, fairly distant – the Rhine Palatinate and Vienna.\(^6\) Taylor’s interlocutors have little knowledge of European geography, but are so violently interested in foreign affairs that they collapse geographical distinctions and differences, squash Bohemia and the Rhineland together, and confuse the landlocked country of Bohemia for a ‘great towne’ with a sea-port, like London. In their interactions with Taylor, fascination and ignorance produce a reworked continental geography that, for all its absurdity, is in fact a subtle and astute commentary on the relationship between the British ‘man in the street’ and a ‘cause’ that would soon come to be associated far more with ‘the Pallatinate country’ than with Bohemia.

Taylor’s interlocutors are exaggerations – hence the comical names, and the description of Gandergoose as ‘an Alderman of Gotham’, the Nottinghamshire village whose inhabitants were renowned in popular culture for their foolishness. Furthermore, the interest in foreign affairs that the characters express so emphatically may be primarily intended to advertise the utility of Taylor’s pamphlet. We cannot assume that, in the autumn of 1620, the people of London really did grab returned travellers in the street and pepper them with questions, but we can assume that Taylor intended to sell copies of his *Trauels*. In contrast to his characters’ ignorance, Taylor emphasises the accuracy of his own eyewitness account: not only does he have the necessary geographical knowledge to understand the foolishness of Easie’s and Gandergoose’s questions, he has experienced Bohemia first-hand. He presents his account of his journey as a necessary corrective to the ignorance he encountered in London streets, reluctantly published in order to avoid having to answer foolish questions in person.

However, Taylor’s anecdote does tell us crucial things about both the international situation in the autumn of 1620, and the ways in which people in Britain may have been aware of

---


and interested in events on the continent. In order for a joke to work, the beliefs and/or attitudes on which it plays must have some cultural traction. Taylor’s account of his conversations does more than simply poke fun at the ignorance of Londoners – it expresses important concerns over attitudes towards, and means of learning about, events on the continent.

Taylor describes a tense intersection between ignorance, interest and knowledge, all played out in the public street, involving figures far removed either from access to political and military intelligence or from the elite institutions in which such intelligence was received, interpreted, and acted upon. He describes non-elite men engaging with foreign affairs in ways that are ridiculous – but which can also be interpreted as disruptive, dangerous, or perhaps even perceptive. In *Taylor his Trauels*, interest in events on the continent is a freighted thing – and this goes for Taylor as well as for the men who catch hold of him in the street. Taylor’s journey to Prague, the interest he reports upon his return, and the act of publishing an account to meet such interest all indicate a partisan and specific link between the British subject and the controversial new court in Prague: and thus with the growing conflict in the Empire.
Part 1: The Palatine conflict

Frederick’s acceptance of the Bohemian crown in August 1619 had set the young Calvinist potentate on a collision course with the Holy Roman Empire’s most powerful family. Bohemia had long been considered part of the hereditary lands of the Habsburgs, but in 1618 the country’s Protestant estates rebelled against their King, the Catholic Ferdinand of Styria, and voted to replace him with Frederick. Frederick accepted the crown, against the advice of some of his Protestant allies and despite having received no approval from James. Ferdinand’s election to the Imperial crown, which took place the day after the Bohemian Estates voted to offer the Bohemian title to Frederick, ensured that Frederick did not only defy a powerful neighbour – he defied the Holy Roman Emperor to whom he was constitutionally subject.  

John Taylor’s journey to Bohemia thus took him to the heart of a growing political, military, and religious crisis. By the time he departed London on 4/14 August 1620, Imperial forces had invaded Bohemia. By the time he reached Prague on 7/17 September, troops from the Spanish Army of the Netherlands had invaded Frederick’s ancestral lands in the Lower Palatinate. Taylor’s journey to Prague therefore took place at a time when the links between different parts of Europe had changed dramatically and dangerously: the fates of Bohemia and the Palatinate were now tied together, and Britain was, through Elizabeth, linked to both. Frederick’s election was accompanied with a degree of celebration and legal justification from British Protestants delighted at a victory over the Papist Antichrist, and 2,000 British troops under Sir Andrew Gray travelled to Bohemia to fight for Frederick.

In this thesis I examine this link – the connection between the British subject and the places, people, and events of the early years of what would later come to be termed the

---

Thirty Years’ War. Like Taylor’s John Easie, my focus is on Frederick’s dominions in the Rhineland rather than on his new kingdom of Bohemia – because it was the Palatinate that would come to define Britain’s relationship to the continental conflict. This divided territory in southern Germany came to be a key focus of British foreign policy and political debate.

On 29 October/8 November 1620, not long after Taylor’s return, Frederick’s forces in Bohemia were crushed by those of the Emperor and the Duke of Bavaria at the Battle of White Mountain. Frederick and Elizabeth were driven from Bohemia; unable to return to the beleaguered Palatinate and forbidden by Elizabeth’s father from travelling to Britain, they set up their court-in-exile in The Hague.

The defeat at White Mountain effectively ended the Bohemian rebellion. Ferdinand reclaimed his former dominions and brutally punished many of Frederick’s supporters. Although Frederick refused to openly renounce the crown, his focus, and that of many others, turned to the ongoing war in the Palatinate. There the combined forces of international Protestantism – the united Protestant princes of the Empire, the Dutch, and the British – were to take on the formidable Spanish Army of the Netherlands, led by Ambrosio Spinola, and later Bavarian forces under Johann Tserclaes, Count of Tilly. However, the German forces, and a large proportion of the Dutch, soon abandoned the defence of the Palatinate, leaving British forces defending the Lower Palatinate cities of Heidelberg, Mannheim and Frankenthal. Both Heidelberg and Mannheim fell to Tilly in the autumn of 1622. In the spring of 1623 Frederick’s patrimony fell entirely into the hands of his enemies: in February Emperor Ferdinand officially confiscated Frederick’s lands, and bestowed the Upper Palatinate and the electoral dignity on Maximilian of Bavaria, and soon afterwards James ordered the British defenders to surrender Frankenthal.

Though the British forces in both Bohemia and the Palatinate had some financial support from the Stuart government, they were volunteers. James I and VI had not supported his son-in-law’s decision to accept the Bohemian crown, and he was determined to secure a resolution to the crisis through diplomacy rather than direct military action, despite the pleas of his daughter and son-in-law. James was also reluctant to intervene militarily because he was attempting to negotiate a match between his son Charles and the Infanta Maria Anna of Spain. Both the projected ‘Spanish Match’ and James’s intractable attitude
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to the Palatinate were sources of friction between the King and his subjects: the King dissolved the 1621 Parliament for discussing the match alongside proposed military action, while mobs gathered in London streets to attack and intimidate the retinue of the Spanish ambassador.

Charles travelled to Spain in 1623 in order to speed up marriage negotiations. This attempt was unsuccessful, however, and the Prince returned in October without his intended bride. The failure of the ‘Spanish Match’ was a source of celebration for many British subjects, and also precipitated a major change in British foreign policy. Charles came to support military involvement in order to recover the Palatinate for Frederick and Elizabeth, and at the Parliament of 1624 it was agreed to pay subsidies and provide men to Count Ernst von Mansfeld, a mercenary commander who had previously commanded Frederick’s forces. After James’s death in 1625, Charles also paid subsidies to Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden and Christian IV of Denmark during their German campaigns of the 1620s. However, the campaigns of Mansfeld, Gustavus and Christian against Imperial forces were largely unsuccessful, and in 1628 British military involvement ceased. The Palatinate had not been recovered. Charles was in no position to finance further military action – not least because, following disputes with MPs over the conduct and finance of the war, he was reluctant to summon Parliament.

Charles would not call a Parliament for eleven years, from 1629 until 1640. During this period of ‘Personal Rule’ Frederick and Elizabeth’s eldest son Frederick Henry died (in 1629), followed by Frederick himself (in 1632). Elizabeth remained at the Palatine court-in-exile at The Hague, but the couple’s second son and heir Charles Louis, and their third son Rupert, lived at Charles’s court in England for most of the 1630s. The British King did continue to act on behalf of his sister and her children, most notably sending Thomas Howard, the Earl of Arundel, as ambassador to the Emperor in 1636. However, Arundel’s embassy was a marked failure. It was the last major British attempt to resolve the issue. Charles Louis was not to return to his father’s capital until 1649, after it was agreed in the 1648 Peace of Westphalia to return the Lower Palatinate to Frederick’s heirs and create a new electoral dignity to replace the one bestowed on the Duke of Bavaria in 1623.
Interest in the Palatinate

Following Spinola’s invasion of the Lower Palatinate in 1620, the fate of Frederick, Elizabeth, their children, and the land from which they were exiled became a mainstay of Parliamentary debates, sermons – and the print market. This was particularly the case in 1620-26: during this period the Palatinate was fought for and lost, the negotiations and controversy over the Spanish Match reached their peak, and Britain eventually became involved in a war effort that did not measure up to the grand hopes entertained in some quarters.

Throughout this period, a wide range of texts were published that dealt with the conflict and with the British response to it. Taylor’s account of his conversations in London during the autumn of 1620 conveys a notion that would become key to many texts published in the following years – that British subjects had a particular interest in events in and connected to the Palatinate. Taylor’s three questioners may be fictional, and the overwhelming interest they express may be exaggerated, but it is an exaggeration that expresses an important point of reference for British texts that addresses the Palatine conflict.

By ‘interest in’ I mean both that British subjects were fascinated by and/or concerned with events in the Palatinate, and that they had a stake in the country’s fate. Both of these senses are crucial to texts that deal with the Palatinate in the 1620s – as is the way in which the two slip into one another. Printed texts that cater to this interest suggest, implicitly or explicitly, that readers should care about the Palatinate, that they have reasons more significant than curiosity for wishing to read news about the siege of Heidelberg, or the Spanish ambassador’s reported attempts to undermine the British push for war.

The reasons these texts gave for such ‘interest’ were compelling. It was in these years, and through the struggle to restore the Palatinate, that Frederick and Elizabeth went, in Jaroslav Miller’s words, ‘from conquerors to martyrs’ in both their own propaganda and in British texts that took their part. Meanwhile, the land over which they had ruled – praised in Edenic terms at the time of the couple’s marriage – became, in these texts, the theatre in which two crucial battles were played out: the fight between the chief exponents of international Catholicism and the Protestant confessions that they were reportedly out to...

---

destroy, and the fight to define what sort of Protestant nation the Stuart polity might be, who its allies were, what it would and would not accept, and what it would do to further Protestant interests abroad. At stake in this conflict was, in these texts at least, both the future of Protestantism in Europe and the nature of British Protestant identity.

The 1620s have long been seen by historians as a time in which the roles and duties of subjects and of monarchs came under sustained and critical scrutiny, from writers and speakers across the political and social spectrum; a time in which these roles were discussed and defined in charged and sometimes confrontational ways. The conflict in the Palatinate was key to these debates: in his influential study of the events following Charles’s return from Spain, Thomas Cogswell describes ‘the appropriate English reaction to the disintegrating Protestant position on the continent’ as ‘the topic in the period’.

Meanwhile, the crisis has been seen as crucial to developments in print media, especially to printed news. However, this study is the first to concentrate specifically on the presence of the Palatinate in British print during this period. I focus on the rhetorical strategies by which the conflict over the Palatinate, the British subject, and the links between the two were fashioned in printed texts from the period; how interest in news from the Palatinate was both supplied and rhetorically constructed. I ask three key questions – firstly, what was available to those who, like John Easie, sought news from the Palatinate during 1620-26? Secondly, what kinds of understandings of the Palatinate and the conflict taking place there may have emerged from these texts? And thirdly, what was at stake in accessing and interpreting these texts?

I approach these issues from a background in the study of English Literature. My analysis is grounded in close-reading of the language and visual strategies used in my primary texts. This close-reading is historically informed: I examine these texts in relation to the multiple contexts with which they interacted. Printed texts took part in complex textual and ideological economies, which encompassed manuscript and oral sources as well as the products of the print shop. The texts I examine moved through, and sometimes formed the currency of, social and commercial relationships. They drew on other forms of discourse, and were modified by them, and in turn those forms of discourse were influenced and

9 _BR_, p.4.
modified by print. Printed texts responded to political events, and sometimes political events responded to texts. My focus on print is informed by awareness of print’s contexts, and print’s implications.

My examination of these texts thus brings me into contact with far-reaching issues in seventeenth century historiography – in particular, ideas about subjecthood and political engagement. A number of these texts deal explicitly with the duties of the individual subject, particularly in respect to their monarch: in doing so they can be interpreted as expressing views that challenge key tenets of the Stuart regime. The degree to which disagreements between James and Charles and their subjects over the British response to the conflict indicate ideological divisions within the state has long been a topic of historiographical contention.10 In this thesis I investigate how the Palatine crisis was constructed in texts as one of the issues that defined the relationship between the British subject and the Stuart monarchy, connected to ideas of both civic and religious virtue. It factored into the construction of both corporate and individual identity within the Stuart state. In these texts, learning about and caring about the Palatine crisis is presented as one of the duties of British subjects, and at the same time such interest unites British readers in international communities marked by the movement of information, confessional links, and sympathy.

**Britain and the Palatinate: knowledge and ignorance**

Taylor’s characters are comically ignorant – but their engagement with continental events is not entirely ridiculous. In fact, Taylor’s anecdote describes a complex sense of connection between British subjects and foreign affairs: one that prioritises factors other than geography. The mangled geographies described by Taylor’s three interlocutors disguise some astute political and military knowledge. The concerns these characters express map clearly onto real concerns about the conflict in which Frederick and Elizabeth were now embroiled. Given the political situation, Taylor’s distinction between Bohemia and the Palatinate is comically specious – it is reasonable enough for Easie to expect that someone at the Bohemian court may have heard a thing or two about events in the Palatinate. Similarly, Gandergoose might not understand that Bohemia is a country rather than

10 See below, pp.38-42.
than a ‘towne’, but his concern over the amount of ‘meate’ available in it is a fair one. The level of provisions available in the country, and in Prague in particular, was critical information for those wondering whether the country would be able to withstand siege warfare. Taylor later stresses that Prague is remarkably well provided with food and drink.\textsuperscript{11} Meanwhile, the third interlocutor demonstrates detailed and accurate knowledge about the various threats facing Frederick.

Examined more closely, Taylor’s mocking account of his conversations perhaps provides a way to convey the gravity of Frederick and Elizabeth’s situation without meddling openly with international politics, or writing things that might be construed as disloyal to their cause. Taylor adds a warning in his address to the reader of \textit{Taylor his Trauels}: people who ‘[report] any ill successe on the Kings party’ are liars, and ‘are to be suspected, for coying such falshoods, as no well-willers to the Bohemian prosperity’.\textsuperscript{12} However, his anecdote slyly suggests both that ‘the Kings party’ was facing a number of very serious threats, and that different forms of ‘truth’ were available to British readers.

Taylor thus describes a public that is simultaneously ignorant and knowledgeable about foreign affairs. Taylor’s characters are sensitive to international links, although they prioritise the military and political over the geographical. Such awareness is key to the complex sense of international connection expressed in texts dealing with the Palatine crisis. The link between Britain and the Palatinate was marked by geographical simplification, distortion, or even dissolution.

This is particularly clear in the ways in which both Britain and the Palatinate were presented. Neither concept was stable or undisputed in this period. The ‘\textit{Pallatinate country}’ as described in \textit{Taylor his Trauels} is singular, and distant from Bohemia. The route to Prague that Taylor describes did indeed avoid Frederick’s ancestral territories – Taylor entered and departed Bohemia from the north, via Saxony. However, if he had journeyed further to the south-west, he may have found himself travelling through ‘the \textit{Pallatinate country}’ – or at least a ‘\textit{Pallatinate country}’. Frederick’s patrimony consisted of two territories – the larger, richer Lower Palatinate in the Rhineland, and the Upper Palatinate, which bordered Bohemia and Bavaria. The two areas were separated by a wide

\textsuperscript{11} Taylor, \textit{Taylor his Trauels} (1620), sig.D\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{12} Taylor, \textit{Taylor his Trauels} (1620), sig.A3\textsuperscript{r}.\n
swathe of Franconia, and were administered separately to an extent: the Palatine Electors traditionally ruled from Heidelberg in the Lower Palatinate, while the Upper Palatinate was governed by a regent.

It is clear that, by ‘the Palatinate country’, Taylor specifically means the Lower Palatinate, which Spinola had invaded at the start of September 1620. Taylor’s elision of the Upper Palatinate shows that ‘the Palatinate country’, as Taylor and his London interlocutors understand it, is not identical to ‘the Palatinate country’ as Frederick V may have understood it. Taylor elides the complexity of Frederick’s patrimony in order to emphasise the emotive image of a single unfairly threatened homeland. This is a feature of most texts in English that deal with the Palatinate in this period – the Upper Palatinate is mentioned far less frequently than the Lower, and always given its full title, while the Lower Palatinate is usually described simply as ‘the Palatinate’.

Meanwhile, the Stuart polity was made up of three kingdoms – England, Scotland, and Ireland, as well as the principality of Wales, habitually described as part of England – recently amalgamated under a Scottish king. Irish experiences and texts are regrettably beyond the scope of this thesis, but both English and Scottish writers and political figures feature strongly. James had attempted to unite England and Scotland as ‘Great Britain’ on his accession to the English crown in 1603, but this had been a marked failure. However, in a verse pamphlet written before he departed for Prague, entitled An English-Mans Love to Bohemia, John Taylor describes a form of national unity based on support for Frederick and Elizabeth. Taylor does distinguish between Englishmen and Scots: but he does so in order to exhort both to friendly competition:

Then let this Iland, East, West, South and North
Jointly in these braue warres emblaze our worth.
And as there was a strife, that once befell
Twixt men of Iuda, and of Israel:
Contending which should loue King Dauid best,
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Long may contention onely then be thus  
Twixt vs and Scotland, and twixt them and vs,  
Still friendly striuing which of vs can be  
Most true and loyall to his Maiesty.\textsuperscript{15}

Englishmen and Scots are united by their loyalty to James and determination to ‘emblaze their worth’ in the war; the two parts of the joined polity spur each other to greater things. Taylor also calls upon ‘true borne Britaines, worthy countrymen’ to ‘[r]esume [their] ancient honors’: ‘I know your valiant minds are sharpe and keene | To serue your Soueraignes daughter, Bohems Queene’.\textsuperscript{16} Taylor elides differences and stresses shared affiliation to a monarch and his children, and shared response to a threat to that dynasty. Such elision is especially noticeable in his dedication of An English-Mans Love to Bohemia to Sir Andrew Grey, the commander of the British forces in Bohemia, with no mention of Gray’s Scottishness or his Catholicism.\textsuperscript{17} Taylor’s approach is echoed, and even intensified, in most texts which deal with Stuart foreign policy: the polities that made up the Stuart monarchy are unified not through political or cultural amalgamation, but through a shared cause.

In this thesis I have used ‘British’ for the most part, both in order to indicate the varied identities of the people involved, and to convey the unified national identity expressed by Taylor above. I have used ‘English’ and ‘Scottish’ when dealing with issues specific to those countries, but when a generalised national identity is appealed to (as it frequently is in the texts with which I deal) I have used British. Occasionally this has brought me into lexicographical conflict with texts which dub such an identity ‘English’. However, I use ‘British’ in order to avoid suggesting that this identity necessarily excludes Scottish and Welsh identities.

\textsuperscript{15} John Taylor, An English-Mans Love to Bohemia (Dort [Dordrecht] [i.e. London]: 1620, STC.23751), p.6.
\textsuperscript{16} Taylor, An English-Mans Love to Bohemia, p.2.
Protestant futures

Taylor his Trauels was published again in 1621, ‘corrected, and much enlarged, with diverse things that were in the first impression omitted’.  

Most significant of these changes is Taylor’s reworking of the poem with which the pamphlet concludes. In the 1620 edition, this is a brief 24-line poem summing up the contents of the pamphlet. The 1621 version is substantially expanded (to 86 lines), and makes reference both to Frederick’s defeat in Bohemia and to the ways by which news of this had arrived in Britain. Taylor describes rumours of bad news from Bohemia, and opines that these may have been ‘deuis’d and amplifi’d, by those | Who are Great Britaine and Bohemiaes foes’. However, he reassures his readers that, even if reports of defeat are true, hope is not lost:

Wars are not like confections sweetly candied,  
But rather like to balls at tennis bandied,  
Whereas the victory, is as the ball,  
In faults, in hazzards, in the chase, in all.  
Then if Bohemia hath receiu’d a cuffe.  
‘T will be requited with a counterbuffe.

Taylor reminds his readers to trust in divine providence: ‘When Man is weakest, God is strongest euer, | And those that trust in him, he leaues them neuer’. After all, ‘Dauid had many troubles with King Saul, | But he obtain’d his Kingdome after all’; Taylor implies that Frederick is, like David, one of God’s chosen, and that if he trusts in God he will be rewarded with a triumphant return to Bohemia. This confident reference to providence is a feature of many texts published during this period. The two ways of presenting the Palatine couple identified by Miller – as ‘conquerors’ and as ‘martyrs’ – can be difficult to separate, in the context of Protestant providential beliefs. Alexandra Walsham’s work on popular representations of providence in early modern England has shown that Protestant providence could be seen to function in the world on two levels: a micro one, in which God punished specific sins, and a macro one, which dictated everything that happened from the beginning of the world until its end – and which led, unavoidably, to the victory of Protestantism over Catholicism on earth. Such beliefs valorised the sufferings of the
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19 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels (1621), sig.D3v.  
20 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels (1621), sig.D3v.  
21 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels (1621), sig.D3v.  
22 Alexandra Walsham, Providence in Early Modern England (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); see especially chapter 1, ‘Providence, Print, and the Religion of Protestants’, pp.8-64.
godly at the hands of the reprobate, and confidently predicted a triumphant Protestant future. In this narrative, the perceived cruelty of the Catholic forces in the Palatinate was a sign of their sinfulness, and the question was not necessarily whether the Palatines and the allies would defeat their enemies, but when. The loss of the Palatinate in 1622-23 did not necessarily put paid to this narrative: it could strengthen it.23

Taylor’s amendments here also indicate the ways in which texts dealing with the Palatine conflict did not simply report or discuss ‘current events’. Firstly, the events represented in these texts were rarely, strictly speaking, ‘current’; they had usually taken place weeks or even months earlier, and news of them might be unclear or unreliable. Secondly, texts reporting on the war also dealt with an increasingly problematic recent past, especially following the surrender of Frankenthal. The losses of 1620-23, perceived by many as stemming from failures of British foreign policy, weighed heavily on many texts published in succeeding years. Even texts that celebrate the events of 1624 have, underlying their praise of the turn to war, the reminder that previous British inaction had been unwise and even morally wrong: that the loss of the Palatinate was preventable, but the British had failed to prevent it.

In this narrative, James’s refusal to order direct, official military action in the Palatinate in 1620-23 became a formative mistake on the part of the British. It could even be interpreted as a sin, in which one of Europe’s most prominent Protestant countries had failed to act effectively to protect their brethren abroad from the Catholic forces of Antichrist. Anti-Catholic prejudice marked both Protestant representations of the international situation and, as Peter Lake has demonstrated, Protestant and British self-image: failure to act effectively against international Catholicism and the perceived crimes of its exponents could thus be more than a tactical error.24

The war effort thus became action not just against a powerful enemy, but against an inglorious recent past: an attempt to wipe away this failure and, by restoring the Palatinate to Frederick and Elizabeth, make it as if the British had intervened directly during 1620-23. It is, of course, not at all certain that such intervention would have been any more

---

successful than the interventions of 1625. However, the fact of the delay opened up the possibility that Palatine Protestants and their allies had been defeated by Catholic forces through the failures of Protestants rather than through Catholic successes: that the Protestant international, rather than their Catholic enemies, were in charge of Protestant destinies. The defeat and continued exile of the Palatine couple and their heirs may have been presented as a form of ‘martyrdom’, but it is important to note that they had been ‘martyred’ not only by the actions of Catholic ‘others’ but also by the preventable inaction of those supposed to be their allies.
Part 2: Print and popularity

The desire for news from the Palatinate satirised in *Taylor his Travels* appears to have been a real feature of British culture in the early 1620s – at any rate, real enough that stationers as well as satirists banked on it to sell books. Over the period 1620-26, the conflict in the Palatinate was a key, and controversial, topic in printed texts produced in and for export to Britain. Taylor’s John Easie could have done worse, over the next few years, than direct his curiosity about Palatine affairs towards the book shops and stalls of Paul’s Churchyard, where he would find plenty of texts – mostly inexpensive quarto and octavo pamphlets – to pique his interest.

British readers might follow events in the Palatinate through the developing genre of printed news pamphlets, particularly during the conflict of 1620-23. The frequent presence of ‘newes from the Palatinate’ on the title pages of such pamphlets indicates that it was attractive to readers, or at least that the stationers involved believed this to be the case. These texts drew a clear line between the sieges of Heidelberg and Mannheim, through international news networks, to readers in London and beyond. They facilitated an anxious sense of connection: readers could learn what was happening in the Palatinate via a continuous, if irregular, flow of publications, but the distance that this information had to travel meant that it would be continually out-of-date.

Taylor’s third character appears to be a reader of news. He adapts a standard salutation in his greeting to Taylor – ‘what newes?’ becomes ‘what newes from Vienna’ – and in doing so displays knowledge about the networks through which news moved across Europe. News from Bohemia usually travelled via Vienna, a major news centre. News from Vienna and news from Bohemia would therefore appear in the same paragraph, or in adjacent paragraphs, in manuscript avvisi and printed texts drawing on them.25 What folds Vienna into Prague in the third character’s ‘tempest of inquisition’ is thus not only political and military events, but also the movement of information.

As well as this, printed texts frequently appeal to a sympathetic connection between British readers and the beleaguered Palatine monarchy and populace. This is implicit in many news texts, but expressed in clearer detail in texts that commented on the significance of these
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25 I am grateful to Joad Raymond for this observation.
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events, and the British reaction to them. Controversial pamphlets by the likes of Thomas Scott were published clandestinely, usually anonymously, sometimes in the Low Countries or Edinburgh in order to circumvent English licensing laws. The Palatinate was a frequent – and contentious – topic in the pulpit as well, and features in a number of printed sermons. While news texts often draw on both Protestant and Catholic sources for news reports, most polemical tracts and sermons dealing with the Palatine crisis take a specifically Protestant line on events.

Over the period discussed in this thesis, the ways in which printed texts dealt with the Palatine crisis changed. Following the fall of Frankenthal in 1623, events in the Palatinate were featured less prominently in news pamphlets. However, the connection that these texts had forged between Britain and the Palatinate did not dissipate. The conflict continued to be a major topic in both printed sermons and, particularly, in tracts by polemicists. Following Charles’s return from Madrid in October 1623, there was a marked increase in texts dealing with the Palatine conflict – but not, by and large, with what was taking place in the electorate itself. Instead, polemical writers celebrated the movement towards war with Spain, and thus an essential change in the relationship between Britain and the Palatinate.

My analysis of these texts is sensitive to the ways in which they moved, and their cultural context. I draw especially on the field of book history, and on recent studies of international news networks. These texts both reported and commented on the international situation, and circulated through international connections. In doing so, they forged links – both real and rhetorical – between British readers and the continental spaces, issues and figures about which they read.

Gauging the exact nature and extent of the Palatinate’s presence in print during this period is difficult, both because many texts may well not survive, and because the terms by which this engagement were phrased are not stable or bounded. These issues are evident if I take

26 See the essays contained in the following volumes: Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe, III, Correspondence and Cultural Exchange in Europe 1400-1700, ed. by Francisco Bethencourt and Florike Egmond (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); The Dissemination of News and the Emergence of Contemporaneity in Early Modern Europe, ed. by Brendan Dooley (Farnham, Surrey, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010); News Networks in Seventeenth-Century Britain and Europe, ed. by Joad Raymond (London and New York: Routledge, 2006); News and Politics in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800), ed. by Joop W. Koopmans (Leuven: Peeters, 2005); The Politics of Information in Early Modern Europe, ed. by Brendan Dooley and Sabrina A. Baron (London and New York: Routledge, 2001).
the year 1622, in which the most dramatic developments in the battle for the electorate took place. The STC lists 633 extant printed texts in English dated to 1622 – i.e., produced between 25 March 1622 and 24 March 1623. The word ‘Palatinate’ features on the title pages of 36 of these texts, just under 6% of the total.

Nearly all of this group are quarto pamphlets of news: there are three that might be considered exceptions. One is entitled More Newes from the Palatinate; and more comfort to every true Christian, that either fauoureth the cause of religion, or wisheth well to the King of Bohemia’s proceedings.27 This quarto pamphlet is assigned in the STC to the section of corantos and news pamphlets (STC.18507), but I contend that although it is presented as news, and linked through its title to other news texts, its content – as discussed in my third chapter – is openly polemical. The second anomalous pamphlet in this list is a tract by the Anglo-Dutch Catholic writer Richard Verstegan, entitled The Copy of a Letter sent from an English gentleman, lately become a Catholike beyond the seas, to his Protestant friend in England, published in St Omer by the Jesuit English College Press.28 Both of these pamphlets utilise features of printed news – reference to ‘newes’ and letters – in order to advertise polemical accounts of the conflict.

The third is The Appollogie of the Illustrious Prince Ernestus, Earle of Mansfield, a translation of a tract by the mercenary leader of Frederick’s forces, Ernst von Mansfeld, which might be described as ‘newsworthy’ in itself.29 The Cambridge scholar Joseph Mead sent a copy to his friend Sir Martin Stuteville on 6 April 1622, along with ‘diuers books & Corranto’s’; Mansfeld’s Appologie was the only one of these that Mead requested be returned to him.30 Searches (in various variant spellings) for Palatine cities (Heidelberg, Mannheim, and Frankenthal) and words like ‘Germany’, and the names of commanders (Vere, Mansfeld, Tilly, Spinola) also bring up news pamphlets, as do other words connected to the Palatinate, such as ‘Palatine’ and ‘Palsgrave’.

27 More Newes from the Palatinate; and more comfort to every true Christian, that either fauoureth the cause of religion, or wisheth well to the King of Bohemia’s proceedings, March 1622 ([London?]: 1622, STC.18507.38, BEC.37).
28 Richard Verstegan, The Copy of a Letter sent from an English gentleman, lately become a Catholike beyond the seas, to his Protestant friend in England ([St Omer: English College Press], 1622, STC.5742.7).
29 Ernst von Mansfeld, The Appollogie of the Illustrious Prince Ernestus, Earle of Mansfield (Heidelbergh [Heidelberg] [i.e. London]: 1622, STC.24915).
30 Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville, 27 April 1622, BL Harley MS 389, ff.176-77 (f.176r).
This dominance of news pamphlets is not, however, the full story: although the Palatinate does not usually appear on the title pages of polemical tracts and sermons, it is often dealt with inside. It is much more difficult to quantify this sort of engagement: one can, of course, search the full-text transcriptions available through *Early English Books Online*, and investigate the subject headings there and on the online *STC*. However, this does not give clear statistics for the Palatinate in print, because not all texts on *EEBO* have been transcribed, and not all texts dealing with the Palatinate are tagged with subject headings to do with the conflict, or the places and people involved. The Palatinate is sometimes dealt with in fairly oblique ways: for example, Thomas Dekker does not mention the Palatinate in his plague pamphlet *A Rod for Run-Aways*, but stresses the sufferings of Germany— which contemporaries may well have taken to mean the Palatinate in particular.31

I have therefore not attempted to give a statistical account of printed texts dealing with the Palatinate. I have used a combination of the *STC, EEBO*, library catalogues (chiefly that of the British Library), studies and bibliographies of the period, and my own judgement to locate material, and limited myself to texts that feature the search terms described above, but I do not believe it is possible to place boundaries around engagement with the Palatinate in print, and would caution that—given the volume of printed texts produced in this period, the different means of accessing them, and the range of issues to which the Palatine crisis might relate—any attempt to set such boundaries risks missing important aspects of the discourse.

**The rhetoric of print**

In focusing on these printed texts, I do not suggest that they were the only, or the primary, means of conveying and circulating information or opinion about the crisis in the Palatinate. I have been mindful of Robert Darnton’s assertion that ‘it makes no sense [...] to separate printed from oral and written modes of communication, as we casually do when we speak of “print culture,” because they were all bound together in a multi-media system’.32 As Joad Raymond writes, ‘the meaning and the efficacy of print lay in its
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31 Thomas Dekker, *A Rod for Run-Aways. Gods tokens, of his feareful judgements, sundry wayes pronounced upon this city, and on seuerall persons, both flying from it, and staying in it* (London: 1625, STC.6520), sig.A3'.

connectivity’. Printed texts interacted with other forms of communication, and these interactions generated meanings that might be different, even contradictory, to those offered in the texts themselves.

This approach particularly informs my second chapter, in which I consider printed ‘newes from the Palatinate’ in the context of the ‘multi-media system’ in which it played a part. Susan Wiseman cautions that one should not take the dramatic developments in print media in the seventeenth century to mean that ‘manuscript writing was always or inevitably to be considered private’.

Printed news drew on manuscript gazettes and personal letters of news both for content and form, and thus should not be considered as separate from them. Joseph Mead’s letters of news testify to a context in which print, manuscript, and oral news all played a part: Mead combined accounts from different sources, and evaluated them according to each other. This fluidity was also the case for polemical works. *Vox Populi* circulated in manuscript as well as print in 1620, and made it into manuscript diaries and commonplace books: for example, it was transcribed by John Rous in his ‘Diary’ sometime after this period. Although Rous notes his positive opinion of Scott’s text, sometimes printed polemical texts might be reproduced and/or commented upon in manuscript in ways that challenged the texts’ original import. Printed sermons claimed to be manifestations of texts that had been composed in manuscript, delivered orally, and then perhaps circulated in manuscript before printed publication.

However, I do want to suggest that there were things that were different, or at least could be different, about print. The specific possibilities and anxieties associated with print and printing meant that discussing the Palatinate in a quarto pamphlet was different to discussing it in the street, or in a letter, or even in a manuscript libel. Choosing to issue a text in print was not an ideologically neutral decision. It brought with it associations – of being ‘public’, uncontrollable, even that most problematic of seventeenth-century concepts, ‘popular’ – that were not necessarily any less powerful or worrying for being rhetorical.

---

distortions. What printing signified, and how it might be used, were concerns to all who had a hand in producing printed texts – and to those who read those texts, and those who sought to control them. My intention is not to isolate printed texts from the contexts with which they interacted, but to examine the particular ways in which the forms of print that tackled the Palatine crisis dealt with that crisis, and with their own role in relation to it.

Printing a text did make practical differences to how, and to whom, it might be disseminated. Most texts dealing with the Palatine conflict might be described broadly as ‘cheap print’, although Raymond warns against overstating the ‘cheapness’ of quarto and octavo pamphlets: ‘[a] pamphlet or an early newsbook or a chapbook would cost a penny or two [...] Few could realistically have afforded such an outlay on anything like a regular basis’. However, print does appear to have widened a text’s potential readership: for example, purchasing printed news pamphlets was substantially cheaper than a subscription to a professional newsletter writer, and did not require the elite connections necessary to acquire news from personal sources. Meanwhile, to experience a sermon in non-printed form, one needed either to attend it in person, or to be connected to the clergyman who wrote it in such a way that you could acquire a manuscript copy. Printing made these texts more readily available to a wider, anonymous public than they had been previously.

Even more than its practical effects, however, printing a text might have rhetorical impact. In 1624 the polemicist John Reynolds addressed his pseudonymous pamphlet *Votivae Angliae* to the newly-returned Prince Charles – but claimed that it had originally been presented in manuscript to James I and VI months earlier. Reynolds utilised print as a rhetorical technique, linking the move from manuscript to print with a pointed redirection of a text calling for war: from a private piece of counsel directed towards a notoriously stubborn and peace-loving monarch to a public address to a prince apparently more receptive to pro-war counsel. Whether or not a manuscript copy of *Votivae Angliae* was indeed presented to James ahead of being printed, Reynolds presents print as a more public form than manuscript, and thus the act of issuing a text in print is one of ‘making public’.

40 S.R.N.I. [John Reynolds], *Votivae Angliae* (Vtrecht [France?]: 1624, STC.20646.1), sig.*.ij.*; see Chapter 4, pp.245-48.
In Reynolds’s formulation, manuscript and printed texts facilitate two distinct models of political engagement – one private and (supposedly) elite, one public and ‘popular’.

**Print publics**

Pamphlets and other ‘cheap print’ such as broadsheet ballads are sometimes termed ‘popular’ texts, but again, this is a problematic term: printed texts cost more money than many people could afford, they required one to be literate (or at least to know a literate person who could read it aloud), and crucially they ‘were not produced by the people: for the most part [they] were produced by particular interest-groups within the people’.  

Scott’s *Vox Populi* may claim in its title to represent ‘the voice of the people’, but this was rhetoric rather than reality. However, Raymond argues for a nuanced use of the term ‘popular’ in his introduction to Volume I of *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*:

> Print culture can be described as ‘popular’ not because it is the voice of the people, nor necessarily because it was widely read among the people or reflected their views, but because the people were understood to be involved in the publicity dynamic, the dynamic by which print came to play a part in public life and the political process. We will never be able to measure the extent of that participation, but the currency of the idea of the popular in the actions of those speaking to each other through processes involving the press legitimizes our use of the term.  

Raymond argues that printed texts claimed a part in the public, ‘popular’ processes by which news was disseminated and discussed, and opinion formed. To take part in ‘the publicity dynamic’ was to engage with politics on a level far removed from the monarch, or his court, or even from parliament. Cheap printed texts that dealt with the Palatinate claimed a range of different political roles, from advisor to the monarch, to instructor of an unknown public, to political agitator, to mediator – often at the same time.

Through this, they also constructed identities for the reader, defined in part through their consumption of texts. These identities are social: they stand in relation to the monarch, and to other members of the polity, and link readers in communities of like-minded consumers reaching from the British Provinces to the Palatinate. However, the identities constructed in
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these texts are also concerned primarily with the actions and beliefs of readers on an individual level. The idealised and/or stereotyped readers presented in these texts are defined by a closely related set of attributes: Protestant faith, loyalty to the Stuart monarchy, and a wish for military intervention on behalf of Frederick and Elizabeth. Crucially, they are willing and able to express these attributes through both their consumption of texts and open, outspoken public testimony.
Part 3: The subject and the state

‘A tempest of inquisition’

Taylor’s account of his interlocutors’ actions is comical – but it is also a little threatening. The characters’ interest in foreign affairs is so overwhelming that it causes them to break the rules of polite interaction in an attempt to satisfy it. The violent language used to describe these interactions – Easie ‘holds [Taylor] fast by the fist half an houre, and will needes torture some news out of [him], while Gandergoose ‘catches [him] by the goll [hand]’ and ‘demands’ information – conveys the strength of this interest, and its capacity to disrupt social boundaries and processes. Easie and Gandergoose step beyond their roles as subjects, and almost appear to ape Star Chamber: they detain Taylor and ‘torture’ him for information. However, they’re far from adept at the role: despite the fact that the questions they ask show real knowledge of the political situation, the skewed geography renders them ridiculous. The upshot of this general, violent interest is chaos: ‘a tempest of inquisition’. While this ‘tempest’ appears to threaten little more than Taylor’s patience, the violence with which the characters express their interest hints at far more disruptive and dangerous interactions between subjects and foreign news.

The question of who was permitted to discuss foreign affairs, and where and how they might be permitted to do so, was a particularly charged one in the early 1620s. Discussion of the Palatine conflict – in the street, in Parliament, in print – intervened in long-running debates about the rights of the subject as opposed to the prerogative of the monarch, and the extent and uses of freedom of speech.

Printed texts played an important part in such discussions. ‘Print was uncontrollable, anonymous, and ungoverned once in the marketplace’, writes Anna Bayman; ‘[i]t enabled the proliferation of multiple viewpoints and opinions’. The dissemination and consumption of some texts could therefore be a matter of serious concern to the authorities. A ‘characteristic piece of anonymous “intelligence”’ regarding the furore over Scott’s *Vox Populi* in 1620 describes ‘such bookes’ as ‘trashe as infatuats the foolish vulgar with a
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misprison of Iest-actiones, and with which they ought not to medle’. In December 1620 James issued a proclamation prohibiting ‘excesse of lavish and licentious speech of matters of State’. James saw the crisis in Bohemia and the Palatinate as arcana imperii, secrets of state, with which his subjects should not interfere.

However, the fact that the proclamation was reissued seven months later indicates that James’s attempts to curb discourse about the crisis and his own foreign policy were not entirely successful. People kept speaking and writing about the Palatine crisis – and printing about it. Texts that deal with the Palatinate could be seen as a challenge to James’s proclamations: they effectively assert that discourse about foreign affairs was not just acceptable, but virtuous and even necessary. This is even visible in Taylor his Trauels, despite Taylor’s mockery of interest in foreign news. For Taylor, publication can be a means to neutralise the tempestuous discourse of Easie and Gandergoose. Wearied by constant questioning, Taylor writes, ‘I was inforced to set pen to paper, & let this poore pamphlet (my harrald or nuntius) trauell & talke, whilst I take my ease with silence’. He claims not to offer news: ‘I Come from Bohem, yet no newes I bring, | Of busines ’twixt the Keysar and the king’. However, he does provide specific information about Bohemia: both a description of Prague, and an account of the war effort. He presents Taylor his Trauels as a means to forestall questions – a means by which people can learn about Bohemia without pestering passers-by. Having such information available on open sale sends a clear message: that the fascination that those like John Easie and Gregory Gandergoose expressed was not necessarily inappropriate in itself, and that foreign affairs were acceptable topics to print and to read about.

**Polemical subjects**

Some texts take this further: presenting the fate of the Palatinate as something in which the subject is intimately involved, and which it is their duty to care about. Interest in the
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46 James I and VI, A Proclamation against Excesse of Lauish and Licentiou Speech of Matters of State, 26 July 1621 (London: 1621, STC.8668).
47 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels (1620), sigs.A2r-A3r.
48 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels (1620), sig.A4r.
Palatinate was, for some writers, closely connected to both religious and political identity. What one believed about the conflict, and what one was prepared to do and say about it, could both be seen as markers of – or even crucial factors in – a particular kind of involved, active subjecehood. This form of subjecehood is expressed particularly clearly in controversial pro-war pamphlets published during this period. I use ‘subjecehood’ here to indicate both the individual nature of this ideal, and the degree to which it was grounded in a monarchical worldview. The ideal identity constructed in these texts was rooted in the structures of the Stuart state, and particularly in the power dynamics between the monarch and his subjects. The subject is consistently defined both in terms of individual beliefs, and in terms of their relationship to the monarch. While both this relationship and these beliefs are matters for personal reflection and action, this ideal of subjecehood is generalised: it does not admit of the complexities of individual experience, of social class or gender. The frontispiece to Thomas Scott’s Vox Regis (1624), reproduced as Figure 9 in Chapter 4, expresses this particularly clearly: joyful subjects cluster at the bottom of the image, but they are all male, and they all look remarkably similar.\(^{49}\)

Such texts are particularly associated with Thomas Scott – the most famous of 1620s polemical writers, whose publishing career coincides with the timespan of this thesis. Scott has been the subject of much critical investigation, and my examination of his pamphlets draws on analyses by David Colclough, Peter Lake, and Markku Peltonen in particular.\(^{50}\) However, rather than tackling Scott as an author in a section of his own, I examine his work in combination with the work of other writers over my third and fourth chapters. This is in part because the boundaries of Scott’s oeuvre are notoriously difficult to define. A range of anonymous publications have been attributed to Scott, both by contemporaries and later critics, but not all of these attributions are generally accepted. For example, a compendium of tracts attributed to Scott published in 1624 contains A Tongue-Combat – a text which is now usually attributed to Henry Hexham, as when originally published in 1623 it was preceded by an address to the reader from one ‘H.H.’, who identified himself as the author.\(^{51}\)

---

49 See Chapter 4, p.222.
51 Henry Hexham, A Tongue-Combat (‘London’ [i.e. Holland]: 1623, STC.13264.8).
I have been fairly conservative when assigning authorship, primarily because authorship is not my focus: I deal with Scott as a rhetorical marker rather than Scott as an author. For the purposes of this project, what Scott stood for, what attaching his name to a text in some form meant, is more significant than whether or not he actually wrote it. Joseph Mead’s references to Scott imply that, soon after the publication of *Vox Populi*, both Scott’s name and the name of his most famous pamphlet became strongly associated with the outspoken expression of pro-war, Hispanophobic opinions, especially in anonymous print. The publisher of the 1624 compendium may have attributed *A Tongue-Combat* to Scott because it seemed to express similar opinions to Scott’s other texts, in a manner – a ventriloquised dialogue between two soldiers – not far removed from Scott’s imagined council-sessions and hauntings. As well as this, there may have been economic factors involved: Scott was Britain’s most famous polemicist, and his books appear to have sold well.52

In other words, ‘Thomas Scott’ and ‘*Vox Populi*’ could both function as useful labels to apply to a text, concepts by which one could place it in a particular ideological bracket. Scott came to define a particular political position – and, as well as this, a particular form of outspoken subjecthood, marked by controversial, indecorous expression of one’s views in (usually) anonymous print. This action is simultaneously self-effacing and self-aggrandising: one publishes anonymously, but through this claims to embody a brave and altruistic public identity.

These elements of this identity remained remarkably stable through the upheavals of 1620-26. Scott justified and reiterated the polemical points made in *Vox Populi* (1620) in *Vox Regis* (1624) and echoed both its form and content in *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost* (1626). Meanwhile, other polemical writers – such as John Reynolds and George Marcelline – made overt and glowing reference to *Vox Populi*, and to each other. This stability means that Scott’s work in particular is sometimes quoted and combined in ways that stress thematic coherence over chronology. However, placing his texts and those of his contemporaries into their detailed political contexts is illuminating. I argue in my fourth chapter that Scott and other polemical writers do respond closely to political developments, both domestic and international – but they do so in a way that stresses the continuity, and thus the correctness, of their own position. The cultivation of apparent ideological stability is itself a rhetorical technique.

52 Kelsey, Sean, ‘Scott, Thomas (d. 1626)’. 
Conflict and consensus

These texts construct and define forms of subjecthood that rest on interest in the Palatinate, opposition to Spain, and religious affiliation – and which, crucially, are active and vocal. A good British subject, as defined in *Vox Populi* or *The Interpreter* (1622), sought news from the Palatinate and interpreted it according to an unyielding anti-Catholic worldview: and was then prepared to state their views on it publicly.53

This idea of subjecthood relates closely to both religious and classical humanist ideas about freedom of speech, traced in detail by David Colclough. Colclough explores the ways in which free speech is conceived of during the period both as a matter for one’s individual conscience – a good Christian should bear true witness to their beliefs – and a public issue, simultaneously a right and a civic duty. In the polemical texts by Scott and those who espoused similar views, free speech was essential for the good running both of soul and state: good subjects were required to advise those in authority, even if those in authority did not want to hear what they had to say.54

Free speech was also, as Colclough explains, seen as a right to be defended: ‘it was one of the “liberties of the subject” fought for by individuals and groups across the political landscape’, and was championed and policed with especial self-consciousness in parliamentary sessions.55 The balance between the royal prerogative and the subject’s right to free speech was both site- and person-specific. Freedom of speech within parliament ‘was the only formally secure version of the right’, but was itself the subject of heated debates and definitions: outside of Parliament the situation was more nebulous. ‘It could be argued that MPs’ rights extended to anything written or said during a session (‘in Parliament time’), and some argued that those rights even extended to other citizens writing at such a time’ – however, the authorities do not appear to have shared this view, as illustrated by the fact that John Reynolds was punished for publishing *Votivae Angliae* during the Parliament of 1624.56 Free speech and political engagement in print were often subject to official mistrust and proscription.

---

54 Colclough, *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England*.
55 Colclough, p.1, pp.120-95.
56 Colclough, p.4. For Reynolds, see Chapter 4, p.236.
At the heart of such disapproval was a perceived need, apparently felt by both James and Charles, to defend the boundaries of the royal prerogative against the encroachments of subjects bent upon going beyond their own duties. In his 1622 ‘Directions for Preachers’, James charged clergy not ‘to declare, limit, or bound out by positive doctrine, in any Lecture or Sermon, the Power, Prerogatiue, Iurisdiction, Authoritie, or Duty of Soueraigne Princes’. These concerns tie into fears over sedition at the stereotyped fringes of the Stuart polity: the stability of the state was seen to be under threat from Catholicism (both foreign Catholic powers, and domestic recusants), and from British Puritan extremists.

The nature and extent of such conflict has long been a controversial topic of debate among historians. The events, debates, and texts of the 1620s have been seen by some as evidence of deep-seated ideological conflict within the Stuart state, and by others as evidence of an essential consensus between its parts. Developments in the historiography of the early seventeenth century over the past four decades have been charted in detail by Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, Peter Lake, and Kevin Sharpe, amongst others. My focus on the rhetorical construction of subject identities intersects with these debates in important ways. I examine how language expressive of both ‘conflict’ and, in particular, ‘consensus’ functioned in regard to a specific political concern – the relation between Britain and the Palatine conflict.

From the 1970s onwards, what Kevin Sharpe calls ‘the traditional narrative of an escalating constitutional crisis, a struggle for liberty and property against absolute monarchy’ – a version of events which interpreted the political disagreements of the 1620s as precursors of those of the 1640s – was challenged by a number of critics who ‘exposed problems in the methods and sources deployed to write the traditional narrative’ and prioritised the use of contemporary manuscript sources rather than relying upon printed works. These historians – who came to be known (although not, by and large, by their own identification) as ‘revisionists’ – reacted to the traditional tendency to interpret the 1620s and 1630s in the
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57 The coppie of a letter sent from my lords grace of Canterburie shewing the reasons which induced the kings majestie to prescribe directions for preachers (Oxford: 1622, STC.33), pp.2-3.
59 Sharpe, Reading Revolutions, p.3
light of the civil conflict to come by stressing that, during the challenging events of these years, Britain had remained peaceful – and that the ‘unrevolutionary’ nature of the political situation was based upon an underlying ideological consensus, even between those who disagreed with each other. The ‘revisionists’ have themselves been persuasively challenged by critics who Kevin Sharpe describes as ‘post-revisionists’. These historians ‘rejected the revisionists’ picture of contending factions in a world of shared values and urged a more nuanced address to conflict – religious and political’, while, like the revisionists, basing their analysis on detailed analysis of primary evidence.

Similarly, historians destabilised the view, exemplified by Christopher Hill, that Puritans constituted a radical minority in the Stuart state. Patrick Collinson and Nicholas Tyacke have argued for the existence of a broad Calvinist consensus within the English church, which the Arminianism of the late 1620s and 1630s disrupted. This view has in turn been challenged by critics who interpret Puritanism as a destabilising force and Arminianism as fundamentally conservative. Again, these debates have been well charted, by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, amongst others.

I do not argue in this thesis for the existence or otherwise of fundamental ideological conflict, or consensus, within the British polity of the 1620s. However, I draw upon post-revisionist arguments in particular when examining the ways in which both royal proclamations and cheap print present the polities they address. I argue that both the Stuart regime and those who questioned its foreign policy addressed themselves to a consensus that was rhetorically constructed, and which was bounded by conflict with equally constructed ‘others’.

---

60 Sharpe, Reading Revolutions, p.4.
I take a similar approach to the religious divisions within British society during this period, and especially to Puritanism. Although I explore some of the uses and appropriations of the term ‘Puritan’, particularly by polemical writers on the more Calvinist end of the British political spectrum, I do not deal specifically with ‘Puritanism’ as a theological, social or political force in British life. My reasoning for this is simple: as with the complexities of ‘British’ national identities, the complexities of theological difference within the British polity do not feature in texts dealing with the Palatinate. Neither the polemical tracts nor the printed sermons I have examined tend to deal openly with divisive questions of theological variation within either British or Palatine Protestantism, instead stressing generalised Protestant unity in opposition to Catholicism. I focus instead on the ways in which these texts deal with the Palatine conflict through the use of a vocabulary of religious action and religious threat. Polemical writers appropriate and redefine ‘Puritan’ to signify conservativism and conformity, religious and political beliefs and activities that are stable and loyal rather than extreme and disruptive. My discussion of the term ‘Puritan’ thus focuses on what the word could be made to mean: the ways in which its association with destabilising extremism could be altered, and the ways in which it might then constitute an identity to be claimed rather than avoided.

In this attention to representational strategies I am influenced by Kevin Sharpe’s call for ‘a cultural turn in early modern studies’; Sharpe has urged ‘a move from politics conceived (anachronistically) as the business of institutions, bureaucracies and officers to the broader politics of discourse and symbols, anxieties and aspirations, myths and memories’. Sharpe argues that ‘neither the revisionists nor their critics have discussed what “ideology” or “conflict” meant to the men and women of early modern England; how a language of difference related to division; or indeed how values were constituted, validated, appropriated – and contested’. Discussions of the existence or otherwise of ‘conflict’ and ‘consensus’ in the early decades of the seventeenth century do not always give enough weight to the importance of both of these notions in the rhetoric by which texts from the time function. Writers on the Palatinate, from the King to clergymen to exiled polemicists, tend to rely on a similar construction of the reader in relation to the political situation. These texts often portray a divided, conflicted society, but they almost always place the reader on whichever ‘side’ is deemed the ‘right’ one. The reader and writer are both figured.
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as part of a broad consensus, and defined against ‘others’ which may be foreign – given the international situation and recent British history, the Spanish commonly feature in this role – but are also frequently domestic, in the form of British Catholics, Hispanicised courtiers, or troublemaking ‘Puritan’ agitators.

‘A notion of language, meaning and authority as multivalent in their construction and reception renders [the choice] between ‘consensus’ and ‘conflict’, a simplistic dichotomy that flattens the many textures of a complex culture’, Sharpe writes.\(^\text{67}\) This observation is key to my argument in this thesis; I contend that texts addressing the Palatinate demonstrate that seemingly innocuous shared values – for example, loyalty to the monarch – may be interpreted in very different ways, according to differing criteria and expectations. What a British subject’s duties were was continually up for dispute: Thomas Scott’s idealisation of outspoken counsel conflicted with James’s insistence that his subjects keep a decorous distance from matters of state, but both James and Scott use the language of love, loyalty and service when describing these roles. Moreover, following the invasion of the Palatinate, James’s refusal to order military action on behalf of his kin on the continent meant that previously innocuous expressions of loyalty to the King and his children gathered a charge that they had not had before. Rather, belligerent attitudes towards the Palatine conflict could be explicitly framed as devotion to the King and his family. ‘In a complex political culture,’ Sharpe writes, ‘unity and division may coexist, and a shared language may convey, or be interpreted as conveying, different, even contested meanings. Actions, pronouncements, ‘documents’ may be multivalent’.\(^\text{68}\) A ‘consensus’ in terms of the language used and the opinions expressed can thus disguise far more, and far deeper, conflict; the conflict of irreconcilable worldviews expressed in similar words.

\(^{67}\) Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.17

\(^{68}\) Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.9.
Part 5: Chapter outline

My approach is also sensitive to the ways in which the political and military situation developed during this period, both on the continent and in Britain. I analyse printed representations of the Palatinate in relation to events, and to manuscript sources, in order to chart how printed texts responded to developments both at home and abroad. My first chapter gives a detailed context for these investigations, through an historical overview of Britain’s connection to the Palatinate. I begin with the background to the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth in 1613, and then analyse texts which celebrated the match, contending that the metaphors of connection used in these texts linked Britain and the Palatinate in such a way to stress religious and royal links but not to elide the distance or differences between the two places. The dynastic union of the Stuarts and the Palatine Wittelsbachs was complicated by constitutional differences. The choice of Frederick – an Imperial Elector rather than a monarch – as a husband for the daughter of the British King appears to have met with opposition from subjects in England in particular, as well as from James’s wife Anne. Frederick’s status was not necessarily stable or respected in Britain; the fulsome praise of Frederick’s lands, powers, lineage, and faith in texts celebrating the match should be seen in the light of this charged context. Frederick was praised in such a way to forge a consciously international link between Britain and the Palatinate.

In Chapter 1, I argue that the rhetoric used in texts published in 1613-14 had important implications for those published in the 1620s. The close international link described in these texts became more charged following Frederick’s acceptance of the Bohemian crown. The disagreements between James and his daughter and son-in-law could lead to divided loyalties, for British subjects: after 1620 the Palatine court in exile became an alternative centre of Stuart royal power for some British courtiers.

My second and third chapters both focus on the period from the invasion of the Palatinate in September 1620 until the fall of Frankenthal in the spring of 1623. This is, in part, in order to address the volume of relevant texts from this period – but also because the period saw two closely related, but distinct, ways of dealing with the Palatinate in printed pamphlets. My second chapter addresses developments in printed news: I examine how news texts advertised a connection to the Palatinate, and the shapes that connection took. News travelled from the Palatinate to London through international news networks, and
then across Britain via sociable ones. It linked its readers to the Palatinate through these networks, and referenced geographical movements, and the time that had elapsed since events. This both stressed the credibility of news reports, and projected the desire to read news forward in time – continually frustrating closure, necessitating future acts of newsreading.

In these texts news from the Palatinate is presented as something that British readers will want to read about; it is often used prominently in paratextual material to advertise news pamphlets. However, printed sermons and polemical tracts published during 1620-23 dealt more openly with the question of what was at stake in such interest, both for the British subject, for the nation, and for international Protestantism. These texts functioned within the context of the news dissemination detailed in my second chapter, but they explicitly address the relationship between reading about the Palatinate and individual subjecthood. In my third chapter I examine the ways in which these texts propounded models of action for the concerned, ‘good’ subject, who should read about the Palatinate, express their (pro-war) views freely, and – most importantly – cultivate a personal emotional and religious connection to events on the continent. I place these ideas in the context of Protestant notions of providence, especially the belief in the eventual victory of the reformed religion over Catholicism on earth.

In my fourth and final chapter I turn to the afterlife of the connection forged in 1620-23. I explore how the rhetorical connections between Britain and the Palatinate in British print changed – or, in some cases, didn’t change – through the dramatic alterations in domestic and international politics from the autumn of 1623 until the spring of 1626. I begin with the hopes expressed following Charles’s return from Spain in October 1623, arguing that celebration of the movement towards war with Spain implied criticism of previous royal policy. Writers made specific reference to Vox Populi, in particular, in order to stress that pro-war arguments had remained stable since 1620. This idea of ideological lineage brought with it a sense of belatedness, the knowledge that the war could have been undertaken from a better position four years earlier. This notion was exacerbated by the series of natural and military disasters of 1625-26. In the final part of this chapter I turn to the ways in which these misfortunes were interpreted in relation to the Palatine crisis. I argue that the plague that hit London in 1625 provided a means by which the subject’s relationship to the Palatinate could be delineated. British subjects had failed to learn from
the divine providence demonstrated in the Palatinate, and to care enough about their fellow
Protestants: and now they found themselves part of the international community of
suffering Protestant nations, united with the Palatinate under divine chastisement.
Chapter 1. The marriage of Thames and Rhine: Britain, the Palatinate, and militant Protestantism

Over the period 1620-26, the fate of the Palatinate and its royals became a key issue in both British politics and British publishing. In this chapter I examine why that was: how events in southern Germany became so important to writers, readers and political figures in Britain. I focus here on the events to which the texts I discuss in the following three chapters reacted, and the actions and utterances of the major actors: in particular, the rhetoric cultivated by Frederick, Elizabeth, and their supporters. The support for the Palatine couple and their cause expressed in British texts during this period was rooted in the past and in royal authority, intimately connected to notions of international Protestant identity that had been forged well before Frederick and Elizabeth moved to Prague. It was through such identification with faith and tradition that people in Britain came to care about a country so far away from them, and a cause rooted in the complexities of imperial politics came to be enmeshed in British politics and culture.

In the first part of this chapter I trace the means by which the Palatinate and British Protestantism became connected, by exploring the background to the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth, and the ways in which it was celebrated in Britain and commemorated in the Palatinate. The marriage linked the Stuart monarchy with the leading European exponent of militant Protestantism, the leader of a union of imperial Protestant princes and free cities; a source of hope for those who hoped that Protestantism would establish ascendancy over Catholicism in Europe and beyond. Praise of Frederick’s Calvinist faith was one of the means by which British writers sought to legitimise Elizabeth’s marriage to a man who, powerful as he was, was subject to the Emperor and not a monarch in his own right. I examine how a prevalent metaphor of connection – that of the marriage of the Thames and Rhine – both drew Britain and the Palatinate together, and emphasised the geographical distance between them.

The second part of this chapter traces what happened when Frederick became involved in the conflict in Bohemia, which through his involvement spread to both Palatinates. Relations between James and his daughter and son-in-law soured over the British King’s unwillingness to commit to direct military action on behalf of the couple. The Palatine couple mounted a sustained propaganda campaign to promote military action from their
court-in-exile in The Hague, through diplomacy and letter-writing, in which Elizabeth took a major role.

Elizabeth did not restrict her efforts to her father and brother; rather, she wrote to a range of British politicians, diplomats, clergy and nobles, maintaining relationships with those she had known in Britain as well as forging links with those she had not. Couriers passed frequently between The Hague and Britain; meanwhile, Frederick and Elizabeth’s court was a frequent port-of-call for British diplomats and others travelling on the continent. Palatine envoys negotiated and collected funds in London, while British men and women were employed at the court in The Hague. These connections kept the couple’s cause at the top of the political agenda. In this section I also examine two of these relationships: those with Sir Francis Nethersole, who James appointed as his daughter’s secretary, and Sir Thomas Roe, who took a more remote role in the couple’s cause but nonetheless communicated regularly with Elizabeth, from London and from Constantinople, expressing his support. These two men cannot be taken as typical of British experience – they were both elite diplomats, with jobs that were connected to the Palatine conflict – but they do illustrate how a culture of support grew up around the couple (Elizabeth in particular), and also how the Palatine court in exile at The Hague became, in effect, an alternative centre of royal power for these British subjects, even when they were not able to visit it. Support for Frederick and Elizabeth divided Nethersole’s and Roe’s loyalties – Nethersole was faced with conflicting orders from his British and Palatine masters, while Roe may have had to work contrary to his clear sympathies with the ‘Palatine Cause’ while British ambassador in Constantinople. In other words, the pro-Palatine views available in stationers’ shops had parallels in international diplomacy and elite communication, and both are representative of a problem faced by British men and women with militant Protestant sympathies – the issue of how to reconcile loyalty to the King with loyalty to his Palatine relatives.

This problem appeared to many to be resolved in the autumn of 1623, when Prince Charles and the royal favourite, the Duke of Buckingham, returned from their secretive trip to Madrid without having secured the projected ‘Spanish Match’ for Charles. This ambition had been opposed by the Palatine couple, as well as by many of James’s subjects. Its failure sparked public celebrations and a push, by Charles, Buckingham, and members of Parliament, towards war with Spain. Charles succeeded to the throne in 1625; in the first year of his reign two British forces departed for the continent – one of infantry for the
Palatinate, and a fleet intended to attack Cadiz. However, this military action was disastrous, leading to conflict between the King, Buckingham, and Parliament over the conduct of the war.

In the third part of this chapter I examine how the relationship between Britain and the Palatinate developed during these upheavals, and how — in the face of disease and defeat — the focus of criticism changed: Britain was now involved in a war, but that war had been found wanting. The energies of Frederick and Elizabeth, and those who supported them, had been devoted since the defeat at White Mountain to persuading the British regime to go to war, but this desire was predicated on the idea that such a war would be prosecuted with alacrity, commitment, and competence — and, crucially, that it would be successful. In 1625-6 those in charge of the British war effort faced a number of disasters, and in the end problems of finance and domestic discord overtook the push for war. The hopes expressed in 1613 were kept alive, after a fashion, through the conflict of the early 1620s by the expressed belief of the Palatine couple and others that official British involvement in the war would solve their problems; hopes that British military action and domestic wrangles were to frustrate.
Part 1: The ‘Palatine Match’

On Valentine’s Day 1613, Elizabeth, the only daughter of James I of England and VI of Scotland, married Frederick V, the Elector Palatine of the Rhine, in the chapel at Whitehall Palace. The wedding was the culmination of extensive negotiations, and brought together two of the leading Protestant powers. It was accompanied by ‘the most magnificent public shows that England had ever seen’, which expressed potent hopes for both the marital union and the political one.1 As well as this, there were a flood of celebratory texts – epithalamia, pamphlets, broadsheets – praising the match and predicting great things for the couple.

However, one group misjudged the mood badly enough to draw the ire of the King. Nearly a month after the wedding, Frederick and Prince Charles travelled to Cambridge, where they were entertained with the performance of two comedies and ‘two very commendable acts in Divinitie and Philosophie’. ‘Entertained’ is perhaps something of an exaggeration: according to the newsletter writer John Chamberlain the scholars ‘marred [the comedies] with length and made them grow tedious, the one of them lasting between seven and eight howres’.2

However, according to Chamberlain, what enraged James was not bad drama but a controversial political debate. On 25 March, two weeks after reporting the trip to Cambridge, Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton about part of the ‘entertainment’ that had proved more offensive to James than eight hours of classical comedy:

The King is very angrie and out of love with our Cambrige men for theyre questions at the Palsgraves beeing there specially whether electio or successio were to be preferred in kingdomes, and is out of patience that yt shoold be so much as argued in schooles.3

Given James’s well-publicised views about the divine right of monarchs, it is unsurprising that he was angered by the suggestion that elective monarchies might be preferable to ones

---

based on succession. Oxbridge debates were traditionally fora for the antagonistic exchange of positions, sometimes extreme, taken for the purpose of argument: James’s anger might be seen as a fundamental misunderstanding of the sort of rhetorical display that he witnessed in Cambridge. However, this debate appears to have been especially controversial. As John Hale writes, usually ‘[d]isputants did not debate truly hot issues [...] The issues were chiefly innocuous through remoteness or generality, or the answer was often a foreknown orthodoxy’. 

Whether by accident or design, the debaters in Cambridge tackled a topic that was neither remote nor general, given their audience. The Elector Palatine was one of seven Imperial electors, whose constitutional role it was to choose the Holy Roman Emperor. Frederick therefore did have certain circumscribed but essential powers over the Emperor, but only in terms of deciding the Imperial succession. By the seventeenth century, this succession had become dominated by the Austrian Habsburgs: the Imperial crown was effectively hereditary, although a succession of childless Emperors in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries complicated matters. Protestants were outnumbered in the electoral college: there were three Protestant electors, as opposed to four Catholic ones.

Frederick’s powers within the Imperial hierarchy were therefore limited, and he was constitutionally subject to the Emperor. However, he ruled in the Upper and Lower Palatinate by hereditary right, and decided on most of the laws and, crucially, the faith to be followed in his dominions.

Many British men and women may well have been familiar with the concept, if not the experience, of elective monarchy. The Danish monarchy, from which their queen hailed and to which Britain had extensive trade and diplomatic links, was elective. However, such familiarity might even exacerbate what Chrisof Ginzel identifies as a major British objection to the ‘Palatine Match’ – the fact the Frederick was not a king. The British Queen, Anne of Denmark, appears to have objected to the match: this may have been on confessional grounds (Anne had converted to Catholicism during her time in Scotland), but
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4 See, for example, Jane Rickard’s discussion of James’s writings in Authorship and Authority: The Writings of James I and IV (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).  
she ‘probably also wanted a more exalted marriage’.  

In the light of these concerns, English writers in particular stressed Frederick’s heritage, his personal power, and the richness of the lands he ruled over. They responded to a perceived need to establish Frederick as a figure worthy of his wife, and thus to integrate him within familiar, court-approved forms of government and prestige. In other words, as Ginzel argues, Frederick was rendered a prince in the Stuart mould, deserving of a Stuart princess.

James had chosen a husband for his daughter in order to further a carefully nurtured foreign policy. The ‘Palatine Match’ was the first in a series of marriages that James planned for his offspring: Elizabeth’s marriage to a Protestant was to have been balanced with Catholic matches for James’s sons Henry and Charles. Through this matchmaking, the self-styled Rex Pacificus would, he hoped, ensure the stability of an increasingly fractured Europe. Frederick’s role in this envisioned future was to lead the Protestant states of Europe towards a friendly, or at least peaceful, accord with the Catholic ones.

**The Calvinist Wittelsbachs**

On one level, Frederick was perfect for this plan – as perfect a figure as the divided and quarrelsome world of European Protestantism would provide, at any rate. He was both powerful and influential in the Empire, and representative of the type of Protestant ruler that James hoped to influence. The regime of which he was the head had long been engaged in fashioning itself as a major exponent, if not the leading power, of Protestantism in Europe. He belonged to the Palatine branch of the powerful Wittelsbach family, who were descended from Emperor Louis IV (1282-1347) and by 1610 consisted of two main branches, the Palatine and the Bavarian. In the Golden Bull of 1356, which largely determined the constitution of the Empire until the Thirty Years’ War, Emperor Charles IV had allotted one of the seven Imperial Electorships to the Palatine Wittelsbachs, but none to
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the Bavarian branch – ‘to the chagrin’ of the latter.9

The Palatine Wittelsbachs themselves divided in 1505 into two sub-branches – the electoral branch, based in Heidelberg, and a cadet branch based in Neuberg. Both branches of the Palatine Wittelsbachs converted to Lutheranism during the course of the sixteenth century; the Heidelberg Electors then converted to Calvinism, causing friction with their relatives in Neuberg.

Meanwhile, confession divided the two Protestant sub-branches both from the Imperial regime and from their cousins in Bavaria, who became stalwarts of the Catholic Counter-Reformation. Bavarian Wittelsbachs also cultivated political, military and dynastic links with the Catholic Austrian Habsburgs, a dynasty which the Palatine Wittelsbachs, those in Heidelberg in particular, were increasingly to align themselves against.10

The Palatinate became associated with a confrontational approach to confessional issues. ‘From about 1556 up to 1618’, Claus-Peter Clasen writes, ‘Heidelberg Castle remained the centre of militant Protestantism’.11 This militancy intensified after the Elector Frederick III converted to Calvinism in 1559-60.12 Calvinism was, in the eyes of many of its adherents, a vulnerable faith. It was at risk both from Catholics and from other branches of Protestantism, particularly Lutheranism – ‘[f]or various reasons the Lutheran theologians and Princes regarded Calvinism as something as pernicious, if not more pestilential, than Catholicism.’13 Calvinism had not been included in the Peace of Augsburg (1555), which had officially ended hostilities between the Emperor Charles V and the Lutheran princes of the Schmalkaldic League by establishing the right of princes to choose whether Catholicism or Lutheranism was observed in their dominions. In the early years of Calvinism in the Palatinate, following the conversion of Elector Frederick III in 1562, the faith faced legal challenges from the Dukes of Württemberg and Zweibrücken (at the Imperial Diet in 1566) and from within the Elector’s own family.14 While the Lower Palatinate became a Calvinist state, the Upper Palatinate – as well as the Wittelsbach cadet

10 See WK, and Thomas, for accounts of Palatine faith and diplomacy in this period.
13 Clasen, p.9.
14 Clasen, pp.9-10.
branch based in Neuburg – remained Lutheran. The Counts Palatine of Neuburg became increasingly estranged from their Calvinist relatives, and made attempts to limit the power of Heidelberg.\(^\text{15}\)

**The Palatinate’s international links**

Both Frederick’s father, Frederick IV, and the Elector before him – Johan Casimir, Frederick IV’s uncle – made repeated attempts to foster consensus and co-operation amongst Protestant powers. Underlying these policies, Simon Adams argues, was ‘a starkly ideological approach to European politics’:

Since the late 1560s, Heidelberg had been convinced of the existence of an international Catholic alliance led by the Habsburgs and the papacy which, once it had established a position of strength, would embark on a campaign to extirpate heresy throughout Europe. To the Palatine leaders, a major religious war seemed inevitable: to defend the Protestant cause, the Catholic revival would have to be combatted at every stage, not only within the Empire but also through the creation of an international Protestant alliance.\(^\text{16}\)

During the late sixteenth century, approaches towards England and Protestants in France and the Low Countries were unsuccessful, but greater success was achieved under the leadership of Prince Christian of Anhalt-Bernberg. Anhalt was appointed Governor of the Upper Palatinate in 1595 and soon became the prime mover of Palatine foreign policy, as Frederick IV’s ‘alcoholism and infirmity’ caused him to delegate control.\(^\text{17}\) The Palatine Wittelsbachs already had extensive dynastic ties to the Orange dynasty and to the Dutch Republic (exemplified by Frederick IV’s 1593 wedding to Louise Juliana of Nassau, daughter of William I of Orange and sister of the leader of the Republic, Maurice of Nassau). Anhalt consolidated these links through a treaty of friendship with the Republic in 1604.\(^\text{18}\) During this time, like other Protestant powers, the Palatines were concerned with defensive matters at home. New defences were built around Heidelberg and Frankenthal,

\(^{15}\) For example, ‘Count Palatine Philipp Ludwig of Neuburg, had actually attempted to arrange a marriage between his heir Wolfgang Wilhelm and Elizabeth Stuart in order to counter Heidelberg’s influence’. Thomas, p.184.

\(^{16}\) Simon Adams, ‘The Union, the League and the politics of Europe’, in *TYW*, pp.25-38 (pp.25-26).

\(^{17}\) Adams, ‘The Union, the League and the politics of Europe’, p.25.

\(^{18}\) *TYW*, p.2.
the two major cities of the Lower Palatinate, while a new ‘fortress-city’ was constructed at Mannheim.\textsuperscript{19}

The Palatine ambition for a confessional alliance was realised in 1608 when the ‘Protestant Union’, a defensive alliance of Protestant states, was formed under the leadership of Frederick IV, following conflict between Catholics and Protestants in the Imperial Free City of Donauwörth and at the Imperial Diet in Regensburg.\textsuperscript{20} A year later a corresponding Catholic pact was agreed, led by Frederick’s cousin Maximilian of Bavaria.\textsuperscript{21} ‘To a large extent’, Geoffrey Parker writes, ‘the battle-lines which divided Germany were thus drawn’.\textsuperscript{22} These opposing bodies – the Protestant Union and the Catholic League – represent public, acrimonious confessional divisions within the Empire.

The Union’s membership expanded following the succession crisis in Cleves-Jülich and Berg in 1609-10. Following the death of the Catholic Duke, John William, in March 1609, the confessionally-mixed Duchies were claimed by two Lutherans – Elector John Sigismund of Brandenburg and Frederick’s relative, Philipp Ludwig of Neuburg – in defiance of John William’s widow Antoinette of Lorraine, the Jülich Estates, and Imperial command.\textsuperscript{23} In response to this, Emperor Rudolf II ordered military action led by his cousin, Archduke Leopold, Bishop of Strasbourg and Passau, who occupied the garrison at Jülich on 23 July. However, the Lutheran claimants had also raised troops, with which they blockaded the garrison.\textsuperscript{24}

This tit-for-tat escalation prompted leading members of the Union, at a meeting in November, to recommend a motion to commit 5,000 men to support the claimants.\textsuperscript{25} The Union’s Assembly met in January 1610, but did not agree to the Princes’ resolution until 4 February, when Anhalt delivered the news of the French King Henri IV’s offer of troops. Simon Adams writes that ‘[t]he intervention of Henry IV transformed the Cleves-Jülich affair from an Imperial to an international crisis’.\textsuperscript{26} In the wake of his involvement, James I and VI and Maurice of Nassau, both of whom had previously refrained from offering the

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{TYW} pp.12-13.  
\textsuperscript{20} Thomas, p.178.  
\textsuperscript{21} Thomas, p.178; Adams, p.31.  
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{TYW}, p.24.  
\textsuperscript{23} Adams, p.29.  
\textsuperscript{24} Adams, p.29.  
\textsuperscript{25} Adams, p.29.  
\textsuperscript{26} Adams, p.30.
Union support, pledged troops to the cause. Archduke Leopold surrendered on the first of September after a short siege.

The formation and actions of the Protestant Union sent out a clear message – that its members did not trust the impartiality of Imperial arbitration, and that they were prepared to defend Protestant interests by force.²⁷ Henri IV’s involvement is telling – the French King had converted to Catholicism in 1593, but continued to oppose the Habsburg monarchies. The Protestant Union did not simply oppose international Catholicism wholesale, but rather focused on perceived Habsburg aggression.

Upon his accession, Frederick became head of an organisation that had a reasonable claim to represent Protestantism in the Empire. It was established in response to a perceived threat: formed to oppose international Catholicism and the actions of the Habsburg dynasty in particular. The fear of this threat, and the hope that Protestant powers would work together to defy and even defeat it, were to be key to Palatine policy both throughout – and following – Frederick’s reign as Elector. James I and VI’s scheme to reconcile the belligerent extremes of Protestantism and Catholicism in Europe through the marriages of his children had, therefore, a flaw: Frederick appeared rather more willing to fight Catholics than to co-operate with them.

The ‘Palatine Match’

In contrast, the British King was far more willing to tolerate confessional diversity for the sake of foreign and domestic stability. James was himself married to a woman whose Catholic leanings were an open secret. Soon after his arrival in England he had given clear testimony that he, unlike his predecessor, planned to pursue peace with Catholic powers: the Treaty of London was signed in the summer of 1603 and brought to an end the war against Spain, which had lasted nearly two decades and been a ruinous drain on Elizabeth’s treasury. James’s reign in his southern kingdom was marked, from the start, by willingness to work with Catholic powers and a preference for peaceful negotiation over military action.

²⁷ Clasen, p.4.
However, this does not mean that James didn’t take a confessional ‘side’. His wife Anne was, after all, from the Danish royal family – her apparent conversion to Catholicism had taken place in Scotland – and thus embodied a link to a powerful Protestant monarchy.28 D.J.B. Trim argues that James ‘[pursued] a prudent yet pronouncedly Protestant foreign policy in the early years of his reign’, especially when it came to the ongoing conflict between the Spanish and the Dutch. Trim points out that despite the Treaty of London, James continued to allow the Dutch to recruit British volunteers and privateers to operate against Spanish ships, as well as ‘encouraging men to fight against Spain by royal patronage of those men who did so’.29 ‘Rather than abandoning the fight against Spanish and papal power’, Malcolm Smuts writes, ‘the King had chosen to pursue it by different methods, which ranged from theological argument to tactical alliances with both Catholic and Protestant states and politicians’.30 Both Smuts and Trim argue that James did not turn towards Spain until well after the ‘Palatine Match’ was concluded. James’s continued support of the Dutch seems to indicate that those who hoped that their King would take a stand against Spain did have reasons to be hopeful.

Britain already had long-established links with Dutch Protestants, and in the wake of the Cleves-Jülich crisis German Protestants also turned much of their attention to wooing the British King. The princes of the Union offered him its presidency, as well as a marriage alliance with the Palatinate, in early 1610. This embassy ‘met with a cold response’, as did another by Anhalt in October. However, James was to change his mind following the assassination of the French King Henri IV on 14 May 1610 and the Treaty of Fontainebleau in March 1611, in which it was agreed that Henri’s son, the nine-year-old Louis XIII, would marry Anne of Austria, the daughter of Philip III of Spain. Although Britain never became a member of the Union, ‘[f]or a brief period in 1611-12 [James] took seriously the possibility that an international Catholic conspiracy had been created, and resolved to counteract it’.31 He made a defensive alliance with the Union in the autumn of 1611, following the momentous agreement, made in the spring of 1611, to marry his only daughter Elizabeth to Frederick V. In doing so, he appeared to give the Palatine regime –

28 Meikle and Payne, ‘Anne (1574–1619)’.
29 D.J.B. Trim, ‘Calvinist Internationalism and the Shaping of Jacobean Foreign Policy, in Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England, ed. by Timothy Wilks (Southampton: Southampton Solent University, 2007), pp.239-258 (pp.252-3). James also allowed the Spanish to recruit – as he did during the Palatine crisis – but Trim argues that in practice recruiters for Spanish service were often arrested (Trim, p.244).
31 Adams, p.32.
notorious for its anti-Habsburg policies – the Stuart seal of approval. Frederick journeyed to England in the autumn of 1612. His arrival on 16/26 October was marked with an elaborate entry to London via the Thames.32

**Henry and Frederick**

James’s heir, Henry, supported the match conspicuously. Henry had entertained Palatine envoys earlier in the year, and appears to have taken a leading role in organising the wedding celebrations.33 The young Prince was himself no stranger to cultivating foreign links: he had close friendships with many of his German relatives, and patronised foreign artists such as Constantino de’ Servi and Salomon de Caus, as well as widely-travelled Englishmen such as Inigo Jones and Thomas Coryat.34 His approach was cosmopolitan – he employed Catholics such as de’ Servi as well as Calvinists such as de Caus, and appears to have idolised Henri IV.

There has been critical disagreement over the extent to which Henry, and his court, were committed to explicitly confessional policies. Roy Strong argues that his court had a ‘strongly Protestant bias’, and that this – especially as reflected in the sobriety of Henry’s court culture – prompted conflict between Henry’s court and the more licentious one of his father.35 Despite his father’s determination to balance Elizabeth’s union with Frederick by marrying Henry to a Catholic princess, Strong argues, Henry appears to have been resolved to wed a Protestant.36 Strong writes that the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth ‘might be said to be the culmination of [Henry’s] policy’, and that his circle seems to have viewed the match in a similar light to the Palatines – ‘as a militant pan-Protestant European alliance to curb Habsburg power’.37 Henry himself, Strong writes, was closely associated with Protestant militarism: seen as the heir to the militant Protestantism of Sir Phillip Sidney and Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex.38
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However, more recent work by scholars such as Malcolm Smuts and Timothy Wilks has challenged the idea of conflict and division expressed by Strong, and even the notion that Henry was opposed to marrying a Catholic. Wilks argues that ‘Henry had no intention of creating a political “opposition court” to that of his father’, and Smuts warns against ‘oversimplifying the political outlook of James and his court, while conflating the political situation during Henry’s lifetime with the much more fraught atmosphere after 1618’. Henry’s approach may not have been as confrontational towards either international Catholicism, or his father’s desire for peace, as Strong writes.

Henry was not to see his sister’s wedding. He was taken ill shortly before Frederick’s arrival, and though he ‘continued against medical advice with his usual activities’, he collapsed on 25 October/4 November and died twelve days later. His death was keenly felt by his sister, his parents – James refused to attend his funeral on 7 December – and many British subjects. The period of mourning meant that his sister’s engagement celebrations were curtailed and her wedding delayed from Christmas to Shrovetide. The wedding was accompanied by ‘an awareness of a prince lost’ – and this awareness was, in a number of texts mourning him at least, confessionally inflected.

Henry may not have been the great ‘Protestant champion’, heir to the Elizabethans who fought in the Low Countries, that Strong describes; but for certain of his father’s subjects he appears to have been a good fit for the role. This is especially evident in texts published after his death, such as Teares on the Death of Moeliades (1614) by the Scottish poet William Drummond of Hawthornden. ‘A Youth more braue, pale Troy with trembling Walls | Did neuer soe’, Drummond writes. Drummond chooses to refer to Henry as ‘MOELIADES Prince of the Isles’ in reference to a 1610 masque in which Henry had performed – Ben Jonson’s Barriers. However, in the masque itself, the name of Henry’s character was actually spelled ‘Meliadus’. As Catherine MacLeod points out, Drummond changes the spelling from that used by Jonson for a rhetorical purpose:
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40 Timothy Wilks, ‘Introduction’ to The Lost Prince, ed. by MacLeod, pp.11-17 (p.14); Smuts, ‘Prince Henry and his World’, p.19.
42 Butler, p.194.
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Spelt Drummond’s way, the name became, as the poet explained, an anagram of ‘Miles a Deo’ or ‘Soldier for God’, and Drummond’s poem expressed the wish that Henry had died in the midst of a (crusading) battle rather than on his sickbed.\textsuperscript{46}

The figure of the ‘Prince of the Isles’ unites the islands of Great Britain, and also the present, past, and future: he aligns the present both with martial classical history, and with hoped-for religious conflict. Drummond makes it clear, in this impossible ideal, Henry would die fighting Catholicism, wishing that ‘[Henry] had made old Rome, | Queene of the World, thy Triumph, and thy Tombe’.\textsuperscript{47}

Christof Ginzel writes that Henry’s death ‘created a temporary vacuum until the emotional and national pathos of the circumstances was fully absorbed in the marriage of Elizabeth and Frederick’.\textsuperscript{48} Britain had lost a future ‘Protestant champion’, and the young head of the Protestant Union was well-placed to take up that mantle. Therefore, literature celebrating the marriage demonstrates the ‘transference of English Protestant hopes onto Frederick and Elizabeth’.\textsuperscript{49} Henry’s middle name had been Frederick, a correspondence that the preacher Robert Allyne made much of in \textit{Teares of Ioy}, his epithalamion on the match:

\begin{quote}
Our \textit{Henry-Fredricke}, lies in timelesse toome,  
Whose double name exprest not halfe his worth;  
A \textit{Fredricke} in his losse, supplies his roome,  
And bearing halfe his name, one halfe sets forth  
Of him, whose all, is hardly match’d by two,  
And therefore is too much, for one, to do.
\end{quote}

Frederick’s name may only be ‘halfe’ of Henry’s, but his fitness to take up Henry’s legacy is, for Allyne, illustrated by Henry’s active approval of the match and his friendship towards the young Elector. Allyne writes that Henry ‘by a high instinct of heauenly grace, | Left not the world, till [Frederick] assum’d his place’.\textsuperscript{50}

Such tokens of acceptance were particularly important, because not all of James’s subjects – or James’s family – viewed his arrival as a matter for celebration. Frederick was not a

\textsuperscript{46} Catherine MacLeod, ‘Elegies on the Death of Henry, Prince of Wales’, in \textit{The Lost Prince}, ed. by MacLeod, pp.170-2 (p.172).
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\textsuperscript{50} Robert Allyne, \textit{Teares of Ioy shed at the happy departure from Great Britaine, of the two paragons of the Christian world} (London: 1613, STC.385), sig.B’.
monarch, and so for some he appeared a lowly husband for the only daughter of the British King. Ginzel writes that upon Frederick’s arrival in London in October 1612, he was seen by some as ‘an unpopular count, a “Palsgrave” as the critics of the marriage would scornfully call him’.\(^{51}\) Upon his arrival, Frederick faced confusion and disapproval: ‘with the exception of a minority that was familiar with Palatinate and continental affairs, the court and public were severely critical of a peer of whom they knew absolutely nothing’.\(^{52}\) John Chamberlain paid Frederick a rather backhanded compliment in a letter to Alice Carleton in Venice, dated 4 February, writing after a glimpse of the Elector at court that ‘he owes his mistres nothing yf he were a Kings sonne as she is a Kings daughter. The worst is mee thincks he is much too young and small timbred to undertake such a taske’.\(^{53}\)

Such hostility may have been in part a response to tensions between James’s kingdoms as well as to Frederick’s status. Steve Murdoch quotes a letter by Marc’ Antonio Correr, Venetian Ambassador to London, which suggests that, in the matter of Elizabeth’s marriage, ‘the political interests of Scotland challenged those of England’.\(^{54}\) Correr reported in April 1611 that the French ambassador backed the match, in which he was ‘supported by the Scottish Nation’, although ‘the desire of the Queen and of the English Nation [was] against him’.\(^{55}\) ‘The Scottish interest eventually won over English desires’, Murdoch writes, ‘and the Scottish princess married her German prince’.\(^{56}\) Such conflict between English and Scottish interests may have meant that, for some in England, the Elector’s arrival in 1613 signified not just a bad alliance for their monarch’s daughter, but an unwelcome example of that Scottish monarch taking the part of his northern kingdom over his southern one.

However, when Frederick left Britain with his new bride, it was ‘as a messianic “would-be king” on a continental mission’.\(^{57}\) This was, as Ginzel argues, an image that had to be laboriously constructed by British authorities and writers. Ginzel argues that ‘ideological, mythical poetry, or myth-making, proved convincingly effective in giving the prince the
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semblance of a prophetic gentleman-warrior’. Frederick was praised in British texts, and was made a Knight of the Garter in December 1612, soon after Henry’s death. The Garter ceremony, Ginzel argues, linked Frederick both to Henry’s legacy and to an idealised, militarised English past. This specifically English ceremony may have been an attempt to stem the disagreement between James’s kingdoms described by Correr: to persuade English observers that Frederick was a worthy suitor for Elizabeth, rather than a lowly potentate foisted upon them by the combined forces of France and Scotland. Through texts and symbolic, public actions, Frederick was assimilated to a glorious national past and made part of a prophesised Protestant future.

Frederick’s status in the Empire and printed praise

Such rhetorical assimilation was not the only way in which Frederick was praised in British texts, however. His German identity was not elided: on the contrary, writers celebrated both his dominions and his constitutional powers. Frederick was not a king, but he ruled over rich territories with many of the powers of one. Meanwhile, his constitutional responsibilities could be interpreted as power over the Emperor himself.

The titles given to Frederick in printed works give some insight into the means by which his German identity was interpreted in Britain. Ginzel writes that ‘Palsgrave’ was a term used by ‘critics of the marriage’, who belittled an Imperial elector by describing him as merely a count. The term ‘Palsgrave’ is taken from the Dutch, and was used in English to refer to imperial Counts Palatine in general and the Counts Palatine of the Rhine in particular. As Ginzel writes, referring to Frederick as a count or palsgrave could be a means to denigrate him through eliding his imperial responsibilities.

Similarly, criticism of Frederick may have been facilitated by the fact that the term ‘Count Palatine’ meant something rather different in a British context, referring to English magnates who governed areas on the borders with Scotland and Wales. These areas were much smaller than either of the Rhine Palatinates, and the English Counts Palatine had less autonomy from the King than Frederick had from the Emperor. Although they had enjoyed
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reasonably independent rule in their counties during much of the late middle ages, by the
seventeenth century much of their power had been limited by successive monarchs. For the
King’s daughter to marry such a limited potentate would indeed be a rather ignominious
match.

However, Frederick is frequently described as ‘palsgrave’ and ‘Count Palatine’ in printed
texts celebrating the match, indicating that neither of these titles were necessarily used to
slight or denigrate him. In fact, in many texts these terms are used as part of a copious
litany of titles and reminders of Frederick’s royal descent. An anonymous pamphlet
recounting the couple’s journey to Germany describes Frederick as ‘the high and mightie
Prince […] Frederick, Count Palatine, Palsgraue of the Rhyne’: the writer gives Frederick
an impressive number of titles by including both ‘Count Palatine’ and ‘Palsgraue of the
Rhine’, although the latter is just a translation of the former. In his religious treatise The
Practise of Pietie Lewis Bayly included a prayer for the wellbeing of the royal family,
including ‘the Princely Palsgraue of Rhene’. In other words, neither ‘palsgrave’ nor
‘Count Palatine’ were insults in themselves: rather, like the other titles that Frederick
possessed (or that writers claimed he possessed), they could be used as building-blocks by
which a powerful identity was constructed.

This identity was usually, in the words of Bayly, ‘Princely’. The notion that Frederick was
essentially royal, in blood and virtue if not in title, is a key note of many texts praising the
match. Thomas Beard stressed that although James I and VI’s primary objective in
choosing Frederick V for his daughter was the Elector’s Protestant faith, ‘there be neuer the
lesse no disparagement in that happie match […] in honour, he being descended from Kings
and Emperours, and the principall Elector Emperiall.’ James Maxwell produced a striking
broadsheet with a portrait of the newlyweds, the title of which could leave no reader in
doubt as to its import: The Imperiall and Princely Pedegree of the two most noble and
vertuous princes lately married. Maxwell traces Frederick’s descent from Charlemagne,
and lists his titles as ‘Prince Palatine, Duke of Bauiere, Knight of the most noble order of
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the Garter, First Prince of the Imperiall blood’. 64 For Maxwell, then, Frederick was of royal blood, and a member of a chivalric order of British knights; he even assigned him the dukedom held by his cousin Maximillian of Bavaria. Another book celebrating the match, translated from a Latin text attributed to Joannes Maria de Franchis, also assigned Frederick the title to Maximillian’s dukedom, as well as noting his status as elector, terming him ‘the high and mightie Prince, Frederick; Count Palatine of Rheine, chiefe sewer to the sacred Roman Empire, Prince Elector, and Duke of Bauaria’. 65

Figure 2: Image from James Maxwell, The Imperiall and Princely Pedegree of the two most noble and vertuous princes lately married (London: 1613, STC.17700.5). Source: Early English Books Online. Reproduction of original in the British Library.

Some British writers did make use of Frederick’s constitutional responsibilities in the Empire – particularly of the fact that the Palatine Elector had the distinction of being the first to cast his vote in an Imperial election, which led some writers to praise him, as de Francis does above, as ‘chiefe sewer to the sacred Roman Empire’. The Anglo-Dutch poet William Fennor used similar language, describing Frederick as ‘Arch-shewer of the

64 James Maxwell, The Imperiall and Princely Pedegree of the two most noble and vertuous princes lately married (London: 1613, STC.17700.5).
65 Joannes Maria de Francis, Of the Most Auspicatious Marriage (London: 1613, STC.11309), title page.
Empire, chiefe Elector, | whose yea, or nay, sets vp, or puts downe Caesar’. The difference in spelling here may be significant: by ‘shewer’, Fennor may mean ‘one that shows’ – i.e., meaning that Frederick directs the course of the Empire. However, the similarity of ‘Arch-shewer’ to ‘chiefe sewer’ is striking. ‘Sewer’ might mean that Frederick ‘sows’ the power of the empire, as one might sow seeds. However, one of the definitions of ‘sewer’ in the Oxford English Dictionary offers an interesting alternative: ‘An attendant at a meal who superintended the arrangement of the table, the seating of the guests, and the tasting and serving of the dishes’. In this meaning, Frederick becomes effectively a servant to the Emperor, albeit a powerful one.

This meaning appears to be implied in the use of ‘Arch-sewer’ by Robert Allyne. Allyne describes Frederick as ‘Great Caesar-maker, thou whose powerfull vote | Can raise a subiect to the Imperiall hight’, and wonders if, given that his role gives him power over the emperor, he couldn’t raise his family to the imperial dignity:

Thou canst make Emperours, and hast thou not
In creating an Empresse equall might?
Expresse it then vpon thy better halfe,
And in advancung her, raise vp thy selfe.
That both together gracing Caesars chaire,
Thy sonne may bee Arch-sewer to his sire.

In Allyne’s imagined future, Frederick and Elizabeth’s future son is the ‘sewer’, serving at the table of his parents who, together, rule the Empire. Allyne’s image demonstrates how recognition of the importance of Frederick’s role in the Empire could lead some to express hopes that the Elector might someday claim a more prestigious title. Allyne’s hopes expose a contradiction in Frederick’s identity, at least for those more used to Stuart monarchy: if Frederick chose the emperor, was he not more powerful than that emperor? And, in light of that, why should he be subject to a ‘subject’ – a Catholic Habsburg, at that – who he had raised ‘to the Imperiall hight’?

These texts – Maxwell’s in particular – frame their praise as explanation, claiming to educate the ignorant. They stress what Frederick already possessed and embodied, and
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ground his power on his genealogy and German possessions. These texts neutralised opposition to the match through claiming, implicitly, that such opposition was based on ignorance of Frederick’s dominions and of the structures of imperial power, and that proper understanding of these things showed Frederick to be a worthy husband for the British King’s daughter. Description of Frederick’s importance in Europe was thus a key component of the texts that praised the match. The glorious image constructed for Frederick in English texts relied both on the ideological translation that Ginzel describes and on stressing that Frederick’s power and status was foreign, and unfamiliar to British men and women. Frederick was ‘made British’, even specifically ‘English’, through the Garter ceremony and his links to Henry, but at the same time writers explained and celebrated his German identity – at least, a rhetorical, British construction of it.

**Palatine Religion**

This negotiation of similarity and difference also takes place in discourse about Frederick’s religion. The elector’s religious identity was key to the ‘transference of English Protestant hopes’ from Henry to the Palatine couple: praise for Frederick’s steadfast adherence to the ‘true faith’ is a key note of texts celebrating the match. Frederick’s faith legitimised him even if his status was problematic: Allyne describes Frederick and Elizabeth as ‘the two paragons of the Christian world’. 69

This comforting identification did not, however, preclude recognition that theological variation might exist, and that the context in which Frederick and his subjects practised their faith was different to those in England and Scotland. This is demonstrated by two pamphlets translated from Dutch sources by John Rolte, and published the year after the match – *A Faithfull Admonition of the Paltsgraues churches to all other Protestant churches in Dutchland*, and *A Full Declaration of the faith and ceremonies professed in the dominions of the most illustrious and noble Prince Fredericke, 5. Prince, Elector Palatine*. Both texts acknowledge the fraught relationship between Lutheranism and Calvinism in the Empire, but make the case for Protestant unity against Catholicism. The title page of the first to be published, *A Faithful Admonition*, informs the reader that it

69 Allyne, title page.
is aimed at German Protestants; it exhorts them to ‘consider the great danger that hangeth over their heads as well as ours by the Popedome, and therefore Christianly and brotherly cease the private unnecessary and now too much growne strife with vs’. It is prefaced by an address to the reader by Thomas Beard, a clergyman and writer particularly associated with anti-Catholic views and with the explication of Protestant readings of Providence. In his address to the reader in *A Faithful Admonition*, Beard also stresses the idea of Protestant unity in the face of apparent theological differences: Protestantism’s ‘Romish aduersaries [...] would faine proue vs to haue no veritie among vs, because we haue no vnitie’, but on the contrary ‘our differences are here made manifest to be not many in number, nor of anie great moment, that is such as concerne the walls and windowes of our faith, but not the foundation’. Despite the difference between Lutherans, Calvinists, and other Protestant denominations, Beard writes, ‘both ioine together in the service of one Christ, and against his great enemie Antichrist’. He does inveigh strongly against certain sects, including the Anabaptists, claiming them to be ‘none of ours’; but otherwise he stresses the connections between Protestants rather than the divisions.

The second of these treatises, *A Full Declaration*, was, according to the title page, ‘published for the benefit and satisfaction of all Gods people’. Like *A Full Admonition*, *A Full Declaration* contains an explanation and justification of Palatine Calvinism, and is prefaced by an epistle to the reader by Beard. Beard gives an account of the publication of both treatises. *A Full Admonition* was, he writes, written to counter ‘vncharitable dealing as it appeareth in most of the writings of those who call themselues Luthers disciples’, but it received an unfavourable response from ‘diuers of a more turbulent nature’ among said critics, and the Palatine ministers published *A Full Declaration* ‘that they might stop the mouthes of their malicious aduersaries, and shew to the world that they hold no such damnable errours as they impute vnto them’. Like in his preface to *A Full Admonition*, Beard asserts the importance of the connection between various Protestant churches, and the unimportance of the issues that divide them from each other:
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this Treatise may serve to advertise vs that we are not alone in the profession of our faith, nor doe separate our selues from other reformed Churches: but ioyne the hands of fellowship and friendship with the Churches of Germany; yea of France, the Low-Countries, Denmark and all other reformed Churches of the world, which howsoever they differ from vs in some ceremonies; yet in substance of faith, we runne all one way, and mind one thing. And touching Ceremonies, being nothing but externall accidents and ornaments of religion, that they are not so obstinately maintained by any of vs, as if the life of religion should consist therein: or that we are not ready to alter and change the fashion of them if necessitie, either in respect of charitie or scandall should so require.74

This presents the Palatine Church striving for harmony between the Protestant churches, an ecclesiastical counterpart of the political and military concord represented by the Protestant Union. Unlike in his preface to A Full Admonition, in this ‘epistle’ Beard mentions the match between Frederick and Elizabeth. Beard praises ‘the religious care of our dread soueraigne, in matching his only daughter a princesse peerlesse, with a Prince of that soundnesse in religion as the Prince Elector is’, a decision that demonstrated James’s ‘singular loue to the truth, and his vpright heart to God’.75 Not only had James effectively given the Palatinate the seal of approval by marrying his daughter to its ruler; Frederick’s ‘soundnesse in religion’ had cast reflected light on James as a father and a Christian. The link between the father and son-in-law has benefited both men.

Beard’s praise of Frederick’s ‘soundnesse’ elides theological or cultural differences between the faith that the Elector practiced and that practiced in England and Scotland. However, it is also important to note that, throughout the treatise, similarities between the two are not stressed either. This is presumably because they didn’t need to be – the beliefs and practices described are standard Calvinist ones, likely to be familiar to most people who might be likely to read such a pamphlet, and also – again, presumably – comforting to British Protestants who hoped their Princess had married into a faith that was compatible with that of her home country. Beard treats Palatine Calvinism with fellow-feeling, but he does not explicitly state specific similarities, much less make any assertion that this was the same as British forms of worship, just taking place in the Rhineland. To make this identification explicit would prioritise the connection between the Palatinate and Britain at the expense of the key argument of both treatises – that the differences between Palatine

Calvinism and other powerful Protestant denominations don’t really matter. Beard’s preface – and A Full Admonition as a whole – make a virtue of allowing for difference. Rather than claiming that the Palatine Church was better, or worse, or the same as the English or Scottish ones, he simply makes it clear that it was compatible, and that both were compatible with other Protestant churches. Beard expresses what seems to have been the founding principle of the Protestant Union – that the essentials of Protestant worship, and opposition to Catholicism, united Protestants from different confessions far more than their differences pulled them apart.

The marriage of Thames and Rhine

Thomas Beard notes that ‘wealth and power’ also made Frederick a suitable husband for a British princess, and that both were rooted in the lands he ruled over: ‘his dominion being both great and large, able to answere his stoutest enemie in the face, if need should require’. 76 Robert Allyne terms the Palatinate ‘a mighty land, a martiall soile’, and stresses its richness, describing it as ‘a fertile glebe of ground, [...] Where grasse, and graine, and Bacchus gifts abound’. The Palatinate, he writes, provides ‘all that nature needs, or use requires’. 77

The area was particularly associated, for foreigners, with the export of wine. William Fennor made this commodity a keynote of his poem praising the ‘Palsgraues Countrey’, which he claims to have performed before the Royal Family at Whitehall as part of the wedding celebrations:

On the right side of Pals the riuere Rhyne,
runnes swimming by the bankes of pleasant vines,
Vpon whose tops bright Sol so warme doth shine,
that from the flintie rockes flow Rennish wines78

For Fennor the Rhine, and ‘the gentle maine’, provide an unrivalled network for both the import and export of goods; ‘there are few Lands haue two such flouds againe’:

These riuers meet at Mence and are vnited,
like Gemeni to swim towards Belgicke Seas,

76 Beard, ‘The Epistle to the Reader’, A Full Declaration, sig.B'.
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78 Fennor, sig.B3’.
But upward these sweet waters are divided
for *Pals-Lands* comfort and the people ease:
The *Rhine* brings boats vnto each South-ward Towne,
but in the North the maine brings treasure downe

Fennor eulogises Frederick’s lands by stressing the links these rivers provide to other parts of Germany; they both uniquely elevate the Palatinate above neighbouring states and place it in a beneficial economic and geographic relationship with them.

Rivers were also a significant feature of the wedding celebrations. Francis Beaumont penned a masque showing Roman gods and assorted mythical figures celebrating the marriage of the Thames and the Rhine, which was performed by the men of the Inner Temple and Gray’s Inn. The image of the two rivers combining recurred in a large number of texts celebrating the match; it was a key metaphor by which the dynastic and geographical link between the countries was conceptualised. It is explored extensively in Robert Allyne’s *Teares of Ioy*. Allyne describes the Rhine as ‘*another Thames,* | *A riuer, no lesse delicate, and cleere*’ with ‘many *Londons* built vpon his bankes’. This river, ‘growne monstrous huge’ by the water from ‘*[a] thousand tributary torrents*’, flows into the sea, and there meets water from the Thames:

> He braues the Ocean, with a fresh deluge.
> Right ouer, and against, where stately Thames,
> Disburdens in the maine, his borrowed growth,
> There changing both their natures, and their names,
> Each hath a prospect, to the others mouth.
> That, if a way lay through the boundlesse brine,
> The English Thames shold touch the Germain Rhine.

This meeting is facilitated by the sea itself: ‘*sure it seemes, the gentle, fauouring waues,* | *Haue yeelded passage, to these friendly floods*’. Allyne personifies the two rivers not as a couple getting married, but as two princes making league:

> And father Ocean himselfe consented
> To haue his mighty sonnes made more acquainted.
> Where, after some short parly past betweene,
> They both did sweare a solemn league of loue
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This league ‘shall not end, till Thames and Rhine | Leaue off to run, or heauenly orbes to moue’. In this imagining, Frederick and Elizabeth become ‘jewels’ pledged as tokens of the rivers’ faith:

But least succeeding ages might aledge
Some friuole reasons, to infringe their oath,
Each did confirme the friendship with a pledge,
Two rarest Iewels, that adorn’d them both.
And for more surety, ‘twas agreed vpon,
That both the Jewels were conioin’d in one.
In whom, and in their sacred seed, for euer,
That louing league shall vnndissolued stand,
Which times, nor fates, nor death, cannot disseuer,
Nor all the force of hels confederate band.

Ginzel writes that in poems celebrating the match, the Palatinate was essentially co-opted as a space adjacent to Britain: ‘Even though the Palatinate was a foreign and partly alien territory, it was described and fashioned topographically and ethically as if it bordered the island empire. This helped to turn the unknown into the well-known’. This argument is persuasive: these texts do not, by and large, deal with specifics, and do highlight aspects that their British readers may have been familiar with (such as the production of Rhenish wine).

However, there is also a persistent note of exoticism in these descriptions: the Palatinate is depicted as preternaturally fertile, and although British men and women may have consumed Rhenish, they were also well aware that such a commodity was not produced in Britain. Moreover, the distance between the Thames and the Rhine does remain important. Allyne builds it into his image – the waters mingle in the ocean, apparently helped along by wind and waves but essentially ‘parlaying’ in neutral space between the countries. Meanwhile, although Beaumont’s masque celebrates the two rivers actually being brought together, this does not necessarily mean that the distance between Britain and the Palatinate was elided. Rather, the symbolic effect relies on the knowledge that the two countries are far distant from one another: the bringing together of the two rivers is a conscious act of geographical dissolution, illustrating the power of the new dynastic alliance. The power of this dissolution comes from the knowledge that such a thing can be done symbolically, but not in reality.
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Heidelberg, 1613-19

Frederick and Elizabeth left England on 26 April/6 May 1613 and journeyed to Heidelberg, the capital of the Lower Palatinate, where they arrived with much fanfare on 7/17 June. The couple’s first child, Frederick Henry – named in part for his late uncle – was born in January 1614.

While in Heidelberg, Frederick and Elizabeth continued to stress the links between the Palatinate and Britain, both at their court and in printed publications. This is perhaps most clearly expressed in the changes made to the Heidelberg castle complex in 1613-19. In this period, the castle and the land surrounding it were expensively remodelled: a large new building was constructed, as well as an extensive, grand terraced garden. These alterations stressed the Palatinate’s cultural links to Britain. The new building was constructed in an ‘English’ style (it is still known as the ‘Englischer Bau’). The garden was designed by the engineer Salomon de Caus, who himself represented the Palatinate’s international links. De Caus was a French Calvinist, who had worked extensively for Elizabeth’s brother Henry at his court at Richmond Palace, and her mother Anne at Greenwich Palace and Somerset House. The spaces in which the couple resided and entertained guests expressed both Palatine power and magnificence, and the central role of Heidelberg in international Protestant culture. Britain was made part of the Palatinate, with similar symbolic deftness to the way in which the Palatine Elector had, through the Garter ceremony in 1612, been co-opted into English ideology. The garden did, however, retain a distinctly Palatine identity – it featured several representations of Frederick, as well as a ‘Rhine fountain’ and statues of gods representing the Neckar and Main.

Grand as these spaces were, they were bounded: a good way to impress visiting grandees and diplomats, but inaccessible to those who could not visit Heidelberg. However, the garden appears to have been conceived of as a publishing project as well as a landscaping one. In 1620 a large folio book entitled *Hortus Palatinus a Friderico Rege Boemiae Electore Palatino Heidelbergae extructus, Salamone de Caus Architecto*, was produced in Frankfurt. It contains thirty engraved images of the garden, as well as a dedication to Frederick and a prose ‘Address to the Reader’ by de Caus. The engravings are based on de
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Caus’s plans for the garden features – some of which had not been constructed by the time of the book’s publication – and a painting of the castle and garden by Jacques Fouquier produced between 1614 and 1616. It seems likely that the engravings were being prepared while work on the garden was ongoing.

Figure 3: Scenographia hortvs palatinvs a Frederico V, electore palatino Heidelbergae exstrvctvs. A 1630s copy, by Wenceslaus Hollar, of Matthäus Merian’s 1620 engraving of the ‘Hortus Palatinus’ at Heidelberg. © Trustees of the British Museum.

However, de Caus’s designs were not to be completed. Work on the garden was terminated after, as de Caus describes it in his dedication, it pleased God to call Frederick to ‘ve demeure Royalle’. He explains the situation more fully in the ‘Address to the Reader’ that follows. The crown Frederick had been elevated to was that of Bohemia, and this honour had come at an inconvenient time for the garden. Writing in November 1619, de Caus informs the reader that the work is nearly complete, ‘and had it not been for the war at

88 Salomon de Caus, Hortus Palatinus a Friderico Rege Boemiae Electore Palatino Heidelbergae extrctus, Salamone de Caus Architecto, French edn. (Frankfurt: 1619), dedication to Frederick, unpaginated.
present, it would have been finished in six months or thereabouts’ (‘Et n’eust esté les guerres d’a present, l’on eut achevé le tout dans six mois ou environ’).  

The *Hortus Palatinus* thus marks a moment of transition for the Palatine regime, the spaces it ruled over, and its public image. The book records designs and plans that were not fully realised by the time of the book’s publication, and which never were to be: in fact, what had been constructed was later damaged or even destroyed during the 1622 siege of the city. This is a hoped-for landscape rather than one that ever truly existed. Frederick and his family were about to be uprooted from the Rhineland. Moreover, the connection between Heidelberg and London was to be dramatically tested – and, for Frederick at least, be found wanting.

Both in the wedding in London and in the redevelopment of the castle complex in Heidelberg, the link between Britain and the Palatinate was celebrated and defined – as a meeting of two distinct powers, each of which brought benefit to the other. This notion of connection was not based on the elision of difference and distance, but instead the fact that, although both difference and distance existed, the link was forged anyway. London and Heidelberg were brought together, despite the distance between them, while British and Palatine Protestants – and other European Protestants, including the empire’s Lutherans – found common ground in the essentials of their faith and their opposition to Habsburg Catholicism. This was a link which allowed for differences of practice, culture, and even belief, and trusted to an essential commonality of purpose to overcome differences and conflicts. Events following Frederick’s acceptance of the Bohemian crown were, however, to prove this notion of common purpose misguided.
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Part 2: Conflict in the Empire

Bohemia (1618-20)

The debate over elective and hereditary monarchy in Cambridge in 1613 – and James’s disapproval – looks, given hindsight, horribly prescient. In the autumn of 1618 Frederick became embroiled in the dispute between the Estates of Bohemia and their King, the Habsburg Ferdinand of Styria. These discontents had come to a head in the spring of 1618, although their roots were deep. Historically, Bohemia was an elective monarchy. However, in practice it had been held to be part of the hereditary lands of the Habsburg monarchy since the accession of Archduke Ferdinand I of Austria to the Bohemian crown in 1526, the transfer of power from one king to another marked by a largely symbolic ‘election’. This constitutional uncertainty was to become a major factor in the conflict. Defining the basis for rule differently, the various factions were able to make and maintain claims on the crown that they fervently claimed were legitimate.

Confessional difference was key to this conflict. While the Habsburg monarchs were Catholic, the noble Bohemian Estates were dominated by Protestants. The population was mixed, comprising both Catholics and significant Protestant minorities (primarily Lutheran and Hussite, with a growing number of Calvinists). A degree of official toleration for the Protestant sects had been secured in 1609, when the embattled King (and Holy Roman Emperor) Rudolf II issued them with a protective ‘Letter of Majesty’. However, having continued to use his army to repress Protestant freedoms, Rudolf was imprisoned by Protestant rebels and forced to cede the crown to his brother Matthias in 1611. Matthias had fostered close links with the Bohemian Protestants when manoeuvring against Rudolf, and relations between the King and the Estates therefore remained fairly stable and tolerant until 1617, when the ailing Matthias was succeeded by Archduke Ferdinand of Styria. Ferdinand was, in the words of Frances Yates, ‘a pupil of the Jesuits, determined to stamp out heresy’, who revoked the Letter of Majesty and set out to suppress Protestantism in his new dominions, as he had in his lands in Austria. In response, in May 1618 a group of
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Protestant nobles stormed the castle in Prague and threw two Imperial governors out of the window.\(^{95}\)

Although Frederick was not publicly involved in the conflict until late August, his advisors helped to escalate events before then. Frederick’s advisor, Christian of Anhalt, had sent Christoph von Dohna to Prague in 1616 to negotiate with Bohemian Protestants.\(^ {96}\) Encouraged by such marks of favour, the Bohemian Estates opted to elect a king themselves. Frederick V was the obvious candidate. His lands in the Upper Palatinate bordered Bohemia, giving him a direct interest in the country’s stability. The head of the Protestant Union and an Imperial Elector, he was the most powerful Protestant prince in Germany. As well as his dynastic link to James I and VI, his mother’s brother was Maurice of Nassau, Prince of Orange. The Bohemians appear to have relied on the readiness of both of these Protestant leaders to support Frederick by force if necessary, an assumption which Frederick was later to repeat to his cost.\(^ {97}\) On 22 August 1619 the Bohemian Estates formally deposed Ferdinand. They elected Frederick to the crown on 26 August, two days before Ferdinand’s election as Holy Roman Emperor.\(^ {98}\) After unsuccessful attempts to secure definite support for his acceptance from the other members of the Protestant Union and James I and VI, and against the advice of many of his counsellors, Frederick wrote to the Bohemian Estates in late September accepting the crown.\(^ {99}\) Frederick, Elizabeth, and their eldest son Frederick Henry departed Heidelberg for Prague in early October.\(^ {100}\) Frederick entered Prague on 31 October and was crowned on 4 November. The problem of his status relative to his wife appeared to have been resolved – at least, if one did not consider the ‘king-making’ role of the Estates too closely. As well as this, Frederick appeared to have achieved a major victory over the Habsburgs.

Frederick himself appears to have seen his election as a divine calling. He wrote to the Estates on 14/24 September, in advance of accepting the crown, ‘[s]o from this we must notice along with you the special providence and predestination of God, who gives and

\(^{95}\) ET, pp.271-73; TYW, pp.48-9.

\(^{96}\) ET, p.261.

\(^{97}\) The Estates wrote to Elizabeth on the 7th of September, requesting that she persuade her husband to accept the crown, and obtain her father’s ‘intercession’ on the Bohemians’ behalf – specifically, in the form ‘eithe of money or m[en]’. Bohemian Estates to Elizabeth, 7 September 1619. BL, Egerton 2651, f.25 (f.25').

\(^{98}\) WK, p.74. ET, pp.284-85.

\(^{99}\) See WK, pp.79-80, for a description of Frederick’s deliberations in September 1619.

\(^{100}\) John Harrison, A Short Relation of the departure of the high and mightie Prince Frederick King Elect of Bohemia (Dort [Dordrecht]: 1619).
confers down from above the kings, princes, and lords, into the hearts of those, who have to elect them’. Brennan C. Pursell notes that ‘[i]t seems that private prayer might have taken precedence over reasoned argument in the course of [Frederick’s] decision-making process’, but within the logic of Frederick’s political-minded Calvinism a sense of divine will was reasoned argument: it was, for the believer, the strongest argument one could put forth. Such a narrative is echoed in the words of Salomon de Caus: Frederick was called to ‘vne demeure Royalle’. This version of events allowed Frederick to bypass considerations of personal danger, the peace of the Empire, and fealty to his Imperial lord. It also avoided the earthly personal considerations – profit, ambition for himself and his line – for which his enemies were to upbraid him. Depicting himself as an instrument of God’s providence also implicitly cast those who opposed him as both morally wrong, in that they opposed the will of God, and doomed to failure.

The invasion of the Palatinate

However, the newly-installed Holy Roman Emperor was not prepared to give up such extensive and profitable dominions without a fight. The localised rebellion in Bohemia was to develop through Frederick’s intercession into a conflict that devastated much of Europe, and the Palatinate in particular. Frederick reigned in Bohemia for only a year. Imperial forces invaded Bohemia in the summer of 1619, before the new King had even arrived. Frederick and the rebel nobles resisted, but their forces were comprehensively defeated on 29 October/8 November 1620 at the Battle of White Mountain at Bílá Hora, near Prague. Frederick lost the Bohemian crown and was forced into exile in the Low Countries.

Meanwhile, in early September 1620 25,000 soldiers under the command of Ambrosio Spinola invaded the almost undefended Lower Palatinate. Spinola’s campaign was devastatingly effective: in September alone his forces took Kreuznach and Oppenheim, both strategically important towns in the north of the country, on the west side of the Rhine.
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Spinola held a commission from the Emperor and his forces were from the Habsburg Army of the Netherlands: this was clearly an officially-sanctioned and integrated campaign against Frederick by the Habsburg powers. In fact, the invasion of the Palatinate was part of a Habsburg offensive ‘involv[ing] six separate armies’ fighting against the Palatines and their allies in Bohemia and Austria.\(^{106}\) Spinola’s campaign was, according to the Spanish Council of State at any rate, intended to divert Frederick from the defence of Bohemia and to punish him for accepting its crown.\(^{107}\) The Emperor let it be known that he would negotiate with the Elector for the return of the areas Spinola had won, but only if Frederick renounced his claim to Bohemia.

However, Frederick refused to do so. He was unwilling to abandon his Bohemian allies and thus damage his personal honour as well as the cause of Protestantism in Europe. The Palatine party line did not waver from the one they had held at his election, or from the Protestant militarism that the regime had cultivated for decades. Frederick, Elizabeth, and those who spoke or wrote on behalf of them continued to claim that the Bohemians had been free under law to choose Frederick as their king, and thus that Frederick’s actions had been both legitimate and a blow against the Bohemians’ Catholic oppressors. Furthermore, this was a providential narrative: Frederick had been called to the Bohemian throne by God, a clear indication of divine favour towards the reformed churches. If Frederick abandoned his claim to Bohemia he would disobey the will of God, dishonour both himself and the cause of Protestantism, and betray his Protestant allies into the hands of their vengeful former oppressors. In Palatine logic, the Habsburgs aimed to destroy the reformed churches, and therefore any bargains they made could not be trusted, and their ‘aggression’ could only be effectively countered with force.

The continuity of Palatine rhetoric is not simply a sign of stubbornness or wounded pride; rather, it provided an internally consistent framework for understanding what had happened. Military action by Habsburg forces was, unsurprisingly, rather easy to assimilate to a narrative of Habsburg aggression. The attack on the Palatinate had particularly strong rhetorical force: for the Palatines and their supporters, this was an illegal and immoral escalation of the Bohemian conflict. Frederick’s supporters separated Frederick’s role as King of Bohemia from his role as Elector Palatine, and argued that, even if one believed he

\(^{106}\) See \textit{ET}, p. 299, for discussion of the various operations undertaken as part of this offensive.

\(^{107}\) \textit{WK}, p.106 and footnote 69, p.119.
had offended as the former, he had not done so as the latter: his actions in Bohemia did not affect his hereditary rights in the Palatinate. They also stressed that the Palatinate was the patrimony of Frederick and Elizabeth’s children, who themselves had done nothing to offend the Emperor.

In contrast, no such hairs were split when it came to the Habsburgs. The fact that Spinola’s campaign in the Palatinate was part of a larger, multi-stranded offensive against Frederick and his allies gave ammunition to those who believed that the various parts of the Habsburg dynasty and their allies were working together to exterminate Protestantism in Europe. In this view, the most powerful dynasty in Europe was an unavoidable threat to the stability of the Empire and beyond: the Habsburgs were demonstrably impervious to legal or moral arguments against their actions, and they clearly had the military power to overrun Protestant countries if left unchecked. The Palatines promoted their cause as a ‘common’ one for all Protestants: ‘a war to protect the supposedly endangered existence of Protestantism in the Empire’.108

**The defence of the Palatinate (1620-23)**

Frederick’s supporters – in the form of local militia, troops from the Protestant Union, Dutch cavalry, and British volunteers – gathered in the west of the Lower Palatinate through the autumn of 1620.109 However, the multinational force mustered in defence of the Palatinate did not indicate wholesale support for Frederick’s cause from the Union, the Dutch, or the British. Joachim Ernst, Margrave of Ansbach, who commanded the Union troops, was unwilling to commit them to action against Spinola. The European links forged by the Palatine regime in the wake of Donauwörth and Cleves-Jülich were proving to be weaker than the Elector had anticipated. Furthermore, although his Dutch relatives did provide a court in The Hague for Frederick and his family – at considerable expense – their involvement in the defence of the Palatinate was piecemeal and indirect: the two ‘Dutch’ regiments that marched to the Palatinate were made up of British and German volunteers serving in the Dutch army, recruited by the Palatines.110
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Similarly – and even more gallingly – Frederick’s father-in-law avoided direct military involvement with his cause, although he did allow volunteers to be recruited and money to be raised from his subjects. James had never indicated approval of Frederick’s acceptance of the Bohemian crown. He had delayed replying to his son-in-law’s request for advice on whether to accept the crown or not; in the interim George Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury, had advised Frederick to do so. The Palatines were to learn to their cost that the British monarch didn’t share his archbishop’s opinion. Following Frederick’s acceptance of the crown, James publicly expressed his anger and disapproval, and his fear that Frederick’s involvement would escalate the Bohemian rebellion into a European religious war. The legality of Frederick’s election was also far from clear to the man so offended by discussion of elective monarchy in Cambridge in 1613: James was not convinced of the Bohemian rebels’ right to depose their anointed monarch.

Moreover, James had friendly diplomatic relations with Spain, and he wanted to avoid damaging them, both for the peace of Europe and because Spain was crucial to his ambitions for his family. James had continued to pursue his plan to balance his daughter’s marriage to a Protestant with the marriage of his son to a Catholic princess. Negotiations with both the Habsburgs and the Bourbons had been undertaken rather slowly through the 1610s, and by the end of the decade the leading candidate for Charles’s hand was the Spanish Infanta Maria. Entering into open war with Spanish forces could fatally damage this long-held ambition.

James therefore attempted to deal with the Palatine problem primarily through diplomacy, to the dissatisfaction of his daughter and son-in-law. However, the Palatines did receive some assistance from Britain, following the Habsburg invasion of Bohemia. James agreed to a public collection by the Palatine envoy, which may have reached the region of £80-90,000. In the spring of 1620, as it became clear that Habsburg forces were preparing for an invasion of the Palatinate, James’s peaceful approach came under increasing pressure from his subjects, and he allowed volunteers to be recruited in Britain. Two forces were raised for Frederick – one of 2,500 men to serve in Bohemia under the command of Colonel Andrew Gray, and one for the Palatinate, financed by James. The force for the Palatinate arrived there in the early autumn of 1620. Although it had been intended to comprise 4,000
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men, in the event only 2,250-2,500 men were mustered, although a number of prominent
noblemen were among them. Von Dohna had caused controversy by selecting Sir Horace
Vere to command the force: James’s favourite, the Marquess of Buckingham, wanted the
role to go to Sir Edward Cecil, and redrew his support for the campaign after Vere’s
appointment. Vere was a veteran of Elizabethan campaigns in the Netherlands, and close
to Maurice of Nassau. His involvement may have been intended to appeal to the Palatines’
Dutch allies; also, whether this was intentional or not, it linked the war in the Palatinate to
earlier conflict against Spain.

However, it was clear that this assistance did not represent wholesale support from James.
He refused to loan funds to Frederick himself. Meanwhile, he also allowed public
collections for Spanish forces, and Habsburg agents were permitted to recruit British and
Irish volunteers. In March 1621 5,000 men were recruited to serve Jerzy Ossolinski in
Poland, and in the period 1621-23 2,300 Irishmen were recruited for the Spanish Army of
Flanders. James’s actions, unlike Frederick’s, were governed by the need to keep cordial
relationships with Catholic powers as well as Protestant ones. Such balance did not go
down well with all of his subjects – including members of Parliament. The Parliament that
convened in January 1621 quickly demonstrated support for the war effort by voting two
subsidies, but MPs’ views on James’s plans to marry Charles to the Spanish Infanta Maria
were to dramatically disrupt this apparent consensus. Conrad Russell argues that the
Commons misinterpreted James’s willingness for debate on the Palatine question, believing
that he had invited them to criticise the match. The Commons produced ‘a forthright
petition begging James to make war on the king of Spain, not marry into his family’, and
James angrily dissolved Parliament. This left him without the two subsidies, with the
promise of a Spanish dowry looking ever more appealing.

Throughout this period, the Elector and his father-in-law communicated at cross-purposes.
James made repeated attempts to persuade his son-in-law to renounce the crown of
Bohemia, but Frederick continually rebuffed him. As Pursell notes, Frederick preferred to
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dodge James’s questions: promising to obey the British King’s requests, but at the same time expressing hope of regaining both Bohemia and the Palatinate. James’s inability to rein in his son-in-law would prove the main stumbling block in his negotiations with Spain and the Emperor.\(^{119}\)

Both the Dutch and the Union preferred to trust to British negotiation than to arms, and both were soon unwilling to continue military operations in the Palatinate. Dutch forces left the Palatinate in December 1620, ‘disgusted with the lackluster Union leadership’\(^{120}\). On 11/21 January 1621 Frederick was placed under the Imperial Ban. His territories were officially confiscated, and Imperial subjects forbidden to aid him. For Frederick and those who supported his ‘common cause’, this was another instance of Habsburg perfidy. For his beleaguered, lukewarm allies in the Protestant Union, it was the final straw. The commander of the Union forces in the Palatinate, Joachim Ernst, Margrave of Ansbach, was also placed under the Imperial ban, as was Frederick’s advisor Christian of Anhalt. Both men abandoned Frederick’s cause and sued for pardon from the Emperor. The consequences of aiding Frederick had been made clear, and the Union princes were unwilling to risk incurring such punishment themselves. The Union dissolved in May: one of its last actions was to agree a ceasefire in the Palatinate, to last until July.\(^{121}\) Frederick and Elizabeth blamed their abandonment by the Union on James’s approach to the conflict: Elizabeth had requested Charles, in a letter dated September 25/15 1620, to ‘be most erenest’ with his father, ‘for to speak freelic to you his slakness to assist us doth make the Princes of the union slack too, who do nothing with theire armie’.\(^{122}\)

Following the expiration of the truce in July, the forces of Frederick’s Wittelbach relative Maximilian of Bavaria invaded the Upper Palatinate, under the command of Johann Tserclaes, Count of Tilly. Tilly’s army then marched towards the Lower Palatinate in November. These troops had played a crucial role in the Imperial reconquest of Bohemia, and Maximilian hoped that the Emperor would grant him Frederick’s lands and electoral title. Spinola split his forces and departed for the Low Countries, although some Spanish troops did remain in the Lower Palatinate.\(^{123}\)

\(^{119}\) See WK, pp.132-211, for a detailed account of the relationship between James and Frederick in 1619-23.
\(^{120}\) ET, pp.300-1.
\(^{121}\) TYW, p.xxiv.
\(^{122}\) Elizabeth Stuart to Prince Charles, September 25/15 [1620?], BL Additional MS 5015*, f.1 (f.1’).
\(^{123}\) ET, p.331.
The defence of the Palatinate was left largely in the hands of Vere’s volunteers, who held the three main cities of the Lower Palatinate – Frankenthal, the fortified city of Mannheim, and the capital at Heidelberg – while mobile armies under the command of the mercenary leader Ernst von Mansfeld and a number of Protestant princes engaged Tilly’s forces in the field. In the spring of 1622 Frederick journeyed to the Palatinate in disguise to lead the campaign. James had wanted Frederick to return to the Palatinate, but he became increasingly angry with Frederick’s conduct once there, and eventually persuaded him to a cease-fire. 124

‘Consenting to James’ cease-fire’, Pursell writes, ‘appears to have been fatal to Frederick’s military campaign’. 125 Frederick was abandoned by several of his allies, while another, Duke Christian of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, lost a third of his troops in a battle following the collapse of a bridge over the Main at Höchst. 126 Frederick left the Palatinate, along with Mansfeld and Christian; disgusted by the army’s behaviour on the march, he abandoned them and discharged the two generals. 127

Heidelberg was taken by Tilly’s troops on September 9/19 1622 after an eleven week siege. Frankenthal and Mannheim did not hold out much longer: Mannheim fell to Tilly on 23 October/2 November, while Frankenthal was surrendered to Archduchess Isabella on 10/20 March 1623, on James’s orders. 128 Frederick suffered another indignity when his electoral title was transferred to Maximilian of Bavaria in February 1623.

The British volunteers had failed to preserve the Palatinate for Frederick and Elizabeth: if James wanted his daughter and son-in-law to return to Frederick’s ancestral territories, other means would need to be found.

124 WK, pp.175-9.
125 WK, p.179.
126 WK, p.179; ET, p.337.
The Palatine propaganda effort in Britain, 1620-23

Throughout this period, Frederick, Elizabeth and their counsellors sought to undermine James’s approach, both with the international community and with James’s subjects. The exiled Palatine couple maintained an envoy in London in order to further their cause with the Stuart court. Meanwhile, they attempted to persuade James’s heir, and his subjects, of their point of view. The determination of Elizabeth and Frederick to use any diplomatic means at their disposal to push for war could be uncomfortable for those caught in the middle – for example, the English diplomat Sir Francis Nethersole. In 1619 James had appointed Nethersole as secretary to his daughter in Prague; after White Mountain, Nethersole accompanied Elizabeth from Prague to The Hague, from where she despatched him to England to persuade her father to military action. James promptly sent Nethersole back to The Hague, as British envoy to the court in exile, with instructions to persuade Frederick to renounce the Bohemian crown. Nethersole accompanied Frederick to the Palatinate in 1622, but once there was ordered by James to persuade Frederick to a truce, against his own misgivings. Nethersole was, in other words, required to serve two parties with radically differing opinions as to how the international situation should be dealt with.

The work of Nadine Akkerman on the letters of Elizabeth Stuart has recently shown that Frederick’s wife took a key role in this desperate propaganda exercise.\(^{129}\) From 13/20 November 1620, when Elizabeth wrote to James from Breslaw ‘to be solicitous of the King and myself in sending us help, for otherwise we will ruin the whole’, the deposed Queen of Bohemia mounted a sustained letter-writing campaign to her father, her brother, and to other influential figures in, or connected to, the British establishment.\(^{130}\) Like her husband, she consistently opposed negotiation and favoured military action. She followed developments in Britain with interest and increasing frustration, repeatedly stressing her disapproval of James’s negotiations. The ways in which she expressed this disapproval varied: communications to her father and brother, and to their chief advisors, were usually tempered with expressions of obedience, while to those with whom she had a close epistolary relationship, she would sometimes be far more scathing.

\(^{129}\) See the Introduction to *The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, Volume 1: 1603-1631*, ed. by Nadine Akkerman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

\(^{130}\) ‘je supplie donc treshumblement V.M. d’auoir soing du Roy et de moy en nous envoyant du secours, autrement nous serons du tout ruinez’. Elizabeth Stuart to King James I and VI, 13/23 November 1620, BL Lansdowne MS 1237, ff.50-51 (f.50r).
One of these men was the courtier and diplomat Sir Thomas Roe. Elizabeth’s correspondence with Roe is a particularly notable example of the kind of relationship that she cultivated through the 1620s, and beyond. Roe was never employed in service of the Palatines, but he maintained close epistolary contact with Elizabeth for many years, visited the Palatine court in The Hague in 1629, and even adopted the orphaned daughter of one of Frederick’s Bohemian allies. Having returned from his embassy to India, Roe was in England from the autumn of 1619 until July 1621, and during this period he exchanged frequent letters with Elizabeth regarding events in Britain. His letters during this period give an insight into how one prominent British subject reacted to events on the continent. Roe’s loyalties were, in effect, divided, although perhaps not as sharply as Nethersole’s. He was dependent on James for employment, and may have worked against Palatine interests in 1622 while British ambassador in Constantinople, by frustrating efforts to obtain aid from the Turkish Sultan. However, he seems to have sympathised with the Palatine couple’s cause, as indicated by the fact he took an active role in raising funds and volunteers for the Palatinate while in England in 1620-21, and the supportive letters he wrote to Elizabeth throughout her exile.

Both Roe and Nethersole also engaged with the Palatine Cause in print media. Sir Thomas Roe wrote a pamphlet supporting the Bohemian rebels in 1620. Sir Francis Nethersole provided accounts of events in the Palatinate during Frederick’s time there in 1622, including Christian of Brunswick’s disaster at Höchst, to the pamphlet publishers Thomas Archer and Nicholas Bourne. These men show a clear connection between the Palatine propaganda effort, sympathetic British politicians, and print.

Roe wrote from London on 7/17 June 1620 to inform her of James’s resolution to raise a force of volunteers, and described the eagerness of British nobles to be involved in the cause: ‘though our desires are in this election [the election of Frederick to the Bohemian crown] in part fullfilled, yet I desire your Ma[de] should know the generall affection to your seruice, hath euen in this begotten great emulation’. This emulation had, according to Roe,

131 WK, p.169.
133 This pamphlet does not appear to be extant, but Elizabeth thanked Roe for it in a letter from Prague dated 9/19 June 1620: ‘I thank you for the book you haue written concerning the Bohemians it is exceeding well done I shewed it the King he likes it verie well’. Elizabeth to Roe, TNA SP 81 17, ff.62-63 (f.62r).
taken a militaristic form. A number of British lords had ‘taken priuat companies’. Roe dropped a number of famous names, assuring Elizabeth that ‘ther was almost none woorthy of any hope, but hath declared & stood vp for him selfe: The Earle of Southampton first: S’ Ed: Cicile, & some others [...] the Earles of Oxford & Essex: the Lord Lisle, S’ Ed: Sackuile’. ‘In Generall’, Roe concluded, ‘I am assured never brauer troopes were raysed in England, neuer more alacritye to see that, neuer more sad harts, that they also are not in this employment’.

Despite this cheery assessment, however, Roe’s language is revealing. The King had ‘consented’ to this conscription, rather than taking the lead in it, after ‘many interruptions’ – suggesting that military action for the defence of the Palatinate was hardly being approached with alacrity by James and his court. The attempt to raise monetary contributions was, in Roe’s account, even less successful: ‘[f]or the Contributions they haue yet appeared small & vnworthy of your Ma:tie nor no way proportionall to the affections of the best subiects’, but adding that ‘they haue receiued two impediments, the wary declaration of his Ma:tie & that none of our owne Nation were called to this servise’.

Here Roe skates rather close to open criticism of James’s aversion to direct support. This undercuts his praise of his king – ‘I dare presume to say, for the first his Ma:tie hath showed him selfe a wise and wary Prince & yet at last, an affectionat & good father’. 135

In her letters to Roe, Elizabeth complained about her father’s choice of action in strong terms. She wrote to him in late May 1621 expressing weariness with James’s persistence in seeking a solution to the crisis by negotiation: ‘I confess to you that I doe not look for anie good change of fortune for vs, if my father doe no otherwise then he hath done’. 136 As the situation in the Palatinate worsened, her criticisms became more strongly phrased. On 25 November/5 December 1622 she wrote ‘our affaires […] were neuer worse all is gone saue Frankendale, which is the fruictes of the treatie, the King my father is couesened and abused but will not see it till it be too late’. ‘My father hitherto hath done vs more hurt then good,’ she opined, adding ‘I hope one day our fortune will change, in the meane time I would all the king my fathers counsellers were like honest Thom Roe’. 137

135 Sir Thomas Roe to Elizabeth Stuart, 7/17 June 1620, TNA SP 81 17, ff.59-60 (f.59v).
136 Elizabeth Stuart to Sir Thomas Roe, 21/31 May 1621, TNA SP 81 21, ff.30-31 (f.30r).
137 Elizabeth Stuart to Sir Thomas Roe, 25 November/5 December 1622, TNA SP 81 27, ff.192-93 (f.192v).
Elizabeth would continue to advocate for war to recover the Palatinate, and to foster close epistolary relationships with her supporters, throughout her exile. Her pleas in the early 1620s did not, however, bear the desired fruit. James continued to push for a negotiated settlement. Instead, the travellers and letters that passed between Britain and The Hague helped to preserve a close link between British subjects and the Palatine couple. Elizabeth would not let herself and her husband, or the hopes they had inspired in the past, or the indignities they had suffered following White Mountain, be forgotten.
Part 3: The Palatinate and British politics, 1623-27

The Palatinate and the ‘Spanish Match’ (1623)

The war over the Palatinate gave plans for a Spanish marriage alliance a more urgent charge. James and many of his counsellors believed that the most effective way to solve the Palatine crisis was to make the restoration of the Palatinate to Frederick and Elizabeth a prerequisite of such a match. The two issues thus became deeply entangled, both on the international stage and in domestic politics.

Fixing the Palatine situation through a match with Spain was not a simple proposition, and negotiations proceeded slowly. Most of the troops in the Palatinate were acting under Imperial orders, not Spanish ones, so British plans rested on the notion that the Spanish could either order their Austrian cousins to return the Electorate, or would be prepared to launch a joint military operation with British forces to recover it. This was a serious misapprehension of both Spanish influence in the Empire and Spanish will to conciliate London at the expense of Vienna. On the other hand, James’s ability to control the actions of his son-in-law still remained very much in doubt.138

Meanwhile, James’s plans faced strong opposition at home, as the bitter disagreement between the King and the Parliament of 1621 shows. Negotiating a dynastic alliance with Spain for his son while Spain’s troops were engaged in helping Maximilian of Bavaria to conquer lands belonging to his son-in-law seemed, to many, bewilderingly inconsistent.

Opposition to the match was also rooted in entrenched British anti-Catholicism. The prospect of the heir to the throne marrying a Catholic – and thus the possibility that Charles’s heirs might be raised in the Catholic faith – was strongly opposed by many of James’s subjects. The negotiations were accompanied by a number of real or perceived concessions towards British recusants, much to the disquiet of many British Protestants. Toleration of Catholic worship in James’s dominions was a major aim of the Spanish negotiations, and indeed was at least as much of a stumbling-block to them as the issue of the Palatinate. The Palatine crisis and the Spanish Match were therefore not only bound up with each other, but also with the perennial issue of what to do about British Catholics. The

issue that Thomas Cogswell calls ‘the topic in the period, the appropriate English reaction to the disintegrating Protestant position on the continent’ was a domestic matter as much as it was one for foreign policy: the criticism levelled at the King’s inaction was intensified by fear that the Protestant position in Britain might be on the verge of disintegrating too, whether through the actions of domestic Catholics or through the marriage of the heir to the throne to a Catholic princess, sister to the Catholic monarch most feared and reviled by Protestants.139

Matters were accelerated in February 1623 when Prince Charles, along with the royal favourite George Villiers, Marquess of Buckingham, journeyed to Madrid in disguise in order to claim his bride. Such behavior wasn’t unusual for the Stuarts – James had made a similar journey to Denmark to claim his bride, Anne – but Charles’s journey was seen by the Spanish as an indication of his willingness to convert to Catholicism. Meanwhile, in Britain, fears that the match would be concluded grew, for many people, more pressing. Given that the Prince was apparently at the mercy of the Spanish in Madrid, there were fears that the terms agreed on would be unfavourable, and might not include the full restitution of the Palatinate and the Electoral title to Frederick V. The Prince’s departure was swiftly followed by the surrender of Frankenthal. Already infuriated by James’s decision to abandon the defence of the last Palatine city in their possession, Frederick and Elizabeth were further incensed by his approval of a treaty for a suspension of arms.140

While Charles was in Madrid, the Spanish Council of State determined to resolve the Palatine issue through a marriage between Frederick Henry, Frederick’s heir, and one of the Emperor’s daughters, through which Frederick Henry would regain the Palatinate and the Electoral dignity. Such a match was anathema to Frederick and Elizabeth, given their hatred of the Habsburgs; even worse, the plan required Frederick Henry to be brought up at the Imperial court, presumably as a Catholic. James agreed to this plan, but unsurprisingly Frederick and Elizabeth rejected it absolutely.141

However, Charles’s trip did not accelerate his marriage to the Infanta – rather, disagreements between the British and their hosts precipitated the failure of negotiations. Frustrated with delays, and with the Spanish refusal to commit to the restoration of the Palatinate, Charles and Buckingham (by now a Duke) returned to England – although they

139 BR, p.4.
140 WK, pp.199-203.
141 WK, pp.203-4.
did leave Charles’s proxy in Madrid. Charles’s return in October 1623 prompted widespread celebration among his father’s subjects.

The ‘blessed revolution’ (1623-24)

As Thomas Cogswell has demonstrated, the failure of Charles’s trip to Madrid precipitated a major political change. The Prince had apparently rejected the ‘Spanish Match’, and a Parliament was called: Charles, Buckingham, aristocrats sympathetic to Frederick and Elizabeth, and a “‘Patriot’ coalition’ within Parliament worked to persuade the King to make war on Spain.142 James himself remained wary of committing himself to military action, and determined to avoid making any conflict a religious one, if he could avoid it. With Charles gone from Spain, negotiations for the match stumbled on – the British ambassador to Madrid, the Earl of Bristol, came close to delivering Charles’s proxy and thus concluding it.143 However, it was clear that both the Prince and Buckingham now opposed the match and supported war, as demonstrated by their willingness to co-operate with Hispanophobic members of Parliament.

Parliament convened in February, and quickly agreed to supply funds for a war. James accepted, although with a rather vague speech that did not indicate details of how or when war would be prosecuted.144 The next step in preparation for war was to write to Madrid, in order to break off the match, and to break the treaty for suspension of arms in the Palatinate. However, progress on these points was delayed by domestic politics: the Lower House requested that James crack down on recusancy, to which the King responded by delaying his letters to Spain.145 Parliament themselves delayed passing the subsidy bill until late April, to the King’s frustration: but eventually the treaties were broken, the bill was passed, and a Council of War was formed. During April, Mansfield visited London seeking employment from James: Cogswell argues that this visit may have helped persuade James to support war, as subsidising the mercenary general ‘would allow him to do something for his daughter and his grandchildren with the minimum danger and expense and with the

---

142 See BR, pp.77-105, 137-165 in particular.
143 BR, pp.107-113.
144 BR, pp.215-6, 231.
maximum éclat’. James granted Mansfeld a commission to recruit in Britain, as well as ‘promis[ing] to pay him £20,000 monthly provided France also supported his expedition’.

James’s death in March 1625 intensified hopes that his apparently more pro-war son would regain the Palatinate for his sister. The army of ‘up to 15,000 men’ recruited by Mansfeld over the winter sailed to the Netherlands in early spring. Although James had instructed Mansfeld not to use these forces to attack those of Spain directly, Mansfeld nevertheless aided Dutch forces against the Spanish at the siege of Breda. This attempt was ultimately to prove futile, Mansfeld’s troops having ‘already been much diminished in number by malnutrition, disease, and mass desertions’. However, prior to the surrender of Breda in June it may have seemed that the wishes of those who, like Frederick and Elizabeth, opposed the Spanish and supported an alliance with the Dutch, were finally coming to pass.

Meanwhile, Charles seemed more prepared than his father to prosecute war on behalf of his sister. He married the French princess Henrietta Maria in June, a union that brought with it confessional tensions – the negotiations had been concluded on the understanding that Henrietta Maria would be able to continue Catholic worship unmolested in England, and she showed no sign of readiness to convert to Protestantism – but also expectations of a military alliance with the Bourbons against the Habsburgs. In April, Charles also agreed to pay a monthly subsidy to his uncle, Christian IV of Denmark, who was campaigning against Imperial interests in Germany. It appeared that Charles was allying himself with two powerful monarchies in order to mount a serious, multinational attack on Habsburg interests.

146 BR, p.244; see BR, pp.238-246 for a detailed account of Mansfeld’s visit to London.
148 Asch, ‘Mansfeld, (Peter) Ernst (II) von, count von Mansfeld’.
Plague

However, this promising start was followed by a series of setbacks and disappointments. The first problem Charles faced was a natural disaster. The first Parliament of Charles’s reign was adjourned on 12/22 July, less than a month after first meeting, because ‘the infection of the Plague’ put members in ‘manifest perill’.150

The adjournment was rather belated. As early as April 5 – three days after Charles summoned MPs – instructions issued by John Gore, Lord Mayor of London, indicate that the plague had taken hold in the capital and that measures put in place to contain it were proving ineffective. ‘Although ‘the infection of the Plague is daily dispersed more & more in diuers parts of this City and the Liberties therof’, Gore writes, ‘the houses infected haue not been, nor yet are kept shut vp’, despite a ‘Proclamation, and many Precepts and Orders in that behalfe made and taken, aswell by the Kings most excellent Maiestie, as by mee and my Brethren the Aldermen’. Gore instructed Londoners to avoid leaving their houses, and not to ‘come into, or frequent any publike assemblies’.151

Despite the attempts of officials to limit the spread of infection, it didn’t abate: in fact, the summer of 1625 saw the most destructive outbreak of plague in England in living memory. London’s population density ensured that, like in previous epidemics, the city was hit particularly badly. Paul Slack estimates that 26,350 people died in London, while the official bill of mortality for the period December 1624 to December 1625 issued by the Worshipful Company of Parish Clerks lists total deaths in London, Westminster and the surrounding villages as 63,001, of whom 41,313 had died of the plague.152

The plague was not confined to the capital. In his letters to Sir Martin Stuteville, Joseph Mead traces the movement of infection in East Anglia through oral news and local rumour.153 J.F.D. Shrewsbury notes that ‘[m]ost of the counties bordering on the English

151 John Goare, Mayor of London, By the Major. Whereas the infection of the plague is daily dispersed more & more in diuers parts of this city (London: 1625, STC.16729.2).
Channel seem to have been more or less extensively involved in this outburst of plague’ – a particularly problematic situation for a country preparing to embark upon a European war.\textsuperscript{154} The economic effects of the plague were severe: Charles Creighton writes that it ‘stopped all trade in the City for a season and left great confusion and impoverishment behind it’.\textsuperscript{155} The plague delayed the preparations for war and made funding for it much harder to secure. As well as this it appeared, to some at least, to be clear evidence of divine displeasure with Britain.\textsuperscript{156} The hopes of the ‘blessed revolution’ of 1624 were badly damaged, both practically and ideologically.

**Cadiz**

The plague died down in the autumn, and preparations for the fleet’s departure recommenced. The fleet departed for the Spanish coast on 8 October, under the command of Sir Edward Cecil. However, the expedition was under-financed and under-prepared, and proved a total disaster. A series of mistakes, including miscommunication between commanders and Cecil’s calamitous decision to allow his troops to drink from casks of wine discovered in abandoned houses, meant that no real damage was done to Spanish interests. The fleet was forced to return. The troops arrived back in England in December, seriously depleted by infection, lack of water and rotten food. Between this disaster and Mansfeld’s defeat at Breda, Britain’s military escapades had been expensive failures. The King was clear that these failures would not dissuade him from future action: on 15 December Charles issued ‘A Proclamation for the commanding of all Souldiers, lately imployed in the Fleet, vpon their arriuall, not to depart from their Colours’, ‘Forasmuch as Wee shall haue present vse of the Seruice of those Souldiers, who, if they should retire themselues and be dis-banded, coul not bee so easily gathered togethre againe, as the necessitie of their Seruice doth require’.\textsuperscript{157} However, the mismanagement of the Cadiz expedition was to have severe consequences in the following session of Parliament: consequences that in turn crippled Charles’s ability to launch future attacks on Spain.

\textsuperscript{156} See Chapter 4, pp.257-64.
\textsuperscript{157} Charles I, *A Proclamation for the Commanding of all Souldiers, lately imployed in the fleet, vpon their arriuall, not to depart from their colours*, 15 December 1625 (London: 1625, STC.8806).
The Forced Loan, France, and the end of the war against Spain

The Cadiz expedition had been an expensive and embarrassing failure, and more military disappointment was to come. Mansfeld’s already-depleted forces had been defeated at Breda, and were then routed by Imperial forces at Dessau in April. Mansfeld ‘nevertheless recruited new troops with relentless energy’ and invaded Silesia, followed by Hungary: however, he died of illness in November.\textsuperscript{158} Charles’s uncle Christian of Denmark was defeated at the Battle of Lutter, news of which arrived in England on 11/21 September.\textsuperscript{159} None of the great hopes of 1624 had been realised.

If further military action was to take place, funds would need to be found; but the issue of war finance badly damaged both the war effort and the relationships between Charles, Parliament, and the people. The Parliament of 1626 met on 6 February but, like the Parliament of 1625, it was not to be long-lived or satisfactory to the monarch. As well as the failures against Spain, MPs had been discomfited by the grant of seven British ships to Cardinal Richelieu, the French King Louis XIII’s chief minister, for use against the Huguenots in La Rochelle in July 1625. Richelieu had promised aid against the Spanish in return, but many British Protestants disapproved of this action against their French brethren. Mistrust of Buckingham had increased following the Cadiz expedition, and MPs wanted Charles to address concerns about him before they would grant supply. The Commons had prepared a Remonstrance against Buckingham, which they opted on 12 June to present to the King; Charles pre-empted this by dissolving the Parliament on 15 June.

The King was now left with the problem of how to finance war on the continent – both against Spain and, it seemed increasingly likely, France as well. Despite the plague, the Crown had continued to collect controversial customs duties (Tonnage and Poundage) through 1625. However, following the dissolution of the 1626 Parliament the Crown stepped up its drive for funds: not only did the Privy Council order the collection of Tonnage and Poundage, it also considered severe fines on recusants, and even debasing the coinage.\textsuperscript{160} Various other methods were attempted. In July Charles resorted to raising a benevolence, but this was widely opposed. In August the Crown resorted to a Privy Seal Loan, ‘levied by personal letters sent out to selected individuals’, but this was succeeded in

\textsuperscript{158} Asch, ‘Mansfeld, (Peter) Ernst (II) von, count von Mansfeld’.
\textsuperscript{160} Cust, p.39.
September 1626 by what came to be called the ‘Forced Loan’. This was a levy which ‘was to be raised from the subsidymen en masse, with each being assessed at the equivalent of five subsidies’. Unlike the Privy Seal Loan, it did not come with clear promises of repayment.¹⁶¹

The Forced Loan was intended to allow Charles to rule, and to conduct a war, without summoning a parliament likely to renew attacks on his favourite.¹⁶² As Richard Cust traces, it was a source of conflict between Charles and his subjects. Although initial collections went fairly well, in late October ‘the bench of Judges, led by the Lord Chief Justice, refused to subscribe to the loan’s legality’, and in late 1626 and 1627 a large number of subsidymen – from peers to ‘ordinary subsidymen, below the level of the gentry’ – refused to subscribe and even obstructed the collection of payments.¹⁶³ Charles Creighton notes that collection was affected by the financial consequences of the plague, which ‘in many provincial towns and in whole counties [...] made the people unable, supposing that they had been willing, to take up the forced loan, and to furnish ships or the money for them’.¹⁶⁴

Meanwhile, hopes that France would aid Britain against Spain were frustrated by increasing tension with Richelieu following his use of British ships against the Huguenots. France and Spain grew closer; they concluded a secret peace in 1626, and the Spanish aided the French against the rebels at La Rochelle. Charles and Buckingham’s determination to aid the French rebels meant that ‘England then faced the unique and terrifying situation of being at once at war with France over La Rochelle and with Spain over the Palatinate’.¹⁶⁵

Although some troops under Sir Charles Morgan were sent to the aid of Christian of Denmark in early 1627, the focus of British foreign policy in 1627-28 was France. In the summer of 1627 another fleet departed, under Buckingham’s command. This time, the destination was the Ile de Re, an island on the approach to La Rochelle. Again, the British failed to achieve their objective, suffered heavy losses, and returned to England to wide recriminations. Two further fleets were dispatched to La Rochelle, but both were failures with the first even failing to engage the enemy. Buckingham was assassinated by a

¹⁶¹ Cust, pp.2, 37, 39.
¹⁶² Cust, p.2.
¹⁶³ Cust, pp.3-4.
¹⁶⁴ Creighton, pp.51-12.
¹⁶⁵ WK, p.256.
disaffected soldier in August.166 Meanwhile, the regiments fighting for Christian under Morgan’s command had been ‘render[ed] almost totally ineffective’ by ‘desertion, disease, and the eventual discontinuation of pay’. Morgan surrendered to Tilly in April 1628.167

1625-28 had seen a catalogue of military disasters – and 1628-29 saw a disastrous Parliament. Furious at criticisms that he saw as attacks on his authority, Charles dissolved the session in March 1629. He governed without Parliament for the next eleven years. Unable to raise parliamentary subsidies, he made peace with France, and then with Spain in November 1630.168 British involvement in the war for the Palatinate was over for good, although the Palatines and their supporters made repeated attempts to revive it.

---

167 WK, p.256.
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Conclusion

The link forged in the ‘Palatine Match’ proved ideologically enduring through the vicissitudes of the 1620s. Those who read the work of Allyne or Beard in 1613-14 were familiarised with the Palatinate’s landscape and its religion, the genealogy of its ruler, and the role he played in imperial politics. These were all presented in versions intended for a British readership, which often had rather more to do with British interests and preoccupations than with Palatine realities. However, this doesn’t mean that the facts that the Palatinate was a distant space and had a distinct culture were absolutely elided. Rather, the newly-formed link between London and Heidelberg was celebrated for its ability to bridge a wide space and differing political cultures. Moreover, the idealised continental Protestant culture ascribed to the Palatines in the two treatises translated by Rolte was pointedly interdenominational. Following the formation of the Protestant Union and the conclusion of the ‘Palatine Match’, the notion that Protestant churches would work together against the threat posed by the Habsburgs, putting aside their differences, must have seemed a graspable goal to some, both on the continent and in Britain.

The grand hopes of the pre-war years gives some insight into the depth of the disappointment after both James and the Protestant Union failed to live up to the expectations of Frederick and those who supported his cause. The outrage expressed in the early 1620s has strong continuities with the rhetoric by which writers sought to legitimise Frederick as a husband for Elizabeth in 1613. Following White Mountain, Frederick lost his lands, his titles, and his electorship. Most galling of all for some British subjects, the link forged to Britain did not result in official military action while the Palatinate was under attack from Spanish, Imperial and Bavarian troops in 1620-23. James did not live up to the glorious, martial British legend that Frederick had been symbolically appropriated to in 1612-14. Meanwhile, the Palatine propaganda effort maintained links between Frederick and Elizabeth and powerful men who sympathised with their cause, dividing the loyalties of these British subjects between their monarch and their monarch’s kin. Both of these issues – disenchantment with Stuart policy, and the troubling disjunction between obeying the King’s command and supporting the King’s daughter – are key to understanding the texts I examine in the following chapters.
Following Charles’s return from Madrid in late 1623, Britain did enter the war – but suffered plague and political disagreements at home, and a series of ignoble defeats on the continent. The hopes that had been expressed by Frederick, Elizabeth, and their supporters through the vicissitudes of 1620-23 had rested on the idea that committed, official military action by the British would rescue the Palatinate. However, the reality of plague, financial trouble and military setbacks put paid to that narrative – or at least meant that those who hoped and expected to see the Palatinate restored would need to find ways to accommodate defeat.
Chapter 2. ‘Whereas you expect, and that with great longing, the Businesse of the Palatinate’: printed news from the Palatinate, 1620-23

John Taylor’s ‘John Easie’, pestering the poet for news of Spinola in 1620, may represent a comic exaggeration of public interest in news. However, Taylor’s anecdote expresses a sense that British subjects were closely, even excessively, interested in events in the Palatinate.1 ‘[C]ontemporary Englishmen’, Thomas Cogswell writes, ‘have often been seen as oblivious to news from London, but at the beginning of the Thirty Years War they avidly followed news of the disasters that overwhelmed Protestants in general and the Palatine household in particular’.2 Such confessionally-motivated interest was a source of anxiety for the authorities, an object of ridicule for the likes of Taylor, and a commercial opportunity for a number of printers and booksellers in London and the Netherlands.

In this chapter I examine the developing market for printed ‘newes from the Palatinate’ during the period 1620-23, and in particular the ways in which these texts constructed a connection between their readers and events on the continent. I begin with reports of the Bohemian rebellion of 1619, but focus particularly on the period 1620-23. During 1622 in particular, when British volunteer forces held the besieged Palatine strongholds of Heidelberg, Mannheim and Frankenthal, printed pamphlets advertising ‘newes from the Palatinate’ on their title pages proliferated in London stationers’ shops. Some of these were numbered serial productions; these have long been seen as revolutionary, even as ‘the beginnings of the English newspaper’.3

In this chapter, I argue that changes in printed news publication need to be considered as part of a much wider culture of news production and consumption. Stationers drew on manuscript and print models to produce printed news pamphlets, and these pamphlets were consumed alongside, and through, oral and manuscript communication. In the first
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2 BR, p.1
part of this chapter, I outline the contours of Britain’s foreign news economy – concentrating on the news hub of London – and the means by which the news texts printed in this period reflected the networks and textual traditions on which they drew.

In the second part of the chapter, I turn from this ‘multi-media’ context to the ways in which printed news developed in the period 1620-23. The changes both in the form and volume of printed foreign news in this period were dramatic; I briefly trace these, and also the means – sometimes underhand – by which stationers sought to evade official disapproval. The start of hostilities on the continent, and the controversy over James’s reaction to it, meant that discussion of foreign affairs was considered problematic by the authorities and by others. The crown issued two proclamations prohibiting ‘excesse of lavish and licentious speech of matters of State’ in 1620-21, while the actions of unscrupulous newsmongers, and the excessive desire of their customers for news, were the subject of satire. In the third part of this chapter I examine ways in which the production and consumption of printed news was ridiculed and criticised in this period, particularly in relation to questions of trust and reliability.

In the fourth part of this chapter I turn to the means by which news production and consumption, and in particular interest in Palatine news, feature in news pamphlets – both explicitly and implicitly. The prominence of the Palatinate on title pages does not just indicate that stationers reacted to demand for it: this also informed the reader that ‘newes from the Palatinate’ was important, a popular commodity, and the sort of thing they might want to read. The development of serialised printed news facilitated this, as stationers could accompany news of an event with the promise of further information about its outcome or consequences in future pamphlets.

Through interest in ‘newes from the Palatinate’, British readers were connected both to the Palatinate and to the international networks by which news moved. As Cogswell implies, those who were interested in foreign affairs transcended their localities, after a fashion; British readers in the 1620s cannot be called insular if they were following news about events overseas. In the fifth and final part of this chapter, I focus on the ways in which these texts constructed and delineated links between their readers and the Palatinate: links that also connected readers to European and domestic news networks.
Part 1: The culture and context of foreign news in the 1620s

A ‘multi-media system’

Changes in the production and distribution of foreign news – especially in print – have long been considered some of the war’s most important and lasting legacies upon British culture. In 1620-1, stationers in the Netherlands translated their regular news broadsheets, or ‘corantos’, into English and exported them to London. Several London stationers appear to have imitated the form during 1621, before switching to a quarto pamphlet format in 1622.4

From October 1622 until October 1623, ‘a sort of news syndicate or partnership in news’ – the booksellers Nicholas Bourne, Nathaniel Butter, Thomas Archer, William Sheffard, and Bartholomew Downes – produced what Folke Dahl calls ‘[t]he first series of numbered and dated newsbooks’. They were produced more-or-less weekly, although ‘not [...] on a fixed day of the week’.5 The ‘first series’ was followed by several more: Butter and Bourne continued to publish periodical news pamphlets until such publications were prohibited by a Star Chamber decree in 1632. These periodical pamphlets have been seen by many influential critics, such as M.A. Shaaber, Folke Dahl, and Joseph Frank, as a watershed in the development of the newspaper: the first time printed news in English had been produced in a serialised, relatively stable form. During the early years of the Thirty Years’ War, these critics argue, unprecedented interest in foreign affairs was the impetus for stationers to develop a recognisably modern culture of news publication.6

The British market for printed news did indeed change dramatically in the early 1620s. Many more publications explicitly described as ‘newes’ appeared in stationers’ shops than in previous years. Meanwhile, the ‘syndicate’ employed serialisation to a much more sustained and explicit extent than had been tried in print before, differentiating their publications from those of their competitors through techniques including numbering, continuity of titles, and the use of woodcut images. Neither the important

4 See BEC, p.18.
5 BEC, p.86.
developments of the 1620s nor the work of the above critics should be dismissed: Dahl’s pioneering bibliographical work, in particular, is an invaluable guide both to the ‘numbered series’ and to the unnumbered news pamphlets published in 1622, before the first series began.

However, the apparent clear progression of the ‘numbered series’ produced by the syndicate disguises a much messier reality. Consumption and exchange of news took place in a diverse range of milieu and media. Not all of the forms in which it appeared were explicitly marked as ‘news’. ‘There was considerable overlap’, Joad Raymond writes, ‘between news pamphlets and other means of conveying news, such as ballads, newsletters, sermons and the theatre, channels that dried or shifted course with time owing to developments in society and in the book trade’. 7

Although my focus in this chapter is on printed corantos and news pamphlets, I examine these as part of a news culture that extended far outside its print shops. In 1620s Britain, as Robert Darnton writes of eighteenth-century Paris, ‘it makes no sense [...] to separate printed from oral and written modes of communication, as we casually do when we speak of “print culture,” because they were all bound together in a multi-media system’. 8 Consequently, in this part of the chapter, I examine these three forms of communication: firstly the manuscript texts on which printed news drew, and which it operated alongside, and the networks through which these travelled; secondly the wider market in printed pamphlets, and lastly the domestic networks through which these texts moved, and the acts of reshaping that took place when printed news was shared through letters.

Making the news 1: Manuscript news and international networks

In the seventeenth century, foreign news travelled across Europe via an intricate manuscript news economy: in texts that ranged from personal letters, to mercantile correspondence, to diplomatic dispatches, to digests of news written by professional newsletter writers for high-paying clients, to anonymous avvisi or gazettes. Paul
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7 PP, p.101.
Arblaster describes how the exchange of news via letters was connected to the movement of financial and political capital: ‘across Europe, merchant factors, banker’s agents, private intelligencers, and diplomats spent much of their time writing reports on recent events, an activity which, like printing, began in the fifteenth century but grew considerably in the course of the sixteenth’. International epistolary exchange was facilitated by postal connections throughout Europe, which improved throughout the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. By the time war broke out in Bohemia, ‘[t]hanks to the developing system of interconnecting weekly posts, the merchants and statesmen of Europe were in a position to expect weekly reports from their agents across Europe’.

Regular weekly posts brought regular manuscript dispatches, so many readers would have been familiar with serialised news long before the developments in print in the early 1620s. Professional anonymous newsletters, known as avvisi or gazettes, developed in the sixteenth century. News was collated in centres of news exchange, and presented in successive short paragraphs, headed with titles like ‘News from Frankfurt’ – Frankfurt being the centre from which the news was sourced, rather than the place where events took place.

The trade in [gazettes] was enormous, with professional newswriters in all the major cities copying them out in whole or in part, collating them, commenting on their reliability in the light of other news, and passing them on to their subscribers and colleagues. Any competent merchant or statesman would soon be aware of what they contained.

To ‘merchant or statesman’ we can also add ‘scholar’ – or at least Joseph Mead, a fellow of Christ’s College, Cambridge, who wrote a letter of news to his friend Sir Martin Stuteville nearly every week between about 1620 and 1631. Enclosed within most of Mead’s letters to Stuteville were usually one or more separate sheets containing news
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11 For more on the development and form of these texts, see Arblaster, ‘Posts, Newsletters, Newspapers’, p.20, and Mario Infelise, ‘From merchants’ letters to handwritten political avvisi: notes on the origins of public information’, in Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe, III, Correspondence and Cultural Exchange in Europe 1400-1700, ed. by Francisco Bethencourt and Florike Egmond (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 33-52.
transcribed from gazettes, or from printed news. Mead was, of course, a member of a social elite, communicating with a man even higher up the scale. However, he was neither a politician nor involved in international trade. He sourced most of his manuscript news from three men in London - William Boswell, one of the Clerks of the Privy Counsel, the professional newsletter writer John Pory, and the clergyman James Meddus, the rector of St Gabriel Fenchurch.\(^\text{13}\) Pory charged his client Viscount Scudamore an annual fee of £20 for weekly letters of news.\(^\text{14}\) However, D.A.J. Cockburn suggests that all three men may have ‘provided [Mead] with news without expecting payment’, as they were all close acquaintances.\(^\text{15}\) Mead’s regular consumption and communication of manuscript gazettes indicates that access to such texts could be a matter of who you knew, as much as how much disposable income you had or how much power you wielded. Moreover, it shows that, once acquired, these texts could reach a wider readership through further acts of transcription and collation.

Printed news drew on this manuscript news economy. The English ‘corantos’ printed in the Netherlands in 1620-21 echoed the gazettes’ presentation of news in short dispatches. The news pamphlets that London stationers went on to publish often used this format too, although in general they were more heterogeneous in style and content than the corantos, drawing on personal letters and legal documents as well as printed corantos and manuscript gazettes. The similarity is particularly striking in Mead’s transcribed inserts, in which one can often only tell which news comes from print sources when it is labelled as such.\(^\text{16}\) This continuity was presumably for practical reasons – it is easier to print copy more-or-less in the format in which it arrives (and, in the case of reports in a foreign language, to produce a fairly straight translation) than it is to refashion it. It also, however, indicates that this format was an acceptable, and even familiar, means of presenting news.

Foreign gazettes thus provided much of the material for the news pamphlets printed in London – whether this arrived in manuscript or in the form of foreign printed news.
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\(^\text{15}\) Cockburn, I, p.38.

\(^\text{16}\) See, for example, Mead’s transcribed newsletter dated 19 July 1622 (BL Harley MS ff.218-19), which contains headings reading ‘Out of Printed newes’ (f.218\(^\text{r}\)) and ‘Partly out of Printed newes partly lettres’ (f.219\(^\text{r}\)).
However, British involvement in the war over Bohemia and the Palatinate opened another avenue by which news might reach Britain: personal letters from men involved in its defence or with diplomatic efforts. Reports presented as these frequently feature in the news pamphlets of the early 1620s. While the higher reaches of military action and diplomacy were, at least in theory, off-limits to those not involved in them – and to the print market – London-printed news pamphlets in 1620-23 frequently contain letters purporting to be from volunteers serving in the British forces defending Palatine cities. Most of these were anonymous, ascribed to an unnamed ‘soldier’ or simply to ‘letters’. However, occasionally a particular, notable writer would be named or hinted at: for example, a pamphlet published by Archer and Bourne, dated 21 June 1622, contained ‘the true copies of two especiall letters verbatim sent from the Palatinate by Sir, F.N.’ – Sir F.N. being Sir Francis Nethersole, previously secretary to Elizabeth Stuart, now James’s envoy to the Palatine court-in-exile, who had travelled to the Palatinate with Frederick V when the Elector decided to join the defending forces.\[17\]

**Making the news 2: Printed news pamphlets**

Developments in printed news in the 1620s also took part in a complex print economy – in particular, the market for cheap printed pamphlets. ‘Though imitating Dutch models,’ Raymond writes, ‘the first newspapers emerged out of the trade in pamphlets. They were printed, published, and distributed in the same way as pamphlets’ – and by the same people.\[18\] The printers and booksellers I discuss in this chapter were experienced in the production and retail of pamphlets, and all appear to have continued to produce pamphlets other than the numbered series catalogued by Dahl. Many of these unnumbered pamphlets dealt with foreign affairs, and some use forms of presentation associated with ‘news’. The boundaries between ‘news pamphlet’ and other genres of cheap print were not clear. Printed news was sold alongside quarto histories, polemical tracts, sermons and devotional works, in a format which often looked similar to these other texts, in places that might themselves function as sites for the exchange and


\[18\] *PP*, p.101.
discussion of oral news. The contents of news pamphlets might be reshaped, echoed, commented upon, or contradicted in printed polemical texts or broadsheet ballads.

Focus on these texts as the ‘beginnings of the newspaper’ also elides the fact that news in the form of quarto pamphlets was an established genre in English well before 1620. Raymond traces the history of such pamphlets to uncertain beginnings in the second half of the sixteenth century: ‘[p]rior to the 1580s printed news was scarce, and, with the exception of ballads offering superficial coverage of recent affairs, was exclusively for the elite.’ In response to English involvement in the continental wars of the late sixteenth century, ‘considerable numbers of pamphlets reporting on the French wars were printed in London, most translated from French’.

‘From 1600 onwards the number of pamphlets of domestic news increased’; these were ‘for the most part “wonder” pamphlets and other items with indirect political import’, and most of them reported on discrete items of news. However, Raymond has identified a sequence of consecutive news pamphlets published by John Wolfe in 1592. The decision by the ‘syndicate’ to publish news in quarto pamphlets ensured that they participated in a well-established and sophisticated market for printed news.

**Reading the news: London and domestic news networks**

Cogswell’s reference to ‘news from London’ in the quotation with which I started is important. The news that one might source from London was not just reports of events in England’s capital – the city was also the place in which much of the foreign news that entered Britain was received, evaluated, repackaged and retailed. London was Britain’s main point of contact with European postal and print networks, and the news that flowed through these in the form of manuscript newsletters, printed broadsheets, personal letters, and word of mouth, might be supplemented by textual and oral news gleaned from diplomatic or mercantile sources. London’s newsmongers congregated in the nave and churchyard of Paul’s Cathedral, a couple of miles from Westminster to the west, and the docks to the east, through which much of England’s international trade.

---

19 In his ‘Diary’, John Rous describes a discussion about prophecies taking place in a bookseller’s shop (BL Additional MS 22959, f.67v).
20 PP, p.99.
21 PP, p.100.
22 PP, p.100.
was conducted.

British printing was also concentrated in the English capital city, although Edinburgh was an important printing centre and there were presses in Oxford and Cambridge. Presses abroad produced English-language news sheets and related texts – notably in the Netherlands. Meanwhile, some London stationers obscured or falsified the provenance of their texts. However, it was the booksellers of Paul’s Churchyard who imported and sold printed news from The Hague or Amsterdam as well as texts printed in London. London remained the node which connected British readers to European networks, and thus the place from which one sourced foreign news.

London was also a major centre for the consumption and interpretation of news texts; by the 1620s the capital had a large and voracious reading public. But it was not the only place in which news was consumed and interpreted. News pamphlets might also be imported by regional booksellers, or sold by itinerant chapmen. They might also move around the country by being enclosed with manuscript correspondence. Although the initial movement of most news was radial – moving out from London to other centres – after this, pamphlets printed in London and the news gleaned from them might continue to circulate outside of the capital via networks of correspondents. Joseph Mead used material from printed pamphlets in his letters, demonstrating that 1620s news pamphlets regularly travelled from London to Cambridge. This is unsurprising, given Cambridge’s status as an intellectual centre; but the news Mead read in pamphlets travelled yet further, to Stuteville in Dalham, Suffolk. The news travelled onwards, reshaped and recontextualised, glossed with Mead’s interpretations. At a yet more local level, news texts themselves might be shared in person, whether by reading them out loud to others, or by lending copies, or by encountering them in a social space. International networks fed into local networks, taking part in the dynamics of personal relationships.

Boundaries between print and manuscript also became blurred in Mead’s correspondence. The weekly newsletters Mead sent to Stuteville contained material gleaned from printed news, professional manuscript newsletters, personal
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correspondence, and oral sources. Sometimes he sent the printed texts themselves, but more often the print morphed into manuscript when Mead transcribed it into a handwritten insert. The letters indicate that, at least for Mead and Stuteville, printed news was consumed alongside manuscript and oral news, and evaluated in relation to both.

Mead’s letters are, therefore, a striking demonstration of the fact that news in the 1620s was multi-stranded, various, individual, and international. The news culture of the early seventeenth century cannot be circumscribed within a certain medium, or a certain genre; it cannot even be limited to communications expressly described as ‘news’. Printed ‘newes from the Palatinate’ was drawn from a variety of sources, recording multiple movements through European news networks. While the developments in printed news in the period 1620-23 are striking, they grew out of existing techniques and approaches. London stationers sourced ‘newes from the Palatinate’ through existing networks, as well as new connections afforded by British military action; they published it in forms that drew on existing print and manuscript genres. As news moved onwards, it underwent a wide range of translations and transformations, connected to the varied uses to which it was put.
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25 See Appendix 1 for a list of the nine Dutch-printed corantos from 1621 contained in the first volume of Mead’s letters (BL Harley 389).
Part 2: A brief history of printed news in English, 1619 to spring 1623

The start of the conflict

The start of the Bohemian rebellion in 1618 does not seem to have been widely reported in British print: the first extant news pamphlet in English dealing with the Bohemian rebellion is *Newes from Bohemia. A true relation of the now present warres in Bohemia*, dated 4 May 1619. It claims to have been translated from a Dutch original, and in format resembles a polemical tract or history rather than a gazette: the majority of the pamphlet is a prose narrative of military and political events, with a strong anti-Habsburg slant, though it also contains a brief account of Bohemian troop numbers, and a report of the preparations for war agreed on by the Estates in March.\(^{26}\) The bookseller for whom it was printed, Ralph Rounthwaite, also published another text entitled *Newes from Bohemia*: this one a translation of ‘[a]n apologie made by the states of the Kingdome of Bohemia, shewing the reasons why those of the reformed religion were moued to take armes, for the defence of the king and themselues, especially against the dangerous sect of Iesuites’.\(^{27}\) Both pamphlets appear to have been translated by William Philip, who had written several pamphlets of news from France and Holland in the 1590s. Another 1619 pamphlet – presumably from the first half of the year, as it does not mention Frederick’s elevation to the throne – used ‘troubles in Bohemia, and diuers other Kingdomes’ as a pretext for a stinging, wide-ranging attack on ‘the diuellish practises of state-medling Iesuites’.\(^{28}\)

Bohemia appears to have become of greater interest to London stationers following Frederick V’s acceptance of the Bohemian crown in late September 1619. A number of works were printed that discussed and (usually) celebrated Frederick’s accession, including several treatises on the legality of his election, and John Harrison’s ‘Short

\(^{26}\) *Newes from Bohemia. A true relation of the now present warres in Bohemia*. (London: 1619, STC.3211.5).

\(^{27}\) *Newes from Bohemia. An apologie made by the states of the Kingdome of Bohemia* (London: 1619, STC.3211).

\(^{28}\) *Troubles in Bohemia, and Diuers other Kingdomes. Procured by the diuellish practises of state-medling Iesuites* (London: 1619, STC.3213).
Chapter 2. Printed news from the Palatinate, 1620-23

Relation’ of the Palatine couple’s departure for Prague and their coronation. Amongst these was a pamphlet entitled *The Last Newes from Bohemia with all the Adioyning Prouinces* (1620). Like the earlier *Newes from Bohemia*, this presents a continuous narrative of events in and concerning Bohemia, in this case starting with Bethen Gabor’s invasion of Hungary in August 1619, through Frederick’s decision to accept the crown (which the author(s) ascribe to his obedience to ‘the will of God and his vocation’) and arrival in Prague, to the spring of 1620. *The Last Newes from Bohemia* has no imprint on the title page: indicating that the men who produced it did not want to be associated with this pro-Frederick text.

**News from the Netherlands**

Another means of avoiding identification was to give controversial pamphlets falsified foreign imprints. For example, the title pages of three 1620 pamphlets – *The Late Good Successe and Victory, which it pleased God to giue to some of the King of Bohemia’s forces* and two editions of *A Declaration of the Causes, for the which, wee Frederick [...] haue accepted of the crowne of Bohemia* all bear the imprint of ‘Abraham Schilders’ at Middelburg – presumably a relative of Richard Schilders, a stationer from Middelburg known for the production of Protestant texts in English – but were probably produced in London by either William Jones or William Stansby. Richard Schilders had produced works by a range of prominent British ‘reformed’ writers in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century for export, so it made sense that his kinsman might also produce pamphlets for sale in Britain. Jones or Stansby exploited a known link between printers in the Netherlands and booksellers in London.
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29 See, for example, two editions of John Harrison, *The Reasons which Compelled the States of Bohemia to reject the Archduke Ferdinand &c. and inforced them to elect a new King* (Dort [Dordrecht]: [1619], STC.3212 and 3212.5); *A Cleare Demonstration, that Ferdinand is by his owne demerits fallen from the Kingdome of Bohemia, and the incorporate Prouinces*, ‘written by a noble-man of Polonia’ (Dort [Dordrecht]: [1619], STC.10811); *Bohemiae Regnum Electiuum. That is, a plaine and true relation of the proceeding of the states of Bohemia* ([London?]?: 1620, STC.3206); John Harrison, *A Short Relation of the departure of the high and mighty Prince Frederick King Elect of Bohemia [...] to receive the Crowne of that Kingdome* (Dort [Dordrecht]: 1619, STC.12859).

30 *The Last Newes from Bohemia with all the Adioyning Prouinces that be now vp in Armes* ([London]: 1620, STC.3208), pp.10, 31.

31 *The Late Good Successe and Victory, which it pleased God to giue to some of the King of Bohemia’s forces* (Middelburg [London?]?: 1620, STC.11356); *A Declaration of the Causes, for the which, wee Frederick [...] haue accepted of the crowne of Bohemia* (Middelburg [London?]?: 1620, STC.11351 and 11351.3). See *STC* vol.1, p.502; Patrick Collinson, ‘Fenner, Dudley (c.1558–1587)’, in *ODNB*, January 2008 <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9287> [accessed 15 April 2012].
Sometime before December 1620 Dutch stationers did indeed begin to export news texts to London, in a format that was to have a dramatic effect on British print. Folke Dahl terms these serialised broadsheets of news, known as corantos, ‘[t]he very first newspapers in the English language of which copies are known to-day’.\(^{32}\) As I have argued above, describing these texts as ‘newspapers’ risks prioritising their connections to future forms of print over their wider print and manuscript context. However, they did represent striking developments in English-language print. These corantos were the first foreign-printed serialised news texts to be produced in English, for English-speaking readers both in the Low Countries and in Britain – or at least the first that remain extant. They contained news translated into English (the majority from Dutch sources), and drew on the format of manuscript gazettes, presenting reports in short, anonymous paragraphs headed by the centre from which the news had been acquired. Each coranto was two pages long, printed on both sides of a single sheet of paper. Each page contained two columns of text, with a running title – most of which begin with some variation of ‘Corrant out of Italy, Germany, &c.’ – across the top.\(^{33}\)

The first stationer to embark upon this form of publication appears to have been Petrus Keerius (Pieter van den Keere), in Amsterdam, in 1620. Keerius’s first extant coranto is dated 2 December 1620, although this is unlikely to have been the first published. It is known as *The new tydings out of Italie are not yet com*, because the title is missing.\(^{34}\) ‘In January 1621, James I and VI, sensitive to the circulation of news, persuaded the States General of the Netherlands to place a ban on the export of these corantos to Britain’; however, ‘the ban failed’ and Keerius was followed by Broer Jansz, in Amsterdam, and ‘M.H.’ at ‘Altmore’, which Dahl posits may be ‘an otherwise unknown rendering of Alkmaar’.\(^{35}\)

The corantos differed from earlier news pamphlets in their broadsheet format, in their presentation of news, and in that each was presented, as Raymond writes of *The new
tydings out of Italie are not yet com, ‘as a heterogenous, serial publication’. Nicholas Brownlees writes of the same coranto that it ‘marks a historic break with the way news was packaged and sold in the past’:

Whereas before, news pamphlets generally recounted single events or themes, and were totally irregular in publication, from December 1620 onwards print news not only started being sold on a much more frequent basis but also in single numbers began covering news from many different places in the same issue.

These two innovations – serialisation, and the combining of a number of short dispatches from different places in each publication – had a quick and dramatic effect on the British book market: ‘the Dutch-English corantos were soon extinguished by English-printed competitors’.

Printed foreign news produced in London from 1621

The first of these competitors may in fact have masqueraded as Dutch-printed texts. L. Hanson suggests that the ‘Altmore’ corantos may instead have been printed in London, and the editors of the second edition of the STC suggest of the corantos attributed to Jansz that ‘[t]he entire series may have been printed in London, possibly for T. Archer’ (the bookseller Thomas Archer).

Archer is the first stationer to be named in relation to serialised news printed in England. In a postscript to one of his regular letters of news to his friend Sir Martin Stuteville of Dalham, dated 22 September 1621, Joseph Mead wrote: ‘[m]y Corrantoer Archer was layd by the heeles for making or adding to Corrantoes &c as they say’. Archer was indeed imprisoned in August 1621, along with the printer Edward Allde. The records of the court of the Stationers’ Company for a meeting on 13 August 1621 state:

36 PP, p.130.
38 PP, p.130.
40 Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville, 22 September 1621, BL Harley MS 389, ff.121-22 (f.122r).
It is ordered, that Mr. Aldee, and Thomas Archer, shalbe committed to prison, vpon Mr. Secretaries Calvertes Commands for printing a booke called, A briefe description of the reasons, that make the declaracion of Ban made against the King of Bohemia, as being Electo'r Palatine Dated .22. Januarij last of noe value or worth, and therefore not to be respected.\(^{41}\)

The text in question was *A Briefe Description of the reasons that make the declaration of the ban made against the King of Bohemia [...] of no value, and therefore not to be respected* – a pamphlet dealing with the Imperial ban against Frederick, declared in January 1621.\(^{42}\) It was published with a false imprint, presumably to avoid associating Archer and Allde with the pamphlet’s combative pro-Frederick argument. Like the 1620 pamphlets ascribed to Richard Schilders, *A Briefe Description* is attributed to a named Dutch publisher, in this case ‘Arnold Meuris bookseller at the signe of the Bible’, in The Hague. This presumably refers to a real-life printer from The Hague, Aert Meuris, who published many pamphlets and news sheets between 1602 and 1639, including ‘nouvelles’ for the Court of the Province of Holland.\(^{43}\)

Mead could be using ‘Corrantoes’ to refer to *A Briefe Description*, or perhaps Archer was already known for the production of corantos and rumour blamed his punishment on this. Both the ‘Jansz’ corantos and those from ‘Altmore’ appear to end around the time of Archer’s arrest – the last extant copies are dated 2 August and 10 August respectively.\(^{44}\)

Meanwhile, news publishing in London was taking significant steps towards greater legitimacy. In his postscript to his letter of 22 September 1621 to Stuteville, Mead goes on to write that in the wake of Archer’s imprisonment ‘now there is another that hath


\(^{42}\) *A Briefe Description of the reasons that make the declaration of the ban made against the King of Bohemia [...] of no value, and therefore not to be respected* (the Hayf [The Hague] [i.e. London], 1621, STC.11353). See discussion in Jayne E.E. Boys, *London’ s News Press and the Thirty Years War* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2011), pp.70-73.


\(^{44}\) *Corante, or, newes from Italy, Germany, Hungaria, Bohemia, Spaine and Dutchland*, 2 August 1621 ([Amsterdam: 1621], STC.18507.25, BEC.24).
got license to print them and sell them, honestly translated out of the Dutch’.

This stationer was ‘one “N.B.”’, almost certainly Nathaniel Butter, an experienced publisher who began to produce news broadsheets soon after Archer’s arrest, ‘at irregular intervals [of] between two and eleven days’, echoing the title used for most of the extant Dutch corantos: *Corante, or Newes from Italy, Germany [...]*.

Seven of these corantos are extant – the last listed by Dahl is dated 22 October 1621. Perhaps the curtailment of this series was due to Butter’s own troubles with the law. Butter was imprisoned sometime around May 1622 for selling a controversial pamphlet claiming to have been printed in The Hague: *A Plaine Demonstration of the Vnlawful Succession of Ferdinand the Second*, which questioned the legitimate descent of the Emperor. The pamphlet is dated 1620; W.W. Greg suggests that, given the delay between initial publication and punishment, ‘Butter’s tract may have been an unidentified reprint’. However, it may indicate that the authorities took such controversial, deceptive texts seriously enough to punish those who produced them even after several years had elapsed.

The dates of Butter’s imprisonment are unclear, but he appears to have been released by 3 June 1622, when he collaborated with the bookseller William Sheffard and the printer William Jones on a quarto pamphlet entitled *More Newe [sic] from the Palatinate*, having apparently decided to publish news in pamphlet rather than broadsheet format. A second edition of this pamphlet was published two days later, as *More Newes from the Palatinate, the second time imprinted*, again by Jones for Butter and Sheffard. Around this time Butter ‘made the commercial decision to specialise in mostly foreign-news pamphlets’, and ‘produced dozens of them’ through this key year in the struggle for the Palatinate.

Another candidate for ‘N.B.’ is Nicholas Bourne, who also began to publish quarto pamphlets of continental news around this time – his first, a collaboration with Archer,

---

45 Mead to Stuteville, 22 September 1621, ff.121-122 (f.122r).
46 *PP*, p.132.
47 *A Plaine Demonstration of the Vnlawful Succession of Ferdinand the Second, because of the incestuous marriage of his parents* (the Hage [The Hague] [i.e. London]: 1620?), STC.10814.
49 *PP*, p.132.
was entered in the Stationers’ Register on 18 May as ‘A Currant of generall newes Dated the 14th of may last’.

This pamphlet has been identified as one held at the British Library, which has a missing title-page and is known as *It is certified from Palermo in Sicilia, that Don Francisco di Castro*, after the first line of the extant text.\(^{51}\)

From May 1622 onwards the names of Butter, Bourne and Archer appear frequently on the title-pages of quarto news pamphlets dealing with the conflict in Europe. The names of other booksellers also appear – William Sheffard, Bartholomew Downes, and Nathaniel Newbery. These six men collaborated in varying combinations on pamphlets that tend to share a number of features. The news was usually translated from foreign sources (frequently Dutch), and was ‘no longer printed on broad sheets as earlier but in small 4-to volumes’.\(^{52}\) By publishing their news as quarto pamphlets, these stationers presented their news in a form familiar to both consumer and print shop. These innovative texts were packaged in a familiar form for popular English print.

As the title by which Bourne and Archer’s 14 May pamphlet was entered in the Stationers’ Register (‘A Currant of generall newes Dated the 14th of may last’) illustrates, though, these publications appear to have drawn a great deal from the Dutch corantos both in terms of their content and in the ways in which they were presented. Each news pamphlet covers a number of dispatches from different places, and is dated, usually at the top or bottom of the title page. Folke Dahl lists 44 ‘unnumbered newsbooks’ produced in London during this year.\(^{53}\)

The name by which Dahl designates these publications – ‘unnumbered newsbooks’ – indicates the importance, to Dahl and those who drew on his work, of a development in the autumn of 1622. On the title page of the pamphlet dated 15 October 1622, printed by ‘B.A.’ (presumably Bernard Alsop) for Butter and Bourne, a number was added to the date at the top of the page. This inaugurated ‘[t]he first series of numbered and dated newsbooks’, of which 50 were published at varying intervals until 2 October 1623. Nine of these would be published in the autumn and winter of 1622. These were published by

---

\(^{50}\) Edward Arber (ed.), *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554-1640 A.D.*, vol.IV (London: privately printed, 1877), p.30; according to Arber this date may be new style.

\(^{51}\) *It is certified from Palermo in Sicilia, that Don Francisco di Castro*, [14 May 1622?] ([London: 1622], STC.18507.45, BEC.40A).

\(^{52}\) BEC, p.18.

\(^{53}\) BEC, pp.55-85.
the same group of stationers (minus Newbery). Aside from the consistent dating and numbering, the titles of these pamphlets vary widely, unlike those of Butter’s 1621 series. ‘These newsbooks [...] were published at very irregular intervals and never on a fixed day of the week’. Throughout the titles the word ‘weekly’ appears, suggesting the intention to produce each issue with regular periodicity; Butter and his collaborators never succeeded in this ambition, however. Though they settled into a standard, 24-page quarto format, they either failed to manage their businesses smoothly, or to select and edit the available news to fit a regular periodical publication, or, most likely, to secure a sufficiently steady flow of news (manuscript newsletters also had this problem, and varied greatly in length).

From 1622 until 1624 many of the news pamphlets published by members of this consortium had an ‘editor’ – probably Thomas Gainsford, ‘a Cambridge-educated soldier and writer who had been involved in the writing of pamphlets for some years’. Gainsford died of fever in the summer of 1624. After his death, ‘for some reason or other [the syndicate] was dissolved’ in September 1624. Butter and Bourne continued to publish erratic series of news pamphlets for another eight years, but on 17 October 1632 the printing of foreign news was prohibited by a Star Chamber decree.

The majority of the news texts that I consider in this chapter were published, however, before this innovation. While some do have textual features that indicate connection to other texts – for example, by being advertised as ‘continuations’ of previous news pamphlets, or carrying a distinctive woodcut – they do not have numbers to mark them as part of a series. Stationers utilised means other than clear serialisation to sell news pamphlets – prominent among which were references to the war in the Palatinate, as demonstrated in the fourth part of this chapter.
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54 BEC, pp.55-92; PP, pp.132-33.
55 BEC, p.19.
56 PP, p.134.
59 BEC, p.19.
60 BEC, p.19.
Part 3. Opposition to news publication

News and the authorities

The open sale and consumption of news could, however, be ideologically problematic. Inappropriate desire for news was a frequent topic of satire in Jacobean Britain – as were the various means by which a person without access to elite networks might seek to satisfy such desire.\(^{61}\) The beginnings of war on the continent brought intensified concern over who had access to news, and how they might discuss it – what Fritz Levy calls ‘the decorum of news’ – on the part of the authorities.\(^{62}\) In Levy’s account, accessing prohibited information was seen to endanger the power of the Stuart state:

> The King’s ability to rule depended on control of what was coming to be called the *arcana imperii*, by which was meant not merely the sleights of government, the tricks by which kings kept control, but access to the sources of information underlying the whole structure.\(^{63}\)

Accordingly, in 1620 and 1621 the authorities attempted to curb ‘excesse of lavish and licentious speech of matters of State’ through two proclamations. The first was issued on 24 December 1620; in it James claims that the active role he had taken in international diplomacy has led to an increase in discourse regarding both foreign and domestic politics during his reign:

> *the commixture of Nations, confluence of Ambassadors*, and the relation, which the affaires of Our Kingdomes haue had towards the businesse and interests of forraine States, haue caused, during Our Regiment, a greater opennesse, and libertie of discourse, euen concerning matters of State, (which are no Theames, or subiects fit for vulgar persons, or common meetings) then hath been in former times, used or permitted.\(^{64}\)

This ‘conuenient freedome of speech’ has, we are told, been tolerated until now; but since ‘there is at this time a more licentious passage of lauish discourse, and bold Censure in matters of State, then hath been heretofore, or is fit to be suffered’, James

---

\(^{61}\) See *BR*, pp.21-2.


\(^{63}\) Levy, p.17.

has been forced to command his subjects:

> to take heede, how they intermeddle by Penne, or Speech, with causes of State, and secrets of Empire, either at home, or abroad, but containe themselues within that modest and reuerent regard, of matters, aboue their reach and calling, that to good and dutifull Subiects appertaineth.65

The reason for the increase in ‘lauish discourse’ goes unstated, although the first quotation above implies it: ‘the relation, which the affaires of Our Kingdomes haue had towards the businesse and interests of forraine States’. The link between British affairs and ‘businesse’ on the continent is presented as calmly political rather than personal or familial. Neither Frederick nor Elizabeth are mentioned – and nor are the Spanish Habsburgs. The possibility of confessional interests on the continent is not even hinted at. The message is clear: James will not demean himself in a communication to his subjects by referring to his foreign policy negotiations – ‘which are no Theames, or subiects fit for vulgar persons, or common meetings’ – in anything other than the broadest of terms. These things are _arcana imperii_ – secrets of state – and only to be dealt with by the King.

What is clear, however, is the entanglement of ‘the affaires of Our Kingdomes’ and ‘the businesse and interests of forraine States’. This is what gives impetus to such ‘intermeddling’ discourse, it is implied: the fact that events in foreign states, and the political and diplomatic ends that these states seek to achieve, have direct implications for Britain’s domestic affairs – and vice versa. James foregrounds this link as a reason for the discussion of ‘causes of State, and secrets of Empire’. He does not seek to deny that because of this foreign affairs are likely to be as interesting to ‘vulgar persons’ as domestic ones. Rather, he seeks to forestall such discussion by a combination of force and shame. ‘Causes of State, and secrets of Empire’ may well be interesting topics for ‘vulgar persons’ and ‘common meetings’, but they are ‘aboue their reach and calling’. ‘Good and dutifull Subiects’ must treat such topics with ‘modest and reuerent regard’.

The December 1620 proclamation does not seem to have had the desired effect on the populace. A second, issued on 26 July 1621, echoes much of the first, but adds to it a

---

65 James I and VI, _A Proclamation against Excesse of Lauish and Licentious Speech of Matters of State_, 24 December 1620.
sense of palpable frustration. In it, James complains that ‘wee are giuen to vnderstand, that notwithstanding the strictness of Our commandement, the inordinate libertie of vnreuerent speech, touching matters of high nature, vnfit for vulgar discourse, doth dayly more and more increase’ and promises that ‘We are, and shall be sensible of such presumption, so highly and directly affronting Vs in our Royall commandement’.66

According to the newsletter writer John Chamberlain, this proclamation also failed to curb ‘lauish and licentious speech’. He wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton on 4 August that ‘the common people know not how to understand’ the proclamation, ‘nor how far matter of state may stretch or extend’. The vagueness of the wording allowed authorities to define and redefine the boundaries of acceptable discourse as the occasion demanded. This is suggested by some significant changes in the wording of the 1621 proclamation, when compared to that from 1620: ‘secrets of Empire’ became ‘secrets of gouernment’, and ‘lauish discourse, and bold Censure’ was changed to ‘lauish, and bould discourse’. The wording of the second proclamation was significantly more ambiguous than its predecessor.

However, according to Chamberlain such imprecision also allowed those who produced news texts to act as if the prohibition didn’t apply to them: he writes that ‘they continue to take no notice of yt, but print every weeke (at least) corantas with all manner of newes, and as strange stuffe as any we hav[e] from Amsterdam’.67 The proclamations did not expressly link ‘matter of state’, or the ‘licentious’ handling of it, to printed foreign news – but Chamberlain, a man with a professional interest in elite, manuscript newswriting, did.

Truth, rumour, and ridicule

The developing market for foreign news was a target for satire and criticism in other texts – including Taylor his Trauels (1620). Taylor’s pamphlet begins with a quatrain asserting the accuracy of his narrative, a quality that means it ‘hath not many fellowes in

66 James I and VI, A Proclamation against Excesse of Lauish and Licentious Speech of Matters of State, 26 July 1621 (London: 1621, STC.8668).
the world’: ‘The maner’s common, though the matter’s shallow, | And ‘tis all true, which makes it want a fellow’. 68 Truth is, according to Taylor, a rare (if not non-existent) quality in printed pamphlets, ‘common’ as these might be.

In his address to the reader Taylor is careful to distinguish his pamphlet from printed news. He warns the reader not to expect ‘such matter’ from his text:

   because I would not haue you either guld of your mony, or deceiued in expectation, I pray you take notice of my plaine dealing; for I haue not giuen my booke a swelling bumbasted title, of a promising inside of newes; therefore if you looke for any such matter from hence, take this warning, hold fast your mony, and lay the booke downe 69

Despite this caginess, however, Taylor does inform the reader that he has published his account in order to satisfy popular cravings for news from the likes of John Easie: ‘the troth is that I did chiefely write it, because I am of much acquaintance, and cannot passe the streets, but I am continually stayed by one or other, to know what newes’. 70

Why, then, does Taylor expressly deny writing ‘newes’? He clarifies this assertion at the start of the poem that follows:

   I Come from Bohem, yet no newes I bring,  
    Of busines ‘twixt the Keysar and the king:  
     My Muse dares not ascend the lofty staires  
      Of state, or write of Princes great affairs. 71

Taylor tells the reader that he avoids news about the dramatic political and military developments in Bohemia and Palatinate – the sort of thing that Easie and others are apparently stopping him in the street to ask – because in reporting these things he would step beyond the bounds of his duty as a subject. Such issues were matters for princes, not for Taylor’s humble ‘Muse’.

Taylor gives a scathing account of an oral news culture that takes place in scandalously lower-class locations and relies on unsubstantiated rumour:

68 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels, sig.A2r.
69 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels, sig.A2r.
70 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels, sig.A2r.
71 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels, sig.A4r.
And as for newes of battells, or of War,
Were England from Bohemia thrice as far:
Yet we do know (or seeme to know) more heere
Then was, is, or will euer be knowne there.
At Ordinaries, and at Barbers shoppes,
There tydings vented are, as thick as hopps,
How many thousands such a day were slaine,
What men of note were in the battell ta’ne,
When, where, and how the bloody fight begun,
And how such sconces, and such townes were won;
How so and so the armies brauely met,
And which side glorious victory did get:
The month, the weeke, the day, the very houre,
And time, they did oppose each others powre,
These things in England prating fooles do chatter,
When all Bohemia knowes of no such matter.72

Taylor’s critique identifies two of the main charges levelled against the news available via print and popular gossip – firstly, that it meddled with things that subjects should not concern themselves with, and secondly, that reports were unreliable. He follows this with a brief rebuttal of the ‘prating fooles’ – informing the reader that these glorious victories have not taken place because Imperial forces refuse to engage in battle, preferring to ‘conquer, spoile and pillage, | Some few thatcht houses, or some pelting village’. He does not give details, however, promising he’ll ‘truely write what I haue heard and eyed’; if he meets people who are ‘unsatisfied’ with this, he vows to ‘fill their cares (by word of mouth) with lies’.73 He distinguishes ‘news’ from travelogue, and promises only the latter.

Taylor does indeed avoid news of the conflict in Bohemia, or elsewhere. He describes his journey to Bohemia in detail, and gives a glowing account of Prague – but he does not address military issues, much less give the account of Spinola’s movements desired by Easie. Taylor his Trauels is not so much a replacement for the oral news that the men in Taylor’s London streets seek as a reminder that such information was none of their business, and if they did go seeking for news they should be prepared to be fobbed off with untruths.

A similar picture of foreign news in 1620 emerges from some very different texts –

72 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels, sig.A4'.
73 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels, sig.A4'.

letters from an Englishman at James’s court, William Sterrell, to Charles della Faille, a secretary at Archduke Albert’s court in Brussels. Rather than avoiding news as matter for princes, Sterrell corresponded in secret with della Faille between 1617 and (at least) 1626, offering him information about events in England in return for news of continental affairs. Sterrell’s reasons for doing this are unclear – Charles Howard Carter writes that ‘except for the rather contradictory fact that he was constantly sending intelligence reports to the “enemy”’, Sterrell’s ‘attitude is one of complete loyalty to king and country’. Sterrell does appear to have worked as an English agent among Catholic exiles in Flanders in the 1590s, so perhaps he acted as a double agent in his correspondence with della Faille.

In these secretive texts Sterrell describes a populace who intensely desire news. ‘We longe here like woemen with childe to heare of the Germaine affaiers’, he wrote on 24 August 1620. Both Sterrell and Taylor describe the desire for news as hyperbolically intense and uncontrollable, with dramatic physical effects. In Sterrell’s case, this desire is equated to the irrational longings of pregnant women, while in Taylor his Trauels it manifests as comically extreme violence against the luckless traveller, who finds himself held ‘fast by the fist halfe an houre’ and ‘tortured’ for information.

Like the customers at Taylor’s ‘Ordinaries’ and ‘Barbers shoppes’, Sterrell and his compatriots could not lay their hands on reliable reports – but unlike Taylor, who focuses on the exchange of oral rumour and only implies criticism of printed news in his reference to ‘a swelling bumbasted title, of a promising inside of newes’, Sterrell explicitly criticises printed texts. At the start of November 1620 he wrote to della Faille reporting news of several impressive Protestant successes, including ‘[t]hat the count palatine hath 40000 men more than he needeth & hath sent them into Bavaria’. This seems to have prompted a spate of printed works on the topic – Sterrell adds in a postscript that ‘[t]he newes of the overthrowes are already in Balletts & bookes printed,
& plotts made of the places [...] and great joy is everie where’. Within a few weeks, however, these printed texts had been proved wrong:

Our newes is that our Lordes & gallants are retorned from the Palatinat & doe confess ther was never a blowe stroken between spignola & them since they went. [...] So that all our Books, ballets & plots of spignolas great losses are proved lye. 

The eyewitness testimony of ‘Lordes & gallants’ trumped printed news: both their closeness to events and their social status lends credibility to their accounts. Meanwhile, the credulous consumers of news who believed the earlier reports found themselves to have been cruelly deceived.

---

80 Sterrell to [della Faille], 2/12 November 1620, quoted in Carter, p.165.
81 Sterrell to [della Faille], [London], 16/26 November 1620, MV 56/426&v, quoted in Carter, p.166.
Part 4: Selling ‘Newes from the Palatinate’

The authorities’ disapproval and Taylor’s mockery were not the only rhetorical constructions of newsreading available to readers, however. In printed news texts themselves, both selling and consuming news were, unsurprisingly, described in much more positive terms. Far from being the preserve of the impertinent and credulous, as in Taylor his Trauels and Sterrell’s letters, news pamphlets describe the consumption of foreign news as an important part of a British subject’s duty to their country, their confession, and their monarch. Interest in ‘the disintegrating Protestant position on the continent’, as Cogswell puts it, could be cast as Protestant duty, while concern for the wellbeing of the Palatine family could be termed loyalty to James, even though the King did not approve of discussion of such matters.82 Meanwhile, those who published and edited printed news described their motives as pure and religious, and stressed the credibility of their news by making explicit reference to the methods they used to ensure it was as reliable as possible. The Palatine conflict could thus be used both to sell news, and to rhetorically legitimise it.

Newsreading and confessional identity

Even before Frederick accepted the Bohemian crown, reading about events on the continent was presented to readers as a matter of confessional affiliation. Newes from Bohemia. A true relation of the now present warres in Bohemia, one of the 1619 pamphlets published by Richard Rounthwaite and translated by William Philip, begins by informing the reader of why they should care about its contents: Bohemia’s ‘troubles and dissentions doe as it were diuide the hearts of all men and religions, to wish either their good successe in the affaires of the Empire, or curse their proceedings, if they should thrive against expectations’. Having described opinion on the Bohemian rebellion as divided entirely along confessional lines, the author asserts his apparently decorous approach to writing the news:

I dare be bold to say, that the business of Bohemia at this instant, with the setling of the Empire, is most worthy of consideration, and exemplifying to the vnderstanding of all capacities: not that I mean

82 BR, p.4.
to intermeddle with the Princes Electors, the power of the house of Austria; the jealouzie of their coadiutors; the moldring away of the Papacy, as if a tower were erected of vntempred mortar, and so in a little time subject to demolition; any difference of religion, or other matter of State, which may vndergoe priuate censure, and publike condemnation.  

Instead, he writes, he intends ‘quietly to let downe the pullies of this frame, whereby the meanest of people may looke into the seuerall roomes of such accidents, as must needs bring them both profit, and pleasure’. This account is markedly anti-Catholic, albeit disingenuously so; the writer’s claim that he will not ‘intermeddle’ with the affairs of Catholic powers is belied by his description of them as a crumbling building. *Newes from Bohemia* makes a case for the reading of foreign news as something close to religious observance. The ‘profit’ that newsreading bring is ‘in the consideration of Gods greatnes and goodnes’ in bringing war and disaster to foreign lands, and thankfulness that the creator ‘hath in mercy turn’d this hand of yron from grasping vs and our country too hard’.  

British Protestants acquired a far greater stake in the conflict with Frederick’s acceptance of the Bohemian crown, the invasion of the Palatinate in September 1620, and the involvement of British volunteers in the defence of Heidelberg, Mannheim and Frankenthal. The increase in pamphlets carrying ‘newes from the Palatinate’ in 1621-23 indicates that London stationers were able to source reports of events in the Palatinate with relative regularity, through both established international news networks and epistolary contact with soldiers. It also implies that the stationers producing these texts, at least, considered news from the Palatinate a commodity that would attract readers. Gainsford made explicit reference to the sort of ‘avid’ interest described by Cogswell when excusing the paucity of news from the Palatinate in a pamphlet from July 1622: ‘whereas you expect, and that with great longing, the Businesse of the Palatinate: in this time of cessation, you must not look for fighting every day, nor taking of Townes; but as they happen, you shall know’. Gainsford is clear about what his readership ‘longs’ for: news from the Palatinate, specifically of military action.
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83 *Newes from Bohemia. A true relation of the now present warres in Bohemia*, sig.A2v.
84 *Newes from Bohemia. A true relation of the now present warres in Bohemia*, sig.A2v.
85 *A Continuation of More Newes from the Palatinate, and diuers parts in Europe, and out of Europe*, 26 July 1622 (London: 1622, STC.18507.66, BEC.62), sig. Av.
The clear expression of confessional affiliation found in *Newes from Bohemia* is rare, however, in news texts published after the two proclamations against ‘lavish and licentious speech of matters of State’. For the most part, confessional allegiance is expressed implicitly, through the prioritisation of news about the Palatine campaign, the prominent use of letters from British and Dutch soldiers (some letters purporting to be from Catholic soldiers make it into London-printed news pamphlets in this period, but those from Protestant soldiers are much more frequent), and the consistent use of print and manuscript sources from the Protestant cities of Amsterdam and The Hague rather than from Catholic Antwerp, which was at this time a much more important centre of news exchange.\(^8^6\)

One exception to this is a pamphlet published in March 1622, entitled *More Newes from the Palatinate; and more comfort to every true Christian, that either fauoureth the cause of religion, or wisheth well to the King of Bohemia’s proceedings*. As the title suggests, this text is far from cagey about announcing its sympathies, and indeed about asserting those of its readers. On the title page it informs the reader that it has been ‘published for the satisfaction of every true English heart’.\(^8^7\) This is despite the fact that the news contained within is not of overwhelming Protestant successes: in fact, the pamphlet paints a doleful picture of the Palatinate in the spring of 1622. Rather, the ‘comfort’ is not dissimilar to the ‘profit’ that *Newes from Bohemia* promises, although the material differs: the idea that events form part of a narrative in which Catholicism eventually succumbs to destruction. Frederick’s trials are compared at the very start of the text to ‘[th]e history of the Iewish captiuitie’; both the Palatine people and the British forces in the Palatinate take on the role of the ‘chosen people’ in this narrative, beset by ‘one waue of turbulency following another’, but destined to triumph in the end.\(^8^8\)

In short, this pamphlet is atypical for a news pamphlet – and it could be argued that it isn’t really one. It is far closer in style and tone to the polemical works of Thomas Scott and others than most news pamphlets: so much so that I discuss it further alongside

\(^8^6\) ‘All ordinary post from the Northern Netherlands to Spain, England or France passed through Antwerp, as did almost all post from England to the Continent, and much of that from Italy and Germany to Spain’ (Arblaster, ‘Posts, Newsletters, Newspapers’, p.21).
\(^8^7\) *More Newes from the Palatinate; and more comfort to every true Christian, that either fauoureth the cause of religion, or wisheth well to the King of Bohemia’s proceedings*, March 1622 ([London]: 1622, STC.18507.38, BEC.37).
\(^8^8\) *More Newes [...] and more comfort*, March 1622, pp.1-2.
these texts in my next chapter.\textsuperscript{89} It was published without an imprint; its title appears to echo that of an earlier anonymous pamphlet – \textit{Newes from the Palatinate. A true and comfortable relation of the wonderfull proceedings of Count Mansfield}, which purports to have been printed at The Hague, and was probably published in early March 1622.\textsuperscript{90} This pamphlet demonstrates the closeness of news to polemic: the difficulty of drawing clear divisions between the two, especially in the confused, controversial pamphlet market of early 1622. The notion that British readers would have confessionally-motivated interest in the Palatine conflict was implicit in the prominence of ‘newes from the Palatinate’ in many news pamphlets, even though it was rarely stated so clearly.

\textbf{The Palatinate on title pages}

Throughout 1622 in particular, ‘the Palatinate’ featured significantly on title pages that carried what Taylor might call ‘swelling bumbasted titles, of a promising inside of newes’. The title page was the first that a prospective reader encountered. As books were habitually sold unbound it was important for publishers to make sure that theirs stood out from the crowd of other quarto pamphlets, clearly announcing what kind of text they were, and advertising the contents in an appealing manner.

The first extant British news pamphlet to mention ‘the Palatinate’ on its title page was \textit{Certaine Letters declaring in Part the Passage of Affaires in the Palatinate}, published in April 1621.\textsuperscript{91} It bears an Amsterdam imprint, but the editors of the \textit{STC} suggest it was printed in London. A major Palatine stronghold features prominently in another pamphlet from the spring of 1621, \textit{A Relation of the Passages of our English Companies from time to time, since their first departure from England to the parts of Germanie, and the United Provinces}, which, it is claimed, had been ‘[s]ent from Frankendale in Germanie, by a souldier of those colonels, to his worshipfull friends here in England’.\textsuperscript{92} The prominence of the Palatinate on these title pages suggests that, right from this early

\textsuperscript{89} See Chapter 3, pp.159-69.
\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Newes from the Palatinate. A true and comfortable relation of the wonderfull proceedings of Count Mansfield}, March 1622 (The Hague [i.e. London]: 1622, STC.18507.37, BEC.36).
\textsuperscript{91} \textit{Certaine Letters declaring in Part the Passage of Affaires in the Palatinate}, April 1621 (Amsterdam [i.e. London?]: 1621, STC.1037).
\textsuperscript{92} \textit{A Relation of the Passages of our English Companies from time to time, since their first departure from England to the parts of Germanie, and the United Provinces} (London: 1621, STC.17125), title page.
juncture, events in the electorate might be expected to attract readers.

From the spring of 1622 until the end of the year, ‘newes from the Palatinate’ seems to have been a popular commodity in London’s quarto book economy. The vast majority of the news pamphlets listed by Dahl for this period contain some reference to the Palatinate on their title pages. Usually this is the word ‘Palatinate’, but at times it is supplemented by the names of one or more of the Lower Palatinate’s three main strongholds (Heidelberg, Mannheim, and Frankenthal). There are nine extant pamphlets featuring the Palatinate near the top of their title pages from June 1622 alone: Butter’s two editions of More Newes from the Palatinate (3 and 5 June), one pamphlet from each of 5, 13, 14, 18, and 20 June, and two dated 21 June.93 As well as these, pamphlets from 14 and 25 June promise further down their title pages to deliver ‘the weekly newes, from Italy, Germany, Hungary, Bohemia, the Palatinate, and the Low Countries’.94 Those who sought news of events in the Palatinate would have been well-supplied during this period – as long as they had means to visit or contact London booksellers, and enough disposable income to pay for so many pamphlets, at ‘a penny or two’ apiece.95

The names of Palatine cities are usually invoked in connection with specific action in and around them, but when ‘the Palatinate’ appears on title pages it tends to be shorn of its geographical context. We are not told on these title pages, for example, that it is in Germany; the only apparent exception is Henry Gosson’s A Relation of the Passages of our English companies (1621), which does not use the word ‘Palatinate’ but does refer to ‘Frankendale in Germanie’.96 The Palatinate is invoked as if it needs no explanation, prioritised on title pages as Spain or France might be. Indeed, many of the news
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93 Good Newes from Alascia and the Palatinate, 5 June (London: 1622, STC.18507.51, BEC.46); A Continuation of More Newes from the Palatinate, 13 June (London: 1622, STC.18507.51A, BEC.48); A True and Ample Relation of all such occurrences as have happened in the Palatinate since the first of June, 1622, 14 June (London: 1622, STC.25233); Weekly newes from Italy, Germanie, Hungaria, Bohemia, the Palatinate, and the Low Countries, 18 June (London: 1622, STC.18507.53, BEC.50); A Letter Sent from Maynhem concerning the late defeate given the Duke of Brunswicke by Monsieur Tilley, 20 June (London: 1622, STC.18507.54, BEC.51); Coppies of Letters sent from Personages of Accompt Vnto Divers Personages of Worthe in London, 21 June (London: 1622, STC.18507.56a); [Sir Francis Nethersole], The True Copies of Two Especiall Letters verbatim sent from the Palatinate by Sir, F.N., 21 June (London: 1622, STC.18507.56, BEC.52). See BEC, pp.56-94.
96 A Relation of the Passages of our English Companies, title page.
pamphlets from 1622 list both Germany and the Palatinate in their titles, eliding the fact that one is contained within the other. ‘The Palatinate’ tends to mean the Lower Palatinate, where Heidelberg, Mannheim and Frankenthal are situated, and therefore where British troops were concentrated.

The Palatinate is frequently prioritised typographically on title pages, as illustrated by two anonymous pamphlets from March 1622: the aforementioned *More Newes [...] and more comfort*, and *Newes from the Palatinate. A true and comfortable relation of the wonderfull proceedings of Count Mansfield*. On both title pages ‘Palatinate’ is stressed typographically – on the former it is in italics, while on the latter in large capitals. On the former’s title page ‘Palatinate’ is framed by words in large capitals (‘MORE NEWES [...] MORE COMFORT’. The word ‘NEWES’, in particular, dominates the composition, but this still has the effect of drawing the eye to the italicised words (‘*Palatinate, AND*)’ in between these lines.

The prioritisation is more pronounced on the title page of *Newes from the Palatinate [...] Count Mansfield*, where ‘PALATINATE’ is the only word in large capitals on the page – along with the word ‘Newes’, it dominates the composition.97

---

97 *Newes from the Palatinate. A true and comfortable relation of the wonderfull proceedings of Count Mansfield*, March 1622.
Figure 4: Title page of More Newes from the Palatinate; and more comfort to every true Christian, that either fauoureth the cause of Religion, or wisheth well to the King of Bohemia's proceedings, March 1622 ([London]: 1622, STC.18507.38, BEC 37). Source: Early English Books Online. Reproduction of original in the British Library.
Figure 5: Title page of *Newes from the Palatinate. A true and comfortable relation of the wonderfull proceedings of Count Mansfield, from his first comming into the Palatinate, vntill this present Moneth.*

*Wherein to his eternall memory he hath set out Gods glory, and enlarged his own renowne, by being honest to the King of Bohemia, and a constant maintainer of the Gospell of Christ.*

*Likewise relating the true and admirable manner of raising of the siege of Frankewalde by Sir Horatio Vere, with the rest of his proceedings, vntill this present.*

*Faithfully Translated and extracted out of a Dutch Letter sent from Frankewalde by a great Commander, who hath bene an eyewitnesse of the same.*

Printed at the Hage.
1622.

In seven of Nathaniel Butter’s pamphlets from August and September 1622, the importance of the Palatinate was emphasised on the verso of the title page, with a large woodcut image of Frederick V’s coat of arms.98 Sabrina A. Baron writes that the inclusion of the title page ‘[left] little doubt where [Butter’s] sympathies resided or what policy he was seeking to influence’.99 The presence of the coat of arms ensures that Frederick and his cause are indelibly associated with each pamphlet and its contents, framing and informing them.

Figure 6: Verso of title page and p.1, from Newes from Sundry Places, both forraine and domestique, 4 September 1622. (London: 1622, STC.18507.75, BEC.73). Source: Early English Books Online. Reproduction of original in the British Library.

However, the title of the pamphlet dated 2 August (the first to appear with the coat of arms) does not mention events in the Palatinate at all, although it does advertise accounts of ‘the progresse and arrivall of Count Mansfield with the Duke of Brunswicke [two of the major figures in the Palatine conflict] into Champeney in France’. In the

98 For a list of these publications, see Appendix 2.
pamphlet from 4 September, *(Newes from Sundry Places, both forraine and domestique)* the facing page to the coat of arms carries a dispatch ‘From Venice the thirtieth of July, 1622’ dealing with Spanish action against the Grisons.\(^{100}\) The image does not necessarily indicate that the text carries ‘newes from the Palatinate’ – but perhaps that is not the point. The confessional nature of both the French civil conflict in which Mansfeld intervened and the violence in the Valtellina against the Grisons might mean that, for a Protestant reader, these could be seen as part of the same Europe-wide confessional conflict as the war in the Palatinate: what Nicholas Brownlees describes as ‘a supreme struggle between good and evil, Protestantism and Catholicism’.\(^{101}\) The presence of the coat of arms invites a reading of the Valtelline news which associates the ‘wrongs’ done to Frederick and his family and to the Palatinate with those inflicted on Protestants in the Valtellina, placing both into a narrative of Spanish Habsburg aggression.

More prosaically, using a large and striking image to associate a news publication with Frederick could be a means of advertising, given that the ‘Palatine Cause’ appears to have been a draw for readers; the use of his coat of arms might even give a pamphlet a veneer of Palatine approval, lending credibility to its contents. The coat of arms also appears to have been intended as a means by which Butter’s news pamphlets could be recognised in a crowded marketplace. This is indicated by a notice printed in the pamphlet dated 23 August *(The Certaine Newes of this Present Weeke)*:

> If any Gentleman or other accustomed to buy the Weekly Relations of Newes, be desirous to continue the same, let them know that the Writer or Transcriber of this Newes, hath published two former Newes, the one dated the second, the other the thirteenth of August, all which doe carrie a like title, with the Armes of the King of Bohemia on the other side of the title page, and have dependence one vpon another: which manner of writing and printing, he doth purpose to continue weekly by Gods assistance from the best and most certaine Intelligence.\(^{102}\)

The act of identifying a pamphlet as one of Butter’s would, therefore, entail turning its first page – a neat way of ensuring that potential purchasers would take a closer look at the pamphlets for sale, physically interacting with them and perhaps being ‘drawn in’ to

\(^{100}\) Newes from Sundry Places, both forraine and domestique, 4 September 1622 (London: 1622, STC.18507.75, BEC.73), p.1.

\(^{101}\) Brownlees, p.28.

the contents.

However, neither the ‘like title’ nor the coat of arms appear to have had much staying power. The title of the next extant pamphlet in this series, that of 4 September, begins with *Newes from Sundry Places*, while that of 14 September begins with *A relation of many memorable passages*, that of 20 September with *The newes which now arrive from divers parts*, and that of 25 September with *Newes from most parts of Christendome*. This is the last extant pamphlet to carry Frederick’s coat of arms, and it also carried news of ‘the lamentable losse of the city of Heidlebergh’ sixteen days previously.¹⁰³ Baron’s assertion that Butter ‘displayed the coat of arms of the Elector Palatine [...] on the title page of his coranto series’ therefore elides two of the key points about Butter’s use of the image – firstly, that the images are on the verso of the title pages, and secondly that this was a short-lived feature, which Butter does not appear to have used after the fall of Frederick’s erstwhile capital.¹⁰⁴

Not long after this, *A True Relation of the Affaires of Europe, especially, France, Flanders, and the Palatinate* was published – the first extant co-production between Butter and Bourne.¹⁰⁵ The first of the ‘first series’ of numbered news pamphlets was published for Butter and Bourne on 15 October. Perhaps Butter or Bourne simply thought of a better way to mark out their pamphlets – one which allowed them to place their publications in a sequence, a function that a woodcut couldn’t provide. Rather than a simple statement of political sympathy, Butter’s use of the coat of arms represents an intersection of politics, practical innovation, and shrewd marketing. His abandonment of the practice doesn’t signify a change in politics. Rather, it is probable that this decision was informed by some combination of his new partnership with Bourne, a consciousness that Frederick and the British volunteers were losing the fight in the Palatinate (and thus that news publishers might need to seek elsewhere for news cheering to Protestant readers), and the development of a different means of ‘branding’ his publications.

Following the loss of Heidelberg and Mannheim in 1622, the Palatinate appeared less

¹⁰³ Heidelberg fell on 9/19 September.
¹⁰⁴ Baron, ‘Guises of dissemination’, p.44.
¹⁰⁵ *A True Relation of the Affaires of Europe, especially, France, Flanders, and the Palatinate*, 4 October 1622 (London: 1622, STC.18507.81, BEC.79).
often, and less prominently, on title pages – whether because of waning interest or simply because ‘newes from the Palatinate’ could no longer be acquired as often, or in as large quantities, as before. A few pamphlets dated between late 1622 and early 1623 contain accounts of the siege of Frankenthal, and advertise this on their title pages – ‘the names of those English captains and lieutenants, which came out from Manheim; with the present estate of Franckendale’, ‘the holding out of Frankendale’, ‘the new siege of Frankendale, by the Imperiall and Bavarian forces’ – while not mentioning the word ‘Palatinate’. Frankenthal was surrendered by James’s command on 10/20 March 1623. The Palatinate makes only two more appearances on the title pages of news pamphlets listed by Dahl before the end of the decade. The first is on the title page of number 33 of the ‘first series’ of numbered news pamphlets, A Relation of Count Mansfields Last Proceedings, which advertises ‘The last disiposing [sic] of things in the Palatinate’. The second is on the title page of the first of a series of pamphlets published from September 1624 until August 1628 by Thomas Archer, which advertises ‘the resolution of the college of electors, concerning the succession of the Palatinate’. The Palatinate had been conquered, and there was to be no more of the ‘fighting every day, nor taking of Townes’ there that, according to Gainsford, readers had ‘longed’ for in 1622.

The existence of news texts about the Palatinate does not incontrovertibly prove the existence of interest in such news, merely that stationers believed such commodities to be saleable. Meanwhile, the factors that might prompt people to read them are, in large part, unrecoverable – one cannot tell whether individual readers read news pamphlets out of curiosity, sympathy, concern or self-interest, or even whether they might have supported or opposed Frederick’s cause. However, the fact that ‘newes from the Palatinate’ featured prominently on title pages throughout its defence suggests that texts advertising it sold well. The frequent mentions of the Palatinate in Joseph Mead’s letters to Sir Martin Stuteville testify that Mead, at least, was especially interested in events there, and that he expected his friend to be as well. Through 1621 and 1622 Palatine
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106 Numb. 8, The Continuation of the Former Newes, 21 November 1622 (London: 1622, STC.18507.90, BEC.88); Numb. 9, Briefe Abstracts out of Diverse Letters of Trust, 28 November 1622 (London: 1622, STC.18507.91, BEC.89); Numb. 16, Weekly Newes, containing the propositions of the ambassador of the Emperor at Wolfenbuttel, 31 January 1623 (London: 1623, STC.18507.95, BEC.96).


109 Numb. 23, A Continuation of the Former Newes, 9 September 1624 (London: 1624, STC.18507.346, BEC.390).
news often features in the separates of news transcribed from print and manuscript sources that Mead enclosed with his letters, and as well as this Mead often includes it in his personal letters, often at or near the start, sometimes with his own thoughts on events. Mead often expresses clear support for the Palatines. He consistently refers to Spanish and Imperial forces in the Palatinate as ‘the Enimie’; reporting that Frederick’s forces were in danger in July 1622, he wrote ‘God help our partie & be on their side’.\footnote{Mead to Stuteville, 6 July 1622, BL Harley MS 389, ff.212-13 (f.213r).}

His letters are frequently marked with concern and sorrow over events in the Palatinate: that dated 28 September 1621 starts with the declaration that ‘in the poore Palatinate is nothing but woe & misery; the Spanyards still domineering there at pleasure’. Moreover, ‘it is much feared, it is, or shortly wilbe all lost, & that noble Generall also slayne or taken, if God graciously otherwise dispose not’.\footnote{Mead to Stuteville, 28 September 1621, BL Harley MS 389, ff.123-24 (f.123r).}

Mead describes a fear, not just that bad things will happen to the Palatinate – but that they have already happened, and that people in Britain simply don’t know about it yet due to the time it took to transport news. Such anxiety is key to how foreign news might be read – and retailed, as it implies the need to purchase future news texts. The gratification offered by serialised news is continually deferred – one can find interest in finding out about military events in the Palatinate, or even ‘comfort’ in such news through interpreting it according to a providential narrative, but to find out the outcome of those events one will need to read the next instalment. The chronological and geographical ‘gap’ between the British reader of news and the Palatinate, and the way in which this was negotiated in printed news, is the subject of the next part of this chapter.
Part 5: The journey from the Palatinate

I argued in my previous chapter that the link forged between the Palatinate and Britain in the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth did not collapse geographical or cultural distances: rather, it bridged these distances in ways that recognised their existence. British readers in the 1620s thus inherited the idea that the Palatinate was intimately connected to Britain – and that the power of this connection was such that it crossed a wide distance and surmounted geographical obstacles. The Thames and Rhine had been brought together by the power of a dynastic marriage, and that marriage had been facilitated and legitimised by shared religious faith. In the texts celebrating the marriage, British readers were told repeatedly that Frederick and his subjects were Protestants, and that therefore British Protestants should view them as their co-religionists, natural allies in the fight against international Catholicism. The grand progress by which Frederick and Elizabeth traversed the distance between London and Heidelberg rendered this link real. The journey took time, effort, and serious expense: it was marked with public celebrations and commemorative publications.

However, the Anglo-Palatine link became far more fraught with the invasion of the Palatinate. ‘Newes from the Palatinate’ needed to cross a wide distance to reach London print shops, and it took varying, sometimes unpredictable, amounts of time to do so. The desire to read about ‘the Businesse of the Palatinate’ brought with it awareness that getting this news took time: that, despite Gainsford’s promise that ‘as [military events] happen, you shall know’, there was a gap both of space and of time between the ‘taking of Townes’ and the point at which a British reader might become aware of such events.112 News of the dramatic events in the Palatinate reached London stationers weeks after they happened; printed news texts then took time to move out through the reading population via domestic social and professional networks.

Meanwhile, the mechanics of continental news transmission meant that news reports were likely to be traded, translated and reframed at least once along the way. These transformations could lead to fears that reports had been distorted or falsified: this was especially problematic given that most of the reports in news pamphlets were

112 A Continuation of More Newes from the Palatinate, and diuers parts in Europe, and out of Europe, 26 July 1622, sig. A’.
anonymous.

International news thus brought with it a range of issues regarding how it had moved, and how long it had taken to do so. Printed news pamphlets needed to deal with the ‘gap’ between an event and a reader’s awareness of it – both to indicate how news reports had journeyed to London, and to give the reader the information they needed to place themselves in relation to the event. The point was not to deny that there was a significant geographical and chronological distance between the places where newsworthy events were taking place and the news consumer, but rather to recognise that there was a distance and demonstrate how it has been crossed.

Credibility and connection: The geographical journey

Manuscript gazettes, and texts that echoed their form, preserved in the headings of each report something of the networks through which the news contained in them had moved. These headings give the date of the report and the news centre from which they had been acquired. Dutch producers of corantos do not seem to have found it necessary to add further details, perhaps because of the similarity between their wares and established manuscript newsletters. These texts do not usually give any sense that news reports have come from a variety of texts – with the exception of Keerius’s coranto of 9 April 1621, which concludes with what claims to be a copy of ‘[a] disdaynfull Letter, written by the Turkish Emperour to the King of Polen’.113

The change from broadsheets to quarto pamphlets meant that stationers had space on title pages to include information designed to attract readers: amongst which were details of the provenance of the news they contained, chiefly details of the languages reports had been translated from, and the forms in which they had moved. This may have been a means to partake of some of the credibility of such sources. David Randall argues that ‘English news seems to have been regarded for a while as inferior to Dutch news, which was closer to the events described, and perhaps as the first source of printed news more prestigious than English’.114 Joseph Mead’s exclamation at the start of a letter to Sir Martin Stuteville dated 30 June 1621 – ‘Corantoes I know not what is

113 Courant out of Italy, Germany, &c, 9 April 1621 (Amsterdam: 1621, STC.18507.6, BEC.6), verso.
114 Randall, Credibility, p.134.
become of them’ – suggests that, by this point, Dutch-printed corantos were expected and accepted sources of foreign news: hence, presumably, why N.B. chose to echo their titles for his publications later in 1621. The use of falsified Dutch imprints by English stationers may also reflect a desire to access some of the credibility associated with Dutch news print.

Claiming to have been translated from foreign-language sources was not only a good thing to advertise on the title page of a news pamphlet – it was almost certainly true, as English stationers utilised printed and manuscript material imported from the continent. Translated foreign news was not an innovation. As noted above, during the late sixteenth century a large number of pamphlets reporting on the French wars of religion were published in London, mostly translations of French sources. The Dutch wars of independence seem to have had a similar effect.

These works’ status as translations is often advertised on their title pages. Both of the 1619 Newes from Bohemia pamphlets sold by Ralph Rounthwaite described above stress their status as translations, and thus the route by which they arrived at Rounthwaite’s shop; one has been ‘Translated out of the Dutch copie printed at Newinberg’ while the other has been ‘Translated out of Dutch into Latine, and thence into English, by Will. Philip’. ‘[T]he shadow of translation gave English military news an essential element of its character’; it continues to be noted on title pages for much of 1622, although it disappears from those of the ‘first series’. Newes from the Palatinate [...] Count Mansfield claims on its title page to have been ‘Faithfully translated and extracted out of a Dutch letter sent from Franckendale, by a great commander, who hath beene an eyewitnesse of the same’. Advertising that a text has been translated – especially ‘faithfully translated’ – implies that a text can be translated simply and transparently from one language to another, without losing or gaining anything along the way.

The latter pamphlet also indicates another means by which stationers asserted the

---

115 Mead to Stuteville, 30 June 1621, BL Harley MS 389, ff.100-01 (f.100'). Quoted in PP, p.131.
116 PP, p.100.
117 Newes from Bohemia. A true relation of the now present warres in Bohemia, title page; Newes from Bohemia. An apologie made by the states of the Kingdome of Bohemia, title page.
118 Randall, Credibility, p.12
119 Newes from the Palatinate. A true and comfortable relation of the wonderfull proceedings of Count Mansfield, March 1622.
credibility of their news through its professed provenance: many claim to print letters carrying reports from those ‘who hath beene an eyewitnesse’ of events. Usually the sources of letters are anonymous, or there are short, generic descriptions of the sender: ‘a person of account’, ‘two soildiers’.120 Most of the descriptors applied to the letters on title pages refer to the letters themselves – where they have come from, and how reliable they are. The King of Bohemia’s Welcome to Count Mansfield was apparently ‘[f]aithfully taken out of the Letters of best Credit’, while the ‘journey’ by which the news contained in Three Great Overthrowes reached the print shop is given in some detail: it has been ‘[c]ollected out of two letters, the one sent from Heydelburgh, the other from Mainhime, by an expresse post, that arrived here on May day at night. And now published this fourth of May’.121

In contrast, a pamphlet published by Archer and Bourne in June 1622 names a source for its contents – and a prestigious source at that. The pamphlet is entitled The True Copies of Two Especiall Letters verbatim sent from the Palatinate by Sir, F.N; ‘Sir F.N.’ is Sir Francis Nethersole, previously secretary to Elizabeth Stuart, now James’s envoy to the Palatine court-in-exile.122 Nethersole accompanied Frederick on his journey to the Palatinate, where Frederick was ‘to take personal command of the forces’, in March 1622.123 Both letters contained in this pamphlet were apparently written at Mannheim, and describe the news of Mansfeld’s and Christian of Brunswick’s armies apparently as it was heard at the British garrison there. Nethersole was well known to be close to the Palatine couple and supportive of their cause. His association with this pamphlet indicates both that it contains privileged news from an ‘honorable’ source, and a clear political affiliation.

The letters reproduced often retain features of correspondence. Nethersole’s second letter even appears to preserve a break in the writing. He writes of a defeat sustained by Christian of Brunswick:

120 Good Newes for the King of Bohemia?, 8 April 1622 ([London]: 1622, STC.18507.40, BEC.38); A Continuation of More Newes from the Palatinate, 13 June 1622.
121 The King of Bohemia’s Welcome to Count Mansfield, April 1622 (London: 1622, STC.18507.42, BEC.39); Three Great Overthrowes [...] collected out of two letters, 3 May 1622 ([London: 1622, STC.18507.44, BEC.40), title page.
122 B. C. Pursell, ‘Nethersole, Sir Francis (bap. 1587, d.1659)’.
123 WK, p.171.
The maner and measure of it is yet variously related, but I hope to adde it to this before I close it. In the meane to doe all I may, against the suddayne dispatch of the post, I heartely take leaue rest.\textsuperscript{124}

This is followed with ‘I must close this Letter and yet haue no more certaintie of the defeat of the Duke of Brunswick’.\textsuperscript{125} The account of the defeat that follows is in fact surprisingly full and detailed – it appears that Nethersole did get a measure of ‘certaintie’ before sending his letter.

Mentioning ‘letters’ on a title page or retaining some epistolary conventions within a printed pamphlet was, perhaps, a means of accessing the credibility associated with such elite texts. David Randall describes this as ‘sociable news’, in which credibility might be assessed on the basis of the reputation of named writers.\textsuperscript{126} Printed pamphlets, available for general sale, and usually containing anonymous news, conveyed news in a far more impersonal way: however, use of epistolary content and conventions might give a sense that its publishers were privy to privileged information and that their texts should be trusted.

However, references to letters from the Palatinate do more than ‘ape’ an older standard of credibility. It draws links – perhaps false ones, almost certainly incomplete and oversimplified ones, but nonetheless links – between printed texts published in London and moments of representation much closer to the events described, written by people who have witnessed them. It also provides recognisable and comprehensible methods by which these texts have moved across Europe. This adds both to a sense of texts’ ‘credibility’, and to a sense of the social and textual interconnectedness of territories far distant from one another.

The link between British readers and the Palatinate constructed by a printed pamphlet of ‘newes from the Palatinate’ was not, however, a single straight line running from Heidelberg to the reader. As discussed in the second part of this chapter, news moved by

\textsuperscript{124} Nethersole, p.4.
\textsuperscript{125} Nethersole, p.5. Christian of Brunswick was defeated at the Höchst bridge, near Frankfurt, on 10/20 June NS; see \textit{ET}, p.337.
\textsuperscript{126} See Randall, \textit{Credibility}, chapters 1 and 2, pp.21-75.
complex networks, both international and domestic. The use of headings in news texts
did not just stress the credibility of news reports – they also linked the reader to the
news centres of Europe.

Such ‘connection’ also functioned domestically: those who read news texts and shared
their contents were connected across the country by the epistolary and print networks in
which they took part. The key role of London in Britain’s news economy, in particular,
ensured that the English capital became an important part of such mental networks as
well as real ones. The lines that one might draw between the readers of a pamphlet of
foreign news and Heidelberg and Mannheim passed through Paul’s Churchyard. Such
links might be coloured with frustration – Mead’s letters are filled with complaints
about the currency, reliability, and originality of the news texts he received. However
unsatisfactory the texts he received from London might be, however, Mead did not have
the means to bypass the London news market. During the summer of 1625 he could not
source news texts from plague-stricken London, and was therefore unable to send
Stuteville foreign news.127 Interest in foreign affairs necessitated attention to London.
Even if the city was in rude health, one needed a working knowledge of its news
economy – or access to someone with such knowledge – in order to acquire the latest,
most reliable news. London was both where the news came from and the place where
the official ‘British reaction’ to it was formulated: interest in the Palatine conflict
required readers to turn their eyes to the capital.

Contemporaneity and serialisation: the chronological journey

The link between the Palatinate, European news centres, British stationers and British
readers that these texts draw is, however, complicated by the time it took to travel from
one to the other. Such a gap is, of course, an unavoidable feature of news, especially of
international news at a time when travel was time-consuming and dangerous. It is
connected to what Brendan Dooley terms ‘the emergence of contemporaneity’ across
Europe via international networks of communication. Dooley argues that the
‘dissemination of news’ through these networks led to a growing sense of connection
between far-flung areas:

127 See Cockburn, pp.71-73.
in spite of the frequent delays, shifting borders, linguistic barriers, unreliable carriers and differences in the reckoning of time, Europeans began to share a knowledge of one another and of events in the world taking place in the present. Already in the seventeenth century, something of what happening in Venice was known in Strassburg, events in Palermo were on the pages of papers in Augsburg.128

Dooley argues that developments in news dissemination were instrumental in creating new ways of thinking about a European context and the place of individual readers within it: ‘[p]eople could have a concept not only of living within a European social space, a European theater of political, social and economic reality, but of knowing what was going on in many parts of it contemporaneously’. Dooley describes ‘contemporaneity’ as ‘the perception, shared by a number of human beings, of experiencing a particular event at more or less the same time’.129 This draws on Benedict Anderson’s notion of ‘simultaneity’, which Anderson describes as ‘an idea of “homogenous, empty time,” in which simultaneity is, as it were, transverse, cross-time, marked not by prefiguring and fulfillment, but by temporal coincidence, and measured by clock and calendar’.130

However, ‘contemporaneity’ in newsreading is more complex than the awareness that time is shared, that it runs at the same speed in Heidelberg as it does in Cambridge. It is also the awareness that events continue in Heidelberg and that the reader in Cambridge follows them several steps behind: that ‘disasters’ or victories might be taking place, but one cannot know about them until several weeks have elapsed. Given the geographical, chronological, formal, and representational distance from the events depicted in which the reader stands, a sense of ‘contemporaneity’ might be described not as the awareness of events as they happen, but as the worrying knowledge that one is several weeks and an unknown number of interpretations behind events. It is the placing of events within a common chronological framework, and thus the understanding that the time between the date at the top of the account in the pamphlet and the date of one’s encounter with the text must in some way be imaginatively and critically accounted for.

Both the texts by which news was disseminated in the early modern era, and texts which register reactions to news, are marked by anxiety over time. For example, the diarist Simonds D’Ewes found it difficult to get reliable news about the Battle of White Mountain: ‘the results of the battle were described diversely, with rumour attributing victory first to one side, then to the other, and though D’Ewes inquired after the results daily, it was many weeks before he knew the truth’.131 William Sterrell wrote dismissively to della Faille about the reaction of his compatriots, when he contradicted their news of Protestant victories with the privileged news he received from Brussels: ‘When I tell your last avises, they answere me that [they] are stale, all was done since’.132

Accounting for the ‘chronological journey’ was not necessarily as simple as it sounds; as Dooley writes, ‘time itself imposed other obstacles to contemporaneity’.133 Britain and the continent were, at this point, ten days apart – Britain used a modified form of the Julian calendar, whilst most of Europe used the Gregorian calendar. The legal year, in Britain, began on 25 March. In Venice – an important centre for news from Europe and beyond – the year began on 1 March. Because of these differences, as Dooley writes, ‘gaining a sense of exactly when things were happening was no simple matter – in fact, it was a skill that went along with travel and every other form of intercity and interstate communication’.134

A sense of ‘shared time’ is therefore likely to have brought a strong sense of chronological variance, as well as anxieties over this variance and what it might mean for the interpretation of news texts. The experienced reader of news might bring specialist knowledge of European calendars to their readings, as well as knowledge of news networks; they might also conjecture what had happened in the time between the event and the point at which the printed account is read. However, awareness of this chronological gap would lead, unavoidably, to the knowledge that such conjecture is inescapably inadequate – it may well be wrong, and until another dispatch arrives (itself

132 Sterrell to [della Faille], [London], 2 Nov. 1620 (OS), MV 56/397&v, quoted in Carter, p.165.
out-of-date by the time it is read) the reader has no way of knowing if what they think to be the case in Heidelberg or Mannheim is true or not.

‘Contemporaneity’ is therefore facilitated by the availability of serialised news texts. The anxiety over the chronological ‘gap’ between the reader and the Palatinate could be projected onto future texts. Especially once the first ‘numbered series’ of news pamphlets had started in October 1622, there was always the promise of more news on the way – even if that news, once it arrived, would itself be out of date.

News pamphlets from this period feature the date of their publication conspicuously on their title pages, usually placed at the top. Including the dates of publication so prominently allows the reader to quickly assess the distance between their own moment of encounter with the text and its date of publication. Sometimes listing dates also provides an opportunity to position the printed pamphlet in relation to its sources. Good newes for the King of Bohemia? claims to contain news ‘Sent of purpose by a person of account the eight day of April, and now published the seuyenteenth 1622’.135

The clear dates on the title page tend to conceal the fact that the contents are usually something of a chronological jumble. If more than one ‘letter’ is contained in a pamphlet, they usually bear different dates; one letter may even appear to represent several separate moments of writing, as in Nethersole’s The True Copies of Two Especiall Letters. Meanwhile, the letter may report an event that took place some time ago.

When ‘editing’ the pamphlets of the news ‘syndicate’, Thomas Gainsford makes explicit reference to the need to account for the varying dates of the news he receives. He writes in a pamphlet dated 4 October 1622, introducing news from Naples, that ‘in regard the seuerall Letters beare not one date, I haue thought good to Muster the Newes, which belongs to the same place, as it were into one Armie, and so you shall receiue the occurrences all together’.136 When dispatches from different places are arranged in paragraphs headed by the place of origin and the date, as in the 4 October pamphlet, these may cover a significant period of time and several developments in a situation,

135 Good Newes for the King of Bohemia?, 8 April 1622, title page.
136 A True Relation of the Affaires of Europe, 4 October 1622, p.1.
and may not necessarily be printed in chronological order. Butter and Sheffard’s pamphlet dated 25 September 1622 – the final one to bear Frederick’s coat of arms – places the ‘lamentable losse of the city of Heidlebergh’ second on the title page, following an account of Spinola’s defeat at Bergen-op-Zoom. Inside, the first report from Heidelberg describes the city as still under attack: ‘At Heidelberg it is as yet still, but the Bauarians plant 24. peeces to discharge them suddenly against the City.’ The facing page bears an undated report from Brussels, which begins with ‘WE doe further vnderstand that Heidleberg is rendred, the manner of which is as followeth’. The account of the capture of the city is short – only just over 150 words. It recounts the stages by which different parts of the city fell:

There were many assaults made vpon the same by the enemy, and the towne very valiantly defended it selfe, till the enemy in a most furious manner with multitudes ouer-charged them; notwithstanding they still maintained the same for many daies together, till at last the Suburbs were lost, afterwards the Towne held out foure days, in which many were lost on both sides, amongst which the Gouernour is supposed to be one, who behaued himselfe most valiantly, and brake through the enemies Pikes, but most unhappily he was by the enemy shot with a Musket in the brest, afterwards the Castle was assailed by the enemy, and did hold out for 4. daies longer, but was forced to yeeld for want of supply of Victuals and other necessities.138

A fairly lengthy period of time and a number of dramatic events are compressed into a single, bald paragraph. After the nebulous ‘many daies’ before ‘the Suburbs were lost’, the conquest of Heidelberg is presented as an orderly progression, with the duration of each stage clearly noted – four days before the town fell, and then another four before the Castle ‘was forced to yeeld’.

Although this dispatch takes a pro-Protestant angle on the defeat, stressing the ‘valiant’ actions of the British defenders, it is very different from the polemic with which More Newes [...] and more comfort presented the situation in the Palatinate in March. Doubtless this has a lot to do with the fact that this pamphlet reports a crucial defeat; news pamphlets tended to put an ‘emphasis on victory [...] victories were reported far more often than defeats’.139 ‘When they did speak of defeat, letter-writers [and the news

138 Newes from Most Parts of Christendome, 25 September 1622, p.3.
139 Randall, Credibility, p.109.
pamphlets that used them as sources] preferred to obscure the subject. One could look for the little victories that let you claim you had really won’ – like the reported valour of Sir Gerard Herbert and his troops at Heidelberg.140

The simplicity and superficial calmness of this dispatch disguises a careful negotiation of emotive information. The dispatch breaks the news of a British defeat – and a huge blow to Protestantism on the continent – gently, while at the same time drawing the reader into the narrative of events. Noting the duration of the two four-day periods provides a sense of exactness and detail while leaving the actual details of what happened in those periods up to the imagination of the reader. The text’s silences about these periods, and about what happened after the defeat, leaves gaps open to fear, and to desire – fear over the fates of the defeated British soldiers, and desire to learn more. In this case, details of chronology create a link based both on imaginative sympathy, and on the awareness on the reader’s part that they know little of what has happened, and nothing of what is happening now.

Butter’s next pamphlet, a collaboration with Archer dated 27 September, corroborates the news of Heidelberg’s fall with ‘an abstract of a letter from an English Gentleman at Frankford’, which states that ‘the Emperour’s Generall, Monsieur Tilly, hath taken Heidelberg, and hath beene in possession both of the Towne and Castle these foure or fiue dayes’. It also gives further information about British involvement and casualties: ‘There was in the Castle two English Companies, Sir Gar. Herberths, and Sir John Wentworths: Sir G. Herbert was slaine, and his Lieutenant shot, and some few English slaine and hurt’, as well as the news that the defeated soldiers had been granted safe passage to Frankfurt by Tilly.141 This letter is the final document in this pamphlet. It ends with the text tapering to a point – a typographical flourish used in many pamphlets, but here used to accentuate a sobering point about the Palatinate’s future: that the remaining cities are likely to fall, and that the enemy will then possess ‘the last strength of the Palatinate’.142
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Interpreting defeat

The continual forward projection of serialised news tempts both with the promise of new information, and with that of checking the information you already have; knowing for sure that the gossip is not true, and that Heidelberg’s defenders have indeed escaped. It also allows one to check whether an imagined, conjectured future is the one that actually takes place. News allows one to guess what will happen next, and serialisation promises to reveal whether one’s judgement is correct or not in later publications. News pamphlets were constrained to reporting past events, but they frequently advertise the utility of their ‘newes’ in predicting what will take place in the future. The title page of a pamphlet dated 4 October 1622, *A True Relation of the Affairs of Europe*, claims a clear link between ‘seeing the present estate of [the Palatinate’s] prouinces’ and ‘conjecturing what these troubles and wars may produce’. Doing this requires attention to the details of news reports; these provide not only markers of ‘credibility’, but also means by which possible future events can be deduced. In *A Continuation of More Newes from the Palatinate*, dated 13 June 1622, Gainsford writes that ‘[t]he two
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143 *A True Relation of the Affairs of Europe*, 4 October 1622, title page.
Armies lie now at the gaze one vpon another: which it is expected they will not doe longe’. Gainsford goes on to muse on what might happen if Christian of Brunswick decided to attack Bavaria – if he does, ‘the Duke of Bauaria is likelier to haue neede of his owne forces vnder Mounsieur Tilly, and to leaue Don Cordoua and the Spaniards in the Palatinate, to the mercy of the King of Bohemiah’. Meanwhile, ‘if hee comes hither, the King is absolutely and vncontrouleably, Master of the Field’. Whichever Christian chooses, ‘the next Post shall bring newes of’.

Not all ‘conjecture’ was this cheery. Butter’s pamphlet dated 4 September 1622 (Newes from Sundry Places) reports that ‘in regard of the Country being wasted, & through feare of want of Victuals within the Townes’, as well as fear of Tilly’s forces:

Heidelbergh, Manheim, and Franckendale [...] are forced to turne out of their Townes all superfluous people aswell Inhabitants as others, and to leaue them to the mercifull hand of their gracious God, without whose miraculous preseruation they are like to perish for want of sustenance, this is all the comfort that we at this present can affoord them, nor any other assurance haue wee that our selues in short time shall not follow them.

In A True Relation of the Affaires of Europe, Gainsford offers one piece of hopeful ‘conjecture’ following the capture of Heidelberg:

I cannot but remember a saying of Stephens King of Poland: Kings may command [sic] bodies and liues, but not hearts and consciences: so may some other Prince presume on the Emperours Donation of this Prouince, but the Inhabitants will euer loue their owne Prince, and burst out (no question) vpon any occasion of reuolt or alteration.

This seems optimistic in light of a particular detail from the previous pamphlet published by Butter (Newes from Most Parts of Christendome, dated 25 September). In the first of this pamphlet’s accounts of the siege of Heidelberg – in which Heidelberg has not yet fallen – the writer notes that Bavarian forces are bombarding the city, and that ‘[t]he Boores of the Palatinate, and the Bishoppricks thereabout aid to make the Sconses before the same’. Perhaps an attentive reader might note the disparity
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between these two depictions of the Palatine people, and thus find themselves needing to judge carefully between the accounts according to the other texts they had encountered and the markers of credibility that they valued the most.
Conclusion

The developments in news printing in the 1620s were dramatic, but they did not come out of nowhere. Printed news was consumed alongside news in other formats, and drew on these, both for its content and its form. The reports that made up news pamphlets travelled to London stationers’ shops via complex European trade and postal networks, and stationers referenced these networks in the format of their publications. Reading pamphlets of foreign news brought one into contact with distant spaces and events.

The space most frequently referenced in British news pamphlets in 1620-23 was the Lower Palatinate. Frederick’s struggle to retain his ancestral lands had both confessional and dynastic significance for British readers; the defence of Palatine cities by British volunteers both augmented this connection and gave London stationers another avenue by which they could source news from the conflict.

Meanwhile, the authorities’ hostility towards discussion of ‘matters of state’ meant that selling and reading foreign news could be seen as an indecorous, or even subversive, activity. Perhaps in response to this, news reading is described in these pamphlets as not just permitted, but positive: connected to national and Protestant identity. The numerous pamphlets carrying ‘newes from the Palatinate’ in 1620-23 connected their readers to the Palatinate through European news networks. These texts reinforced and shaped this link, but – even more so than those celebrating the wedding in 1613 – they did not collapse the distance between the places. Rather, by highlighting the centres of news exchange from which dispatches had come and the languages from which they had been translated, they emphasised the means by which the geographical and chronological distances had been bridged. Through this, readers might connect themselves to the times and places in which events had happened, in which news texts had been collated and communicated. Texts bearing ‘newes from the Palatinate’ placed their readers in relation to the defence of Heidelberg, Mannheim and Frankenthal, but at the same time kept them aware of the time-lag between the news they were reading and the events themselves. Serialisation allowed one to project worries about events onto future texts: but the reader was always behind events.

News texts in the 1620s helped to forge a fraught relationship between the Palatinate
and the reader – one that was, at the same time, both intimate and distanced. By implication, they also encouraged one to care about the Palatinate, perhaps even in a partisan, confessionally-motivated manner. Joseph Mead’s expressions of concern and support for the Palatines, and his use of ‘the Enemie’ to describe Imperial and Spanish forces, indicates that such a notion of news reading had at least some basis in reality. During this period, James repeatedly refused to treat the Palatines’ adversaries as his enemies; rather, he continued to negotiate a Spanish marriage for his son. The news texts of this period give some insight into the disjunction between royal policy and how the conflict was presented in popular print: an issue even more prominent when it comes to printed polemical tracts and sermons, the subject of my next two chapters. The connection to the Palatinate presented in these pamphlets was chronologically and geographically distanced, but not ideologically so: commentary on the rights and wrongs of Frederick’s position is largely avoided, and the defence of the Palatinate presented as something the British reader should care about and want to succeed. Things were not so simple when it came to the relationship between a British subject who wanted the Palatines to win – and a British monarch who, to many, did not seem to be doing enough to make that a reality.
Chapter 3. ‘Twixt the subject and the stranger’: Piety, polemic, and the Palatinate, 1620-23

In British politics, and in British print, the conflict over the Palatinate in 1620-23 tapped into a range of related concerns: worries over the threat of Catholicism (both international and domestic), the role of Britain on the international stage, and the question of whether the King’s fatherly duties could be considered distinct from, or even opposed to, his duties as a monarch. Most crucially, discussion around Britain’s action or inaction in the Palatinate touches on a fundamental issue: the multiple, varied relationships between the monarch and his subjects, and how each should act to the other. Were events in the Palatinate secrets of state, beyond the understanding of mere subjects? Should the King’s decisions, as an absolute monarch, go unquestioned and undiscussed? Or were there moral or practical considerations that made speaking or writing about the Palatinate a preferable alternative to silence?

In this chapter I explore how discussion of the Palatine conflict fed into, and at times disrupted, ideas of subjecthood – what made a person a good subject of their king and country, what responsibilities this role brought, and what responsibilities the monarch had themselves. James seems to have considered discussion of the conflict and of his actions to be beyond the bounds of decorum that his subjects should observe. This period was marked by attempts to control how political matters, including the war over the Palatinate, were written and spoken about.

However, these did not manage to stifle discussion. My focus in this chapter is two forms of text which provided readers, not with ‘newes from the Palatinate’, but with commentary on events there and the British reaction to them: polemical tracts and printed sermons. Politics and religion were, of course, tightly bound up with one another during this period; consequently, these two kinds of pamphlet are closely linked, both in terms of the ideals expressed and of the techniques employed. Both are framed as counsel to the reader, both deal overtly with the actions and beliefs of individuals, both express univocal interpretations of identity, and both deal with the conflict over the Palatinate as a matter of priority for British Protestants.
In this chapter I start by examining the religious context in which these texts intervened, focusing both on anti-Catholic ideology and how this related to Protestant providentialism. Peter Lake has examined the ‘structure’ of antipopery, stressing the ways in which this prejudice helped to structure, through antithesis, key aspects of Protestant and British identity. In the first part of this chapter I explore what British polemicists wrote about Spanish Catholics, and what this might say about the national and religious self-images available through these texts. I then turn to how the Catholic cruelties described in these texts, and the Protestant suffering that resulted from them, fitted into narratives of Protestant providence.

In the second part of this chapter I examine the means by which James I and VI attempted to control speech and writing about ‘matters of state’ – firstly the furore over Thomas Scott’s *Vox Populi* (1620), and then the proclamations against ‘excesse of lavish and licentious speech of matters of State’ issued in 1620 and 1621, and the Directions for Preachers issued in 1622. I argue that these texts did permit interpretations of a subject’s duty which allowed for, or even required, outspoken engagement with foreign and domestic politics. The third part of the chapter focuses on how a particularly active and outspoken ideal of Protestant subjecthood is constructed in two polemical texts, *Vox Populi* and *The Interpreter* (1622). These texts categorise and evaluate British subjects – as ‘subjects’, ‘strangers’, and even as ‘slaves’ – according to their opinions, both those that they expressed and those that they kept secret.

However, printed sermons by clergymen such as Samuel Buggs and Thomas Gataker took a less overtly oppositional approach to the Palatine conflict, and to how an individual Protestant should respond to it. These texts deal less with the relationship between the individual and temporal authority, and more with the relationship between the subject and their own soul. In the final part of the chapter, I examine how these texts posit an idea of emotional and spiritual connection to the Palatinate: of supporting the cause of international Protestantism through caring for, and praying for, Palatine brethren.
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Part 1: The Palatinate and Protestant providentialism

A war of religion

James was apparently determined throughout this period ‘not to make [the conflict] a War of Religion’, as he wrote to Conway in 1624. However, for many of his subjects, the notion that James should, or even could, avoid a ‘War of Religion’ must have seemed wrong-headed. For many both in Parliament and outside it, Europe was already engaged in a religious war, with James’s daughter and son-in-law at the centre. Intervention by James on behalf of Frederick and Elizabeth was thus intervention in a confessional conflict, whether he liked it or not. What was at stake throughout this period was the nature of this intervention. Would James continue to negotiate with Spain, or would he decide on military action – and what form would this action take?

From its very start, this conflict appears to have been represented and understood by many as a war to protect – and even, perhaps, to advance – Protestantism in the Empire. The enemy was international Catholicism, led by the old enemy of Elizabeth I’s day – the Spanish Habsburgs, and their reported ‘perpetuall designes to an vniversall monarchie’. At stake was not just the Palatinate, but the future of Protestantism – in the Holy Roman Empire, in Great Britain, and in the world.

In this part of the chapter, I first explore the pervasive anti-Catholicism that defines many polemical responses to the Palatine crisis. Texts such as Henry Hexham’s A Tongue-Combat and the polemical news pamphlet More Newes from the Palatinate; and more comfort to euery true Christian presented Spanish actions as ‘insulting, cruell, and bloudy’, and stressed the damage caused to ‘Religion’ and ‘the Reformed Church’. I then look at the use of biblical parallels in polemical texts, and place accounts of the sufferings of the Palatinate within the wider context of Protestant providentialism. Lastly, I examine the importance of learning about, and caring about, events in the Palatinate for the individual British Protestant reader.

---

Anti-Catholicism and national identity

Henry Hexam’s *A Tongue-Combat, lately happening betweene two English Souldiers in the Tilt-boat of Gravesend* (1623) dramatises the tension felt by those who disapproved of James’s decision to allow recruiters for the Spanish army of Flanders to operate in Britain and Ireland.4 “[T]he Cause, Course, and Continuance of those Warres, is debated, and declared’ by two soldiers, ‘[t]he one going to serve the King of Spaine, the other to serue the States Generall of the United Provinces’.5

It is a reply to a 1623 pamphlet with nearly the same title published in Mechelen, written by Richard Verstegan, an Anglo-Dutch Catholic and prolific writer living in Antwerp.6 In Verstegan’s *Toung-Combat*, the first soldier (‘Red-scarfe’, fittingly, given the association of the colour red with Spain) dominates the debate. He criticises the United Provinces for rebelling against Spain, for failing to show gratitude for the excessive cost (both in terms of money and of men) of Britain’s military support, and for ‘their most vile and contemptible vsage of our Nation in the East-Indies and elsewhere.’7 He condemns Protestantism, and stoutly defends Catholicism and the foreign policies of Spain. The second soldier (‘Tawny-scarfe’) offers some token resistance, but appears flummoxed by Red-scarfe’s arguments.

Hexam’s *Tongue-Combat* is addressed to Sir George Holles, nephew and Sergeant-Major to Sir Francis Vere, under whom Hexam served in the Low Countries.8 In the dedication to Holles, Hexam describes how his shocked reaction to Verstegan’s pamphlet prompted him to counter it with one of his own:

> I could not, without iniurie to Truth, permit so many falshoods (as vnder colour of sinceritie and modesty, were wrapt vp in those waste-papers, to be vented for rich commodities vpon our Coast, greedie of nouelties) to passe without question or contradiction.9
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4 See ET, p.322 for a table of British military involvement in the Thirty Years’ War as a whole. During 1620-21 15,950 Scots and English soldiers served Bohemia, the Palatinate, and the Dutch, while 2,300 Irish soldiers served Spain, and a further 5,000 British soldiers served Habsburg troops in Poland under Jerzy Ossolinski.
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In contrast to the greed and dishonesty he attributes to Verstegan and his publishers, Hexham describes his own writing process as truthful – he seeks to correct lies and defend the reputation of his religion, the United Provinces and British monarchs, both past and present. Throughout, Hexham quotes Red-scarfe’s part of the discussion from Verstegan, but significantly expands and alters Tawny-scarfe’s replies. The effect is to claim a moral victory – Tawny-scarfe has represented Red-scarfe’s words honestly, and triumphed over his opponent’s actual arguments.

Hexham’s Tawny-scarfe trumps Red-scarfe’s criticisms of the United Provinces with a searing account of Spanish attacks on British interests:

But what meane you to mention this? when all the injurys they haue done vs, though they be great, incredible, intolerable, vnworthy that they should inflict them, or we suffer them, yet they are nothing to that which the Kings children haue suffered by a Spanish Armie. Here priuate Merchants, or a Societie, or Companie receiued injurie by them, There the Kings children, Religion, the Reformed Church, suffered shipwracke, by the insulting, cruell, and bloody Spaniard; and many thousands of Christians were martyred after a barbarous and butcherly manner; yea vpon all aduantages, euen vnder tearmes of Treatie and Peace.\textsuperscript{10}

Tawny-scarfe accuses the Spanish occupying forces of a litany of violence and treachery against both the Palatinate and Britain. The Spanish have betrayed British trust, ‘whilst Spaine had league with our State, yea whilst the Townes were vnder our Kings protection; whilst the Army was payed by our King, and the Generals hands bound for attempting against them’. Moreover, they have attacked persons and causes – ‘the Kings children, Religion, the Reformed Church’ – presented as central to British morality and identity.\textsuperscript{11}

In Verstegan’s text, Red-scarfe appeals to Tawny-scarfe to serve the States ‘as they ought to bee serued; such trickes I meane, as might reuenge some of the villanies and wrongs they haue offered vs’. Verstegan’s Tawny-scarfe replies blandly: ‘I gesse at your meaning, but it concurses not with my resolution, & you know theare is a precept that willeth to do good for evil’, to which Red-scarfe replies that, in this case, ‘dooing good where you do it,

\textsuperscript{10} Hexham, pp.69-70.
\textsuperscript{11} Hexham, pp.69-70.
makes evil become woors’. Hexham quotes Red-scarfe’s original request directly from Verstegan, but his Tawny-scarfe interprets Red-scarfe’s request as a revelation of his true character, and of that of his religion: ‘I guesse at your meaning, for now you discouer your selfe, and appeare in your right colours: but such courses become not the Religion of Christians, but Anti-Christians’.

In associating Catholicism with ‘Anti-Christians’, Hexham’s Tawny-scarfe expresses a pervasive Protestant belief. Peter Lake writes that ‘to many, if not most, educated Protestant English people of the period popery was an anti-religion, a perfectly symmetrical negative image of true Christianity’. Lake argues that antipopery provided a means to reinforce Protestant ‘self-image’ – ‘every negative characteristic imputed to Rome implied a positive cultural, political or religious value which Protestants claimed as their own exclusive property’ – and therefore that antipopery was ‘a “rational response” to situations in which values central to that self image came under threat’. Any dealings with Catholic powers on a political or military level would be tainted, if not dictated, for many Protestants by the notion that they were dealing with people who represented everything that Protestantism rejected.

Lake stresses that ‘the popish threat provided an unimpeachably ‘other’, foreign and corrupt origin and explanation for conflict’. This ‘other’ provided a means to imaginatively purge the body politic. It was a force ‘to which those elements in the political system deemed noisome or divisive could be assimilated, while leaving the basic structure of the English political system and Church pure and unsullied’.

Rejection of undesirable characteristics allowed one to praise one’s nation and church for possessing the opposite attributes. Tawny-scarfe compares Spanish dishonesty to a specifically ‘English’ identity: ‘[t]he true honorable bloud of the English know better, except it be tainted by Romish corruptions, then to dishonour themselues, Countrie, and Nation, by such perfidious and treasonable Actes’. A key feature of ‘Englishness’, in Tawny-scarfe’s view, is fair dealing and loyalty to one’s Protestant allies. Tawny-scarfe, in
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discovering Red-scarfe’s ‘right colours’, also represents another facet of the ideal ‘English’ soldier – an ability to see through deceit.

The despicable reported behaviour of Spanish Catholics thus provides a means to define both the true Church and a ‘true’ national identity. The two soldiers in Hexham’s Tongue-Combat are both leaving their homeland to fight for foreign powers in a foreign war – but one marks himself as a good ‘English’ subject, loyal to the royal family and his country’s interests, and the other does not. The ‘tongue-combat’ stands in – within the confines of ‘the Tilt-boat of Gravesend’ and of the pamphlet – for the conflict itself, and Tawny-scarfe performs admirably in it, besting his opponent. His outspoken support for the Palatine family is of a piece with his decision to fight for the United Provinces: Tawny-scarfe is shown to support international Protestantism wherever it is under threat, through both word and deed. The perfidy and cruelty of the Spanish occupying forces in the Palatinate are a means by which Hexham can delineate what ‘Englishmen’ are, what they do and do not do, and what they will and will not accept.

Casting Catholicism as a foreign ‘other’ identified Protestantism with self, and with national identity. This also meant that foreign Protestants, through difference from and opposition to Catholics, were essentially not foreign. Palatine Calvinists were to be considered ‘brethren’ of members of the English and Scottish Churches. The ground for this identification had also been prepared around the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth in 1613, by books such as John Rolte’s A Full Declaration of the faith and ceremonies professed in the dominions of the most illustrious and noble Prince Fredericke, which stressed the affiliation between most of the different branches of European Protestantism.  

This is, of course, an oversimplification. Palatine Calvinists cannot be unproblematically aligned with British Protestants, and British Protestantism itself was a long way from doctrinal or political unity. This view of the international situation, and of British responsibilities, was based on the division of people, confessions and causes into clearly defined and evaluated groups – the godly, the godless, the heretical; those who keep their word and those who deceive; brave man and coward, honest man and hypocrite. The Europe – and, indeed, the Britain – envisioned by many polemicists was peopled with such archetypes.
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Catholic cruelty and Protestant suffering

Spanish forces, Tawny-scarfe alleges, have ‘martyred’ ‘many thousands of Christians’ in the Palatinate ‘after a barbarous and butcherly manner’. Tawny-scarfe accuses the Spanish not just of a breach of faith, but of a breach of humanity. Reference to the apparent cruelty of the Spanish occupying force in the Palatinate is a key feature of polemical texts dealing with the conflict: in contrast to the news pamphlets I discussed in my previous chapter, which rarely feature direct commentary on the news they report. One ‘news pamphlet’ that does contain such commentary is a text published in March 1622, *More Newes from the Palatinet; and more comfort to euery true Christian*. Although this text is presented as ‘news’ and contains accounts of events in the Palatinate apparently taken from letters, it deals with the conflict in a far more polemical way than later news pamphlets would do.

*More Newes [...] and more comfort* presents the Palatinate suffering a litany of exaggerated and generalised cruelties. It describes the devastation of the Palatine landscape:

> the warre hath not onely made scarres in the face of the pleasant Countrey, but filled it with wrinkles, which haue taken in so much soile, and durt, and sweat, that I am affrayd the running water of peace will hardly wash it cleane againe in good time, and it will scarce recouer her pristinat glory in many yeares.¹⁹

‘But of all other things most lamentable,’ the pamphlet continues, ‘the Church of God hath suffered deuastation, and the backes and sides of Religion haue beene lashed with cruell stripes, and the tormentors hand hath gon ouer them and ouer them againe’. The people of the Palatinate have been forced to conform to Catholic forms of worship, presented as abhorrent:

> For Idolatry hath made the walls of those Churches weepe, where God hath beene truely worshipped, and not the name of an Image heard in many yeares. The pulpits haue beene trampled in with those obscouene feet, whose masters haue trod vp on the graues of poore deceased Christians, and by the name of Hereticks, thought them onely worthy to be receptacles for their ordure, making their Chappels a very Stewes: the houses which haue lodged their

---

¹⁹ *More Newes from the Palatinet; and more comfort to euery true Christian, that either fauoureth the cause of religion, or wiseth well to the King of Bohemia's proceedings*, March 1622 ([London]: 1622, STC.18507.38, BEC.37), p.6.
garrisons, have been filled with their strumpets, who have made the hearts of the owners sad again, with their filthy prostitution, abominable Masses, songs of ribaldry, inveigles against Christ and his Gospel, and many other fearfull impieties of superstition and blasphemie: yea all places have beene replenished like the groves and altars of the heathen, with mixtures of incense and sacrifice, which I know, stinke worse then the smell of a dung-hill in the nostrils of our sanctifier.20

The religious disruption caused by the invading Catholic troops is, the reader is told, utterly destructive and horrifying: the places and actions of Protestant worship corrupted into their sinful and fetid opposites.

Types and examples: biblical history and Protestant providence

However, More Newes [...] and more comfort does provide, as promised, ‘comfort’ to its readers – through referring to a glorious Protestant future. The writer compares the fate of the Palatinate to that of the Israelites in Egypt, exiled from their homeland – first describing the ‘history of the Iewish captiuitie’, and adding ‘hath it not fared thus with Count Palatine, whose inuesture with his euer memorable and heroike Queene was for the time glorious, and the manner acceptable, till the supportation of his greatnes fell from him’. Prague has been ‘prov[ed] like an Egyptian reede not to be trusted vnto’ and the loyalty of the German Protestant princes has been found lacking.21

But now comes the comfort and cure, Ierusalem is reedified, the people restored, the Temple erected, the wall builded, the Prince sent home againe, the Law read, the Sacrifice exalted, the Priesthood magnified, and a worke is done of admiration: for the God of breath and spirits blew gentle calmes vpon the violent heate of their persecutions, and slacked the burnings of their outragious fires: and why may it not be thus with the Palatinate?22

This parallel assimilates the conflict to the familiar biblical sequence of trials and triumphs, aligning Protestants both in the Palatinate and in Britain with the oppressed Jews of the Old Testament, and the Palatinate with the Holy Land to which the chosen people were destined to return.

20 More Newes [...] and more comfort, pp.6-7.
21 More Newes [...] and more comfort, p.1.
22 More Newes [...] and more comfort, p.2.
Describing parallels between biblical history and current events was, of course, a key preaching technique – although it needed to be applied with care. Joseph Mead describes how the Oxford clergyman Sampson Price was punished in 1621 for being ‘to busie with Rochell, the Palatinate, & the Spanyard’; Price compared Spain to the ambassador of Babylon who visited Hezekiah’s court in 2 Kings 20, prompting Isaiah to prophesise to Hezekiah that ‘all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store unto this day, shall be carried into Babylon’. 23

The use of biblical parallels in printed polemical tracts demonstrates the fact that both sermons and polemics drew on shared referents. As Kevin Killeen writes, the familiarity of such discourse meant that preachers did not necessarily have to link Israel to the Palatinate overtly in order to raise such a link in the minds of their auditors:

The language of sermons does not become political only at the point in which England or its Protestant neighbours are mentioned or when the details of state are explicitly raised. The lattice of reference to kings, judges, punishments, places, tardiness, and retribution are inherently political for early modern congregations across the denominational spectrum. By no means a clandestine code, the biblical was rather the natural language in which events were conceived, and in which commentary was formulated. 24

Killeen describes how ‘[s]ermon literature’ in the early 1620s ‘turns with a remarkable frequency to a set of Old Testament texts describing those Israelites who neglect God’s call to arms, the failure to support one’s allies in need and the implacable will of God’. 25 These texts allowed preachers to deal with the Palatinate without necessarily mentioning current affairs. In this way, ‘[i]f the arcana imperii should, by both protocol and edict, have been kept out of the pulpit,’ Killeen writes, ‘foreign affairs were nevertheless plainly and repeatedly discussed, in the ability of preachers to wield and adapt biblical Syrians, Persians, and Babylonians against the trials of Judah and Israel’. 26

---

23 Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville, 14 July 1621, BL Harley MS 389, ff.108-09 (f.108v); 2 Kings 20.12-19.
25 Killeen, p.394.
26 Killeen, p.393.
This technique was crucial, as Mary Morrissey illustrates, to the ‘prophetic sermon’: a form ‘in which the prophecies of the destruction and captivity of the Old Testament kingdoms of Israel and Judah, as described in the prophetic books of the Old Testament, are applied to the situation of the preacher’s auditors’.\(^\text{27}\) Morrissey here refers to Michael McGiffert’s notion of the ‘Israelite paradigm’: the notion that, in sermons, the history of Israel was typologically related to that of England, specifically. In McGiffert’s interpretation, this paradigm posited England, like Israel, as an elect nation: England had a special ‘national covenant’ with God, meaning that – if English people obeyed divine commands – they would be granted earthly prosperity.

However, Morrissey challenges McGiffert’s association of morality with national identity, arguing that it pays insufficient attention to the division at the heart of Calvinist belief – that between the elect and the reprobate. The doctrine of ‘total depravity’ dictated that all humans were born into a state of sin, from which only a predestined elect would be saved, through divine power rather than anything they did themselves. While some Calvinists did believe that election could be sensed through inner conviction or external evidence, most believed that one’s soteriological status was essentially unknowable.

The Church therefore existed in two forms – the visible one of all believers, and the invisible, made up only of the elect, ‘invisible’ because neither those who belonged to it nor those who didn’t could be absolutely sure of its boundaries. The nation – and every congregation, for that matter – was thus made up of a mass of mingled saints and sinners. The invisible Church could not be equated with the visible, and certainly not with the nation. National identity and soteriological identity might overlap – might, indeed, be intimately interlinked – but they were distinct, and though for most people the former was fairly clear, the latter was impossible to ascertain for certain.

Morrissey argues that although in sermons ‘the Israelites function as a source of examples for God’s behaviour towards the invisible Church (and its individual elect members) and towards the various national, visible Churches on earth [...] it should be equally clear that these examples cannot refer to all of these groups simultaneously’. Morrissey contends that

critics need to distinguish, as contemporaries did, between the visible and invisible churches: that ‘[t]he visible Churches and the invisible Church are treated differently by God; so too the bases of their comparisons with the ancient Israelites, the chosen people, are different. Israel was ‘a type of the invisible Church’ – ‘an event in history designed by God to refer to something in the future’. Its history could be used to predict the future of both visible and invisible Churches, but while for the latter it was a certain promise of both heavenly and earthly joys, members of the former could not trust that they would achieve either salvation or temporal happiness.

Morrissey maintains that Israel functioned in sermons not as a type of the happiness, earthly or heavenly, that English men and women might expect – one could not reasonably expect either, but one could follow the ‘example of a sinful people, or national, visible Church’ that Israel provided in order to please God and hopefully ensure earthly prosperity. The various earthly Churches, and their members, might find peace and prosperity like the Israelites upon their return from Egypt, or they might be – as any number of Old Testament stories illustrated – punished or even abandoned by God for their sins.

Protestant eschatology

At the heart of this distinction was a specifically Protestant interpretation of providence. Alexandra Walsham describes divine providence operating in the world on two time-scales: both short-term and long-term. God controlled the world on a micro level – chastising specific sins with portents and disasters, aiding the elect with miracles – and it was the responsibility of believers to act well in order to avoid such chastisement, and to treat the punishment meted out to themselves and others as a prompt to repentance.

Meanwhile, divine providence also operated on a macro level – it underlay everything that happened, from the beginning of time to the end. God’s ‘eternal and unchangeable decree [...] was the single teleological thread which wove together past, present and future, the blueprint for human history drawn up in the beginning’. This was key to the uses of biblical exemplars discussed above. ‘[O]ne constant’ in this discourse, Killeen writes, ‘was

28 Morrissey, p.48.
29 Morrissey, p.48.
30 Morrissey, p.48.
the exegetical presupposition that every battle was the same battle, be it those of the Israelites, those of Revelation, or those in Bohemia and the Palatinate.\footnote{Killeen, p.394.} The Palatine people were thus linked to the Israelites not only because their story was similar, but because they were part of the same divine plan – one that tied together Old and New Testament, Holy Land and Europe, past and future.

Lake describes a Protestant ‘eschatological framework’ which foretold the eventual demise of Catholicism:

> Viewed in this way, the world took on the shape of a progressive and therefore ultimately predictable struggle between Christ and Antichrist, and thus became the ground for the collective action of Protestants, who had been called together positively by their common opposition to the threat of Rome.\footnote{Lake, ‘Antipopery’, p.82.}

This was a powerful argument for Protestant unity: ‘[p]opery thus became a unifying ‘other’ in the presence of which all those not directly implicated in the problem (popery) became part of the solution (non-popyery)’.\footnote{Lake, ‘Antipopery’, p.82.} Protestant countries were fundamentally implicated in a narrative of confessional victory.

Thomas Gataker describes the continental conflict, in \textit{A Sparke toward the Kindling of Sorrow for Sion} (1621), as a sign of approaching apocalypse: ‘the generall broiles at this instant in all parts almost of Christendome, may well perswade vs, that euen the bottomlesse pit is broken vp, and set open; and Satan and his limbes let loose’.\footnote{Thomas Gataker, \textit{A Sparke toward the Kindling of Sorrow for Sion} (London: 1621, STC.11675), sig.A3'.} Gataker refers to ‘the bottomless pit’ opened by the star that falls from heaven in Revelation 9, from which demonic locusts are released. ‘From the sixteenth century Revelation was inextricably linked to reformation and the apocalyptic with the political’, Kevin Sharpe writes.\footnote{Kevin Sharpe, ‘Reading revelations: prophecy, hermeneutics and politics in early modern Britain’, in \textit{Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England}, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp.122-63 (p.127).} Protestant commentaries on Revelation recounted a narrative of Protestant trial and triumph, of conflict with the Antichrist – often identified, in a tradition that went back to Wyclif, with the Pope – and eventual victory.\footnote{See Katharine R. Firth, \textit{The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), and Sharpe, ‘Reading revelations’.}
Such beliefs could lend themselves to the interpretation of current events. The defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 ‘unquestionably heightened English interest in the apocalypse as events appeared to confirm an English history foretold in biblical prophecy’.\(^{38}\) In that year James VI of Scotland himself wrote a paraphrase of the whole of Revelations and a commentary on one chapter, both published in his *Workes* of 1616. It was markedly anti-Catholic and Hispanophobic: James interpreted the battle with Gog and Magog in Revelation 20 to refer to ‘the treaty recently concluded between the Turks and Philip of Spain, which had freed Philip to attack the rest of Western Europe’.\(^{39}\) At that time, James may have been intending to curry favour with Elizabeth I of England, but this does indicate that the King was no stranger to eschatological arguments equating Spain with the enemies of Christianity.\(^{40}\)

Defeat in Bohemia and the Palatinate did not necessarily render the narrative of Protestant victory any less powerful. The conflict tapped into a central – the central – narrative of European Protestantism, offering both the spectacle of Protestant suffering at the hands of Catholic forces, and the possibility of victory over those forces in the near future. Suffering is crucial to the narrative projected in many books printed and sermons preached during the early part of the 1620s. At heart, it is the same narrative told in John Foxe’s *Actes and Monuments*, a fixture in every English cathedral (as well as in many churches, guildhalls and private houses) since 1571. Protestant suffering gave shape and meaning to the eventual victory, just as the eventual victory gave shape and meaning to the sacrifices of British soldiers and the Palatine people. The ‘eschatological framework’ both provided consolation for the violence and degradation of war, and implicitly sanctioned an interest in its details. The particulars of Palatine Protestants’ suffering were integral to these narratives, and to the ‘comfort’ that readers might draw from reading about events.

The Palatinate and Great Britain were thus tied together by the grand sweep of Protestant eschatology: events in both tended towards the same ends. One could and should, therefore, trust in God to bring this about, even if the situation seemed dire. In *The Ballance of the Sanctuarie*, published in Christopher Harmar’s English translation in 1621, the Middelburg preacher Willem Teellinck stresses that one should trust in God’s plan, and not become

---

\(^{38}\) Sharpe, ‘Reading revelations’, p.129.
\(^{39}\) Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, p.132.
\(^{40}\) Sharpe, ‘Reading revelations’, p.131.
despondent or shaken in one’s faith by the fact that ‘the ungodly oftentimes oppresse the godly, and that when Gods people and their enemies, encounter in bataille and fight together, many times their enemies haue the victorie and overcome them’.\textsuperscript{41} God ‘suffereth it so to bee, thereby the more to aduance his honour’:

\begin{quote}
for the same cause he suffereth his people of Israel to be humbled, that afterward he might aduance them, and that so all the world might see that it was neither their policie, wisedome, nor power, but his blessings that had releiued, and raysed them vp.\textsuperscript{42}
\end{quote}

Teellinck interprets the troubles of the Palatinate as, in effect, a divine rhetorical technique: God allows his people to suffer in order to demonstrate his power to relieve them through grace. The writer of \textit{More Newes [...] and more comfort} similarly asserts that the Palatinate’s troubles are temporary, and that God will eventually enact a dramatic reversal:

\begin{quote}
God (as he hath done) will maintaine the cause of his Church; and Religion (as she hath done) will shew her owne Splendor, in despight of clouds and opposition, like the Sunne, that may be a while obscured, but at last openeth the vapours, and commeth like a Bride out of her chamber.\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

These troubles are temporary punishments for sin, or an illustration of the power of grace. Either way, believers should trust God and follow his commands, and remain assured that God’s plan tends towards the final victory of Protestantism.

However, this did not mean that the Spanish should not be fought. Rather, ‘one should not wholly neglect or reject lawful secondary means, feebly surrendering oneself to whatever destiny held in store’.\textsuperscript{44} The onus was on the elect to obey moral dictates and to do what they could to help their cause, rather than to blindly and arrogantly rely on divine actions that were beyond their understanding. The fact that Protestant victory was inevitable did not mean that either individual Protestants or the Churches and nations they were part of would share in it, as Peter Lake writes:

\begin{quote}
While it was certain that ultimately Antichrist would lose and Christ would win, it was still an open question whether England
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{41} Willem Teellinck, \textit{The Ballance of the Sanctuarie}, trans. attributed to Christopher Harmar (London: 1621, STC.23860), p.27.
\textsuperscript{42} Teellinck, pp.28-29.
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{More Newes [...] and more comfort}, pp.16-17.
\textsuperscript{44} Walsham, \textit{Providence}, p.18.
would triumph with Christ or be destroyed with Antichrist. The answer depended on whether the English responded to God’s commands expounded to them from the pulpit. If they did, God would protect them from the papists; if they did not he would surely use the papists as a stick with which to chastise his erring flock.45

Most of these ‘commands’ would, of course, refer to the moral and religious conduct of individuals. However, it follows that what Britain did as a political and military force should also conform to ‘God’s commands’; that its role on the world stage should be to oppose Catholicism and support Protestantism. England might not be an ‘elect nation’, but the notion of British soldiers as Protestant champions, fighting on behalf of oppressed brethren in foreign wars, was a stubborn survival from Elizabeth I’s day. Both of the senior British commanders in the Palatinate, Sir Horace Vere and Sir Gerard Herbert, had fought in the Low Countries during the Eighty Years War. If the conflict was interpreted as part of this ‘eschatological framework’, Herbert’s death during the siege of Heidelberg, and the reported massacre of his troops by Spanish and Imperial forces, rendered them martyrs to the Protestant cause.

That cause needed such earthly support, not perhaps to ensure victory – that was in God’s hands – but in order that Britain might both escape temporal punishment and share in the eventual triumph. This is why More Newes [...] and more comfort could promise the restoration of the Palatinate via reference to the return of the Israelites to the Holy Land, while at the same time praising the actions of British troops. Protestant victory in the world was pre-ordained and non-negotiable. However, no-one could be sure either that they, or their country, would share in it.

Such was the force of this narrative of Protestant victory that the King could not avoid it – not in parliamentary sessions, and not in the textual marketplaces in which his actions were reported and commented upon. By this logic, the escalation of war over the Palatinate into general war with Spain was not just reasonable, or even inevitable, but not actually escalation at all. The notion that the forces that besieged and eventually conquered the Palatinate were those of the Antichrist, forming part of a continuous diabolical threat leading back to the Armada and beyond, and forward to the apocalypse, was utterly irreconcilable with the idea of negotiating with those forces in any way whatsoever.

Reading about the Palatinate and subjecthood

The connection between the Palatinate and the reader in Britain reached, then, to the very core of a Protestant, and in particular a Calvinist, view of how God worked in the world. Both places were contained within the same divine plan: what happened in one place affected the other on both micro and macro levels of providence. The suffering of the Palatine people was a prompt for all Protestants to repent and reform. Although interest in the cause and appropriate reactions to it could not ensure election, it might allow one to avoid earthly punishment and assure prosperity; at any rate, to learn about and appreciate the power of the divine. In the light of this, interest in God’s actions in the Palatinate – whether this took the form of newsreading, or the emotional engagement prompted by polemical tracts and sermons – could be effectively a spiritual exercise.

The title page of *More Newes [...] and more comfort* clearly describes a link between reading about the Palatinate and both religious and national identity:

More Newes from the Palatinate; and more comfort to euery true Christian, that either fauoureth the cause of religion, or wisheth well to the King of Bohemia’s proceedings. [...] now published for the satisfaction of euery true English heart.46

The reader attracted by this title will be, we are told, a ‘true Christian’, in possession of a ‘true English heart’. He will support the ‘cause of religion’ and be comforted by good news about Frederick V’s ‘proceedings’. Faith, patriotism, and a specific position on foreign affairs are closely intertwined.

Reading about the Palatinate is thus recursive. It reflects on the reader’s identity as a member of a political nation, and as a ‘true Christian’. These identities are both public, in that they define one as part of a social group, and private, in that they are a personal reflection on the power of God’s providence. They also relate both to personal conduct – one should pay attention to God’s providential actions in order to take guidance from them for one’s own faith and conduct – and to that of the nation and the visible Church, as how these react to the crisis may define whether or not they share in eventual Protestant victory. Reading about the Palatinate could thus have important implications both for an individual’s future and for the future of the church and nation he or she belonged to. In this

46 *More Newes [...] and more comfort*, title page.
interpretation, the British reader and the Palatinate are linked by God’s providence – and, unlike the human link which carried ‘newes from the Palatinate’ from Heidelberg to London, this providential link contains not recognition of distance but of essential, immediate kinship. Protestants in both places oppose Catholicism, and are both part of the same eschatological scheme. More Newes [...] and more comfort presents the Palatine conflict as a key issue for the state and, at the same time, unquestionably a matter for the individual subject.
Part 2: The limits of speech and writing

Secrets of state

James appears to have seen foreign affairs as resolutely royal matters – *arcana imperii*, secrets of state. *Vox Populi* (1620), Thomas Scott’s satirical account of Spanish attempts to undermine British politics, offended the crown so much that the authorities attempted to trace and prosecute everyone involved in its production and distribution. As I argue in the first part of this section, *Vox Populi* became emblematic both of Hispanophobic opinions and of particularly uninhibited means of expressing them.

James attempted to limit speech and writing both through punishing specific transgressors, and through preventative legal measures. In 1620 and 1621 he issued the two proclamations against ‘excesse of lauish and licentious speech of matters of State’ that I discussed in my previous chapter, and then on 4 August 1622 sent six ‘Directions for Preachers’ to the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, warning preachers to avoid matters of state and attacks on other confessions. The Directions proved controversial: having initially sent the directions to bishops with a short note on 12 August, Abbot had to write again at more length on 4 September to mollify critics. The Directions and the letter were then printed by the King’s printers John Lichfield and John Short in Oxford.

However, none of these admonishments state exactly which ‘matters of state’ or manners of discourse were proscribed. Many people may have responded to this by erring on the side of caution, given that one could not entirely predict what might draw the ire of the authorities; however, this also meant that subjects could interpret their own statements as neither ‘lavish’ nor ‘licentious’, or as justified by the text on which they were preaching.

*Vox Populi* and forbidden books

Tackling ‘matters of state’ in print could incur the anger of the authorities – as shown by the most famous publication scandal of the early 1620s, that over Thomas Scott’s *Vox

---

47 *The coppie of a letter sent from my lords grace of Canterburie shewing the reasons which induced the kings majestie to prescrib directions for preachers* (Oxford: 1622, STC.33), p.3.
Populi, or, Newes from Spayne.\footnote{Thomas Scott, \textit{Vox Populi, or Newes from Spayne} ([London]: 1620, STC.22100.2).} \textit{Vox Populi} was written in Edinburgh early in 1619 and published anonymously in London sometime before November 1620.\footnote{Sean Kelsey, ‘Scott, Thomas (d. 1626)’, in \textit{ODNB}. \url{http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24916} [accessed 26 March 2012].} Scott’s biting satire of Spanish ambition and hypocrisy was not happily received by a monarch engaged in negotiating a Spanish marriage for his son. It ‘proved popular enough to warrant seven editions in the year of its first issue’, and later also circulated in manuscript, presumably in an attempt to avoid punishment.\footnote{David Colclough, \textit{Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p.105.} The authorities embarked on a hunt for those involved with the text, first discovering the printer, who named Scott as the author.\footnote{Colclough, p.105.} Forewarned of his imminent arrest, Scott escaped to the Netherlands; he lived in Utrecht, and continued to publish polemical tracts aimed at British readers, until he was murdered in 1626.\footnote{Kelsey, ‘Scott, Thomas’.}

\textit{Vox Populi} professes to represent the report made by Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, 1st Count of Gondomar, the Spanish Ambassador to James’s court, to the Spanish council of state upon his return from his first embassy to London in 1618. By the time it was published Gondomar was engaged in his second embassy to James’s court, which lasted from 1619 to 1622. While in London Gondomar and his servants were frequently the target of insulting speech and writing, and even outright violence from those who objected to his actions and his closeness to the King. In the spring of 1621 Joseph Mead describes apprentices rioting against Gondomar in the streets of London, and the proclamation against disrespecting foreigners in London ‘even by countenance’ issued in response.\footnote{Mead to Stuteville, undated [around 7 April 1621], ff.48-49 (f.49v).}

Scott’s ‘Gondomar’ gives a scathing account of royal inaction and Spanish manipulation. James ‘extreamly hunts after peace, and so affects the true name of a Peacemaker, as that for it he wil doe or suffer any thing’. Meanwhile, the Spanish are deceiving him over the match, being ‘too devout to deale with heretiques in this kinde in good earnest’. Although ‘Gondomar’ praises James as ‘one of the most accomplisht Princes that ever raign’d’, the King’s excessive and self-defeating desire for peace and his credulous trust in the Spanish reflect badly on his judgement and care for both his family and his country.\footnote{Scott, \textit{Vox Populi}, sig.Bv.}
The furore surrounding *Vox Populi* crystalised the fears of those in authority regarding the publication and distribution of texts dealing with matters of foreign policy. As noted in a ‘characteristic piece of anonymous “intelligence”’ from around 1620, forbidden works apparently continued to be distributed by stationers:

> Although such bookes as vox populi, and other suche as daylie tooe audaciouslie are dispersed, are forbidien and ought by noe good subject be intertained or openly divulged, yet (as I am lykewayes crediblie given to vnderstand) there bee dyuers stationers sooone as they heare of anie such bookes, as haue noe publicke authoritie they indeavo vpon whatsoever condic to gett them in theire handes and hopes some younge Fellowes to transcrybe them, & sells them to such Nuefangle persones as will not spare anie charges for acquieringe such trashe as infatuats the foolishe vulgar with a misprison of Iest-actiones, and with which they ought not to medle

> This I take to be the cheefe cause of the soe common dispersinge of such bookes, and incouradgment of light braines or sedicious spirits, to studie to such subjects, is the makinge priyvate gaine by them.55

The anonymous source interprets *Vox Populi*, and its movements, according to the strictures laid out in James’s two proclamations: this is information ‘with which [‘the foolish vulgar’] ought not to medle’. These texts have a disturbing effect on their readers, too: they ‘infatuate’ them ‘with a misprison of Iest-actiones’. What renders a text ‘forbidden’ is implied rather than stated, through reference to Scott’s Hispanophobic pamphlet. The name of *Vox Populi* is invoked to denote an entire class of text, defined by its illegality far more clearly than by its content.

The scandal of *Vox Populi* appears to have been a juicy piece of domestic news. A transcribed copy of a manuscript newsletter, sent by Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville in a letter dated 2 February 1621, reports that ‘It is sayd, that Mr Scott a Minister of Norwich is found or supposed, to be the Author of Vox populi’.56 Mead picks up the dramatic story of Scott’s flight at the end of his own letter to Stuteville dated 10 February: ‘Scott of Norwich, who is sayd to be the Author of Vox populi, they say is now fled, hauing as it seemes fore-notice of the pursevant’.57 These fragments illustrate the degree to
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56 Mead to Stuteville (transcribed newsletter), 2 February 1621, BL Harley MS 389, ff.7-8 (f.7”).
57 Mead to Stuteville, 10 February 1621, BL Harley MS 389, ff.14-15 (f.15”).
which *Vox Populi* was itself a news event – one which drove its author both out of the
country and into the awareness of those following domestic and continental news.

Mead’s later letters suggest that *Vox Populi* continued to resonate long after Scott’s flight,
in large part because works associated with him continued to appear. Their imputed
authorship appears to be a significant part of their news value for Mead. Another
transcribed newsletter sent by him to Stuteville, dated 7 February 1623, reports the news
that ‘[t]here is a pamphlet lately come over from Holland (is sayd) called the Belgick
Pismire’ exhorting all great & small, after the example of those Lowcountry-men to labour,
providence & prevention’. The discussion about this pamphlet apparently centres around
authorship: Mead describes the pamphlet as ‘a blew-coat & supposed to be from the same
hand, that Vox populi came’. 58

The meaning of ‘blew-coat’ in this context is unclear. The first definition provided by the
Oxford English Dictionary is ‘Formerly the dress of servants and others of low social
status; (hence) the uniform of almoners and charity children’, while another is ‘A person
who wears a blue coat; e.g. an almsman, a beadle; a blue-coated soldier or sailor; a
policeman’. 59 In the light of these definitions, ‘blew-coat’ could carry a number of
meanings. It could be a general social slur denoting a low status publication, or carry
martial overtones. Or, perhaps, it could describe the relationship in which the pamphlet
stands to its author and perhaps to others – is it a ‘servant’ to a person or cause, or perhaps
a recipient of charity? Sean Kelsey writes that ‘[g]iven the scale of his polemical output in
the years which followed, and his freedom from pursuit or punishment, it is reasonable to
assume that Scott acted with some sort of backing’. 60 The association of blue coats with
charity children might also suggest that the anonymous pamphlet is a ‘foundling’ – one
whose true parentage is uncertain, but suspected.

*Vox Populi* also appears to have become associated, for Mead, with hostile revelations
about Spanish intentions. In a transcribed newsletter dated 12 October 1622, the words
‘Vox Populi’ are appended to the news that Sir Richard Weston, ambassador to the court of
Archduchess Isabella at Brussels, has returned with unwelcome news for James: ‘They say
he tells the King, that there is nothing intended, but the ruine of his Son in the first place,

58 Mead to Stuteville (transcribed newsletter), 7 February 1623, BL Harley MS 389, ff.280-81 (f.281r).
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of himselfe in the next place’. 61 ‘Vox populi’ is added in what appears to be slightly lighter ink, though in the same hand – suggesting that Mead may have added these words after he had transcribed the original newsletter. It is of course possible that by ‘Vox populi’ Mead (or the newsletter writer) actually meant ‘the voice of the people’. However, aside from this instance, all of the occurrences I have found of ‘Vox populi’ in Mead’s letters (either those written by him, or the transcribed newsletters he enclosed with them) make direct reference to Scott and his works. Scott’s *Vox Populi* thus had important cultural ramifications for other forms of political speech and writing: it came to define both a set of ideas and particularly indecorous methods of expressing them.

### Royal proclamations and the Directions for Preachers

In December 1620, not long after the furore over *Vox Populi*, James issued the first of his two proclamations against ‘excesse of lauish and licentious speech of matters of State’; it was reissued in July 1621. In the summer of 1622, the clergy received a similar warning, in the form of six ‘Directions for Preachers’ which prohibited sermons that dealt with political matters. The King appeared determined to quash criticism of his foreign policy.

However, these official prohibitions did not prevent ‘[t]he swirl of commentary’ about foreign affairs, which ‘was such that even the French Ambassador wrote home about the “free speaking, cartoons, defamatory libels” he saw about him, and wondered whether these had now turned into “the ordinary precursors of civil war”’. 62 The ambassador’s musings express a similar disquiet to that underlying the criticism of ‘the soe common dispersinge’ of ‘such bookes as vox populi’ – the fear that such texts and such conversations were a challenge to royal authority.

However, this was not the only construction that one might put on ‘free speaking’, or even on ‘defamatory libels’. Even the texts that sought to limit the matters that subjects might speak, write, and preach about might be interpreted in such a way that they allowed, and even legitimised, certain forms of discourse regarding international politics. A subject could, if they read (or listened to) the Directions for Preachers or the proclamations against
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‘excesse of lauish and licentious speech of matters of State’ in particular ways, find space within them for a model of good subjecthood that differed dramatically from the King’s.

Both the proclamations and the Directions for Preachers prohibit discussion of ‘matters of state’ – but neither offers a clear definition of what these might be. The proclamations ordered subjects ‘to take heede, how they intermeddle by Penne, or Speech, with causes of State, and secrets of Empire’. However, they did not define what those ‘causes’ and ‘secrets’ might be, although they did glance at the fact that the country’s relationship to its foreign neighbours was particularly fraught: ‘the relation, which the affaires of Our Kingdomes haue had towards the businesse and interests of forraine States’ had prompted ‘a greater opennesse, and libertie of discourse, euen concerning matters of State, (which are no Theames, or subiects fit for vulgar persons, or common meetings) then hath been in former times, used or permitted’.

More importantly, even if a person reading the proclamation was quite happy to consider everything in which the authorities were involved as ‘causes of State, and secrets of Empire’, it is not at all clear what ‘lauish, and licentious speech’ is, and how it might differ from other forms of discourse. It implies that one might continue to speak and write about ‘matter of state’, as long as one is neither ‘lauish’ nor ‘licentious’ in doing so. For a writer or speaker (or indeed a reader or auditor) who convinced themselves that a piece of discourse did not deserve either of those adjectives, the two proclamations might be considered evidence of the rightness and decorum of said discourse – it does not break the rules stipulated by authority, and so it deserves to be expressed and consumed without punishment.

The Directions for Preachers were more specific: they instructed preachers to stick to subjects mandated by the 1562 Articles of Religion, or the two Books of Homilies (Bishops and Deans of Cathedrals and college churches were exempt from this rule, but only on feast-days); not to preach on Sunday afternoons on any subject other than ‘some part of the Catechisme, or some text taken out of the Creed, tenne Commandements, or Lords Prayer, (funerall Sermons onely excepted)’ and to preferably spend the time ‘examining the
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children in their Catechisme’ instead; and to avoid the subject of predestination (again, unless a Bishop or Dean). The fourth direction vehemently prohibits discussion of constitutional matters:

no Preacher of what title or denomination soeuer, shall presume from hence forth in any auditorie in this Kingdome, to declare, limit, or bound out by positiue doctrine, in any Lecture or Sermon, the Power, Prerogatiue, Jurisdiction, Authoritie, or Duty of Soueraigne Princes; or otherwise meddle with these matters of State, and the references betweene Princes and the People, then as they are instructed and presidented in the Homilie of obedience, and in the rest of the Homilies and Articles of Religion, set forth as is before mentioned by publike authoritie; but rather confine themselues for those two heads, Faith and good Life, which are the subject of auncient Sermons and Homilies.65

The fifth instructs preachers not to castigate either Catholics or Puritans. The final direction ordered that all lecturers should be licensed by the Court of Faculties, and instructed ecclesiastical authorities to be careful who they licensed.66

In other words, the Directions warned preachers away from matters of theological and political controversy and towards well-worn topics and pastoral care, and warned the ecclesiastical authorities to license only preachers prepared to follow these instructions. Like the proclamations, however, the Directions allow a degree of latitude as to exactly what should be avoided. Preachers were ordered not to ‘causlesly, and without inuitation from the Text, fall into bitter inuectiues, and vndecent rayling speeches, against the persons of either Papist or Puritan’.67 However, many preachers may have considered castigation of Catholicism to be justified by the ‘causes’ of war abroad and recusants at home, and may have argued that the expression of such opinions was permitted as long as one did not use ‘bitter inuectiues, and vndecent rayling speeches’. Carefully-chosen Bible verses could also, as Killeen argues, provide means to discuss events on the continent through implicit parallels.68

In both the Directions and the proclamations, meanings are treated as self-evident. According to the proclamations, if someone makes a statement that goes beyond James’s

65 The coppie of a letter [...] directions for preachers, pp.2-3.
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67 The coppie of a letter [...] directions for preachers, p.3.
68 See Killeen, pp.391-401.
bounds of decorum, it is not because they have understood the proclamation’s terms in a more lenient way – rather, they have transgressed in the full knowledge that what they are doing is against the law and against their duty as a subject. For James, a text critical of his foreign policy cannot ‘proceede otherwise, then out of rashnesse, euill custome, or too much passion’. If such a text also contains assertions of loyalty to the Crown, he considers this sophistry:

Neither let any man mistake Vs so much, as to thinke, that by giuing faire, and specious attributes to Our Person, they can couer the scandalls, which they otherwise lay vpon Our Gouernment, but conceiue, that wee make no other construction of them, but as fine, and artificiall glosses, the better to giue passage to the rest of their imputations, and scandalls.69

In his letter accompanying the Directions for Preachers, Abbot describes the Directions having been ‘so graciously set downe, that no godly or discreet man, can otherwise then acknowledge, that they doe much tend to edification’, as long as he reads properly and does not rely on other people’s descriptions of the text: ‘if he doe not take them vpon report, but do punctually consider the tenor of the words as they lie; and doe not giue an ill construction to that, which may receiue a fairer interpretation’.70

Not quite stating what was forbidden might have had practical benefits for the authorities. It allowed them to define what they would accept on a case-by-case basis, meaning they could respond with flexibility to changes in the political situation. As well as this, such ambiguity could make censorship more effective, especially when this was conducted with limited resources. If writers, stationers, and preachers were unclear on exactly what was permitted, then they could not predict who would be targeted by the authorities: the resulting sense of randomness might be far more effective than clearly codified guidelines at frightening subjects away from discussion of political matters. The ferocious response of the authorities to *Vox Populi* may well have dissuaded other writers, and stationers, from expressing overt Hispanophobia in print.

However, this ambiguity also opened a space for those who did wish to discuss such things, and a means by which they might claim legitimacy for their texts or sermons. The
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Chapter 3. Piety, polemic, and the Palatinate, 1620-23

vagueness of James’s proclamations and directions to preachers ensured that one did not necessarily have to define one’s position in opposition to that of the King.

One writer who appears to have attempted to exploit this ambiguity was George Wither. Wither’s 1621 poem *Wither’s Motto* – an epic paean to Wither’s ‘own heart’ – was published in pamphlet form after the first proclamation against ‘excesse of lavish and licentious speech of matters of State’. In his *Motto* Wither praises his own refusal to dissimulate. In ‘these guilty *Times*’ outspoken honesty can be dangerous: ‘such, as loue in speaking to be free; | May for their freedome, to their cost be shent’. Despite this, Wither scorns to suppress his opinions: ‘in an honest action, my heart knowes | No more of feares, then dead-men doe of blowes’. However, he also claims to avoid direct criticism of individuals of political affairs, including foreign ones:

> You are deceiu’d, if the *Bohemian State*  
> You thinke I touch; or the *Palatinate*:  
> Or that this ought of *Eighty-eight* containes;  
> The *Powder-plot*, or any thing of *Spaines*.

Wither uses apophasis to make a contentious point: the juxtaposition places the Palatine and Bohemian crises into a narrative of Spanish aggression against England dating from the Armada and including the Gunpowder Plot. *Wither’s Motto* was considered to have disobeyed the 24 December proclamation – possibly because it also contained veiled criticism of the Marquess of Buckingham, the King’s favourite. Wither was examined before the House of Lords on 27 June 1621 and committed to prison, where he remained until 15 March 1622.

However, Wither later claimed, in *The Schollers Purgatory* (1624), that in writing the *Motto* he merely ‘to conscionable purposes, expressed such resolutions, as euery reasonable man should endeauour to entertayne’:

> And hauing as opportunity was offered, glaunced also in generall tearmes at the reproofe of a few thinges of such nature as I feared might disparage or preiudice the Commonwealth; some particulars,
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not then in season to bee medled withall, were at vnawares so neerely toucht vpon, that I vnhappily fell into the displeasure of the State: and all my apparrant good intentions were so mistaken by the aggrauations of some yll affected towards my indeauours, that I was shutt vp from the society of mankind.\textsuperscript{75}

Wither denies that, in recounting these experiences, he is ‘accusing the State of iniustice: God forbidd’.\textsuperscript{76} Wither has been punished, he argues, simply because the authorities were not in possession of the whole truth: ‘I assure myselfe the seuerity of my sufferings was vn knowne to that most honourable counsel which o mitted [sic] mee; and that more fauour should haue been shewed, if meanes had been afforded mee to complaine’.\textsuperscript{77} His release apparently came about once he was able to explain his actions:

For, the greatest faulte which euer I committed, confessed, or other coulde discouer in those writings; was this, that they sauoured a little more of Honesty than discretion. And verily, should euery man publickely suffer for his indiscretions as I haue done, our prisons must be made larger then our streetes.\textsuperscript{78}

In \textit{The Schollers Purgatory} Wither asserts an inflexibility of interpretation comparable to that which James asserts in his proclamations – although here it is not guilt that is unmistakeable, but innocence. According to Wither, \textit{Wither’s Motto} was not ‘licentious’, and can only be seen as such through misreading born of malice.

The proclamations and Directions for Preachers did not close down constructions of good speech and writing – and of good subjeethood – that allowed for, and even required, engagement with ‘matter of state’. Writing well of the king’s person was surely a subject’s duty, and not all writers or readers seem to have seen the contradiction between the pro-war and/or Hispanophobic arguments they wrote and consumed, and professions of loyalty and admiration for their monarch, given that their monarch’s daughter, son-in-law and grandchildren were at the centre of the conflict in the Palatinate. This is not to say that writers such as Wither did not know that what they wrote was likely to incur royal anger. Rather, it allowed Wither to maintain a position of constancy despite his punishment – to claim that he had not actually transgressed, that his text was not incompatible with the law.

\textsuperscript{75} George Wither, \textit{The Schollers Purgatory, discouered in the stationers common-wealth}, (London: [1624], STC.25919), pp.2-3.
\textsuperscript{76} Wither, \textit{The Schollers Purgatory}, p.3.
\textsuperscript{77} Wither, \textit{The Schollers Purgatory}, pp.3-4.
\textsuperscript{78} Wither, \textit{The Schollers Purgatory}, p.4.
Even within the proclamations and Directions for Preachers, there remained space for definitions of subjecthood that valued freedom of speech.
Part 3: Good – and bad – subjects in ‘licentious’ texts

It appears that, for the authorities and those who reported intelligence to them, Thomas Scott’s *Vox Populi* both indicated and caused a ‘lavish and licentious’ approach to foreign and domestic politics. *Vox Populi* tainted all who came into contact with it: its author, those who printed and distributed it, and its readers. However, one of the issues that Scott’s text itself deals with is the role of the British subject – what a good subject believes, how he acts, and what response this gets from the authorities. *Vox Populi* describes a form of good subjecthood quite different from that commanded by James’s attempts to limit speech and writing: one that rested not on silent obedience to the King and avoidance of what he deemed *arcana imperii*, but on a far more active and vocal approach to foreign and domestic politics. This ideal, and its antitypes, is explored further in a text from 1622, *The Interpreter*, which may also have been written by Scott. These texts present an ideal of subjecthood marked by open expression of loyalty to the King, but not necessarily by obedience to all of his commands.

**Good and bad subjects in *Vox Populi***

In *Vox Populi*, Gondomar makes a startling accusation about some of James’s subjects. Although ‘the English generally loathed the matche, and would as he thought buy it off with halfe of their estates’, there were, he tells the assembled Spanish nobles, ‘two sorts of people [who] unmeasurably desired the match might proceed’:

> First the begging and beggarly Courtyers, that they might haue to furnish their wants. Secondly the Romish Catholiques, who hoped hereby at least for a moderation of fynes and lawes, perhaps a tolleraaion, and perhaps a total restauration of their religion in England.\(^79\)

These recusants, Gondomar reports, ‘will be for Spaine against all the world’; ‘their rage hath [...] perverted their judgements’ to the extent that they speak ‘so basely of their King and State’ that even the Spanish ambassador is shocked.\(^80\) Most worryingly for James, Gondomar says that some British Catholics have vowed ‘they will expend ‘al their friendes and halfe their estates’ in order to ‘procure them the service of our Lady (if she

\(^79\) Scott, *Vox Populi*, sig. B'.
\(^80\) Scott, *Vox Populi*, sig. B'2v.
came to be married too their Prince’) – and even ‘faithfully to fight under her colours, when they might doe it safely’.  

Scott implicitly divides the British populace into three groups – those who ‘loath the match’, courtiers greedy of money and advancement, and treacherous Catholics. James’s love of peace and friendly relationship with Spain has blinded him to the fact that not only are his allies deceiving him, but his own polity is riddled with treachery. Scott describes subjects who are indeed meddling maliciously with ‘matters of state’ – but they are not the subjects that James distrusts. Gondomar claims to have fostered ‘a dislike betwixt the King and the lower house’; this ‘was so cunningly caried the last Parliament, that as in the powder plot the fact effected should haue been imputed to the Puritans (the greatest zelots of the Calvinian sect)’.  

Through Gondomar’s dishonesty, both the events of the present and of the past have been twisted to lay blame on a particular group of James’s subjects:

> Which very name and shadow the King hates, it being a sufficien [sic] aspersion to disgrace any person, to say he is such, & a sufficient barre to stop any suite & utterly to crosse it to say it smels of or inclines to that partie.

Scott’s description of the King’s hatred for the term ‘Puritan’ may not be too far from the truth. Patrick Collinson writes that ‘Puritans, like Catholics, were important parts of the stage scenery composing this king’s worldview [...] both papists and Puritans in their pure, extreme forms defied his regal and divine authority’. To describe someone as a ‘Puritan’ was therefore to assign them to an extreme that the King did not accept.

However, Scott describes ‘Puritan’ being consciously and maliciously misapplied: used to discredit those who oppose Spanish interests, and thus to twist James’s relationship with his subjects. Gondomar describes the label being used to suppress speech and writing critical of the Spanish Match. Subjects ‘both in England & Scotland all for the most part (except such as are of our faith) oppose this match to their utmost, by prayers, counsels, speeches, wishes’:
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but if any be found longer tongued then his fellowes, we haue still
meanes to charme their sawcinesse, to silence them, and expell
them the Court, to disgrace them and crosse their preferments, with
the imputation pragmaticke Puritanisme.  

Those labelled ‘Puritans’ stand in contrast to the Machiavellian Gondomar and the British
subjects that treacherously advance his cause. Through his hatred for ‘Puritans’, James has
not merely misjudged his enemies – he has also misjudged loyal subjects. The ‘free
mindes’ in Parliament who seek to ‘preserve the priviledge of subjects against soveraign
invasion, call for the course of the common lawe, (a lawe proper to their nation)’ are
frustrated by Hispanophilic ‘tyme servers’ who ‘cry the lawes down and cry up the
prerogative’ – flattering the king at the expense of the nation’s good, magnifying his power
while in fact delivering him and his people into the hands of the country’s enemies.  

While Scott does not spell out a systematised notion of a ‘good subject’, he does suggest a
number of attributes: they speak freely when called upon to advise their monarch, they
support the rule of law and the rights of the subject, and they vehemently oppose Spain, so
much so that they would go to considerable personal expense to ‘buy off’ the Spanish
Match. The reference to the readiness of James’s good subjects to expend ‘halfe of their
estates’ to avoid the match implies that the King should rely on the financial generosity of
his subjects rather than seeking a dowry from Spain – and that, if he gets back into their
good graces by breaking off negotiations, ample funds will be freely given. It might also
glance at the public collections taking place at the time for the war in Bohemia and the
Palatinate. Both the Palatine envoy and representatives from Spain and the Emperor were
authorised to collect donations for their forces; as with the recruitment of British soldiers
by Catholic forces, this even-handedness presumably angered those who supported
Frederick.  

Perhaps most worryingly for concerned authorities, these ‘free mindes’ represent the
opinion of most British subjects. Vox Populi does indeed claim to represent the voice of the
people. Hatred of Spain unites apprentices who seek to ‘vent their owne spleenes, in doing
[Gondomar] or any of his a mischiefe’, the majority of the populace, willing to go to great
personal expense to prevent the match, and the mislabelled ‘Puritans’ in Parliament,  
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attempting to preserve the rights of the subject and the sovereignty of the King against Spanish perfidy.

**The Interpreter**

A similar tripartite division of James’s subjects is found in another controversial text, itself tentatively attributed to Scott in the *STC – The Interpreter* (1622). *The Interpreter* deals with three stock figures – a ‘Puritan’, a ‘Protestant’, and a ‘Papist’ – defining them through their political beliefs, speech, and actions, in particular their attitudes to foreign affairs. Like *Vox Populi*, only one of these figures – the Puritan – is presented positively; the other two are dangers to the state. The pamphlet is a sustained redefinition of these three familiar archetypes – one that delineates a notion of good subjecthood very different from that found in James’s public pronouncements.

*The Interpreter* is a tiny octavo volume comprising 16 pages – one sheet of paper. Its full title is *The Interpreter wherein three principall termes of State much mistaken by the vulgar are clearely unfolded*. ‘Much mistaken by the vulgar’ is in italics on the spartan title page of the 1622 work, as is the motto ‘Qui vult decipi, decipiatur’ – ‘Who wants to be deceived, be deceived’.88 There is no author or place of publication listed on the title page; the editors of the *STC* conjecture that it may have been printed in Edinburgh.

As the title suggests, *The Interpreter* is presented as an aid to comprehension: it starts with an address ‘To such as understand not the English tongue perfectly’.89 The title may well be a reference to the 1607 legal dictionary written by the civil lawyer John Cowell, *The Interpreter: or booke containing the significance of words*. This was itself a controversial publication: the government response to it is discussed in detail by Cyndia Susan Clegg in *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*.90 Cowell’s definitions of four terms in particular – ‘King’, ‘Parliament’, ‘Prerogative’, and ‘Subsidy’ – appear to have drawn the ire of members of the House of Commons. In the entry for ‘Parliament’, Cowell contends that ‘of these two one must needes be true, that either the king is aboue the Parlament, that is, the
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positiue lawes of his kingdome, or els that he is not an absolute king’. 91 The King’s prerogative is held to stand above common law. Parliament is thus entirely limited to an advisory role, with no real legal basis for their power. For Cowell the King’s prerogative gives him the unarguable right to make laws without Parliament, and to ‘quash any lawe concluded of by them’. 92 The King consults Parliament on legislative matters because ‘it be a mercifull policie, and also a politeue mercie (not alterable without great perill) to make lawes by the consent of the whole Realme, because so no one part shall haue cause to complaine of a partialtie’ – but not because he has to. 93

The 1622 The Interpreter is a very different text, published twelve years later in a very different political context (and after the acrimonious dissolution of two subsequent parliamentary sessions). However, given the extent of the furore in 1610, it seems reasonably likely that those involved with the publication of the 1622 The Interpreter named this pamphlet in reference to Cowell’s text.

Right from the title page The Interpreter lays claim to a reader savvy enough to resist surface presentations and to bring knowledge of previous texts to bear on their reading. Firstly, the presentation of The Interpreter as an innocuous reference work is laughably insincere: the title echoes a controversial text, and instead of an extensive legal dictionary the pamphlet contains definitions of only ‘three principall termes of State’. ‘Who wants to be deceived’ can ‘be deceived’, but it would take an act of will to be taken in by such a pointedly transparent fiction – unless one is unintelligent and uneducated enough not to be able to read between the lines, or to interpret a short Latin motto. This places the reader in an implied community, of those who ‘get it’. Those who ‘understand not the English tongue perfectly’ are not, in this context, necessarily foreigners, but rather people who do not hold similar political views to those expressed in the text. Language here becomes metonymic of national identity – to understand ‘the English tongue’ in the way that the pamphlet dictates is to be properly ‘English’. The title page thus purports to address one type of reader – a ‘vulgar’ one who does not understand the ‘perfect’ meaning of the ‘three principall termes of State’ – while in fact providing a series of clues aimed at a far more
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observant, if not necessarily sympathetic, reader, primed to look for the signs of controversy and rule-bending.

The 1622 text is much shorter than Cowell’s dictionary, in verse, and it does not deal so much with the respective rights of the King and Parliament as with the role of the subject. The ‘three principall termes of State’ are three terms which would have been extremely familiar to any British reader – ‘Puritan’, ‘Protestant’, and ‘Papist’. *The Interpreter* purports to enable the ‘vulgar’ to understand these terms, and thus the state of which they are a part, through verse descriptions of each of these figures. It purports to explain rather than admonish, thus allowing its reader access to the proper language ‘of State’ and facilitating discussion and debate.

However, *The Interpreter* does not appeal to the individual judgement or interpretation of its reader as much as to their sense of loyalty or identity. Defining ‘termes of State’ has clear polemical potential – definitions are, by their nature, set, stable, and prescriptive. The three terms defined in *The Interpreter* are chosen for more than snappy alliteration; they are political and religious buzzwords, but more than this as well. Each of these terms, for a Jacobean reader, represents a tense intersection of identity and stereotype. Taken together, they simultaneously describe the religious and political variation within the Jacobean polity, stigmatise it, and parody it. While ‘[t]he description of the papist is considerably the shortest of the three, a fact which highlights the relative lack of controversy surrounding the widely vilified category’, the descriptions of the ‘Puritan’ and the ‘Protestant’ ‘are motivated by a commitment to redefine the puritan, and are characterized by a subtle awareness of the capacity of language to shape reality’. 94 *The Interpreter* redefines these two terms in ways that are very different to their normal use in public discourse in the period, in which ‘Puritan’ signified a stigmatised social and religious extreme, while Protestantism was (in theory, at least) the faith of King and country. It thus offers a radically reshaped image of the political nation, and a system of interpreting speech, action, writing and thought that is as inflexible and absolute as that implied by James’s proclamations, and utterly opposed to it.

However, *The Interpreter* frames its renegotiation of Puritan identity as stemming from linguistic conservatism. The address ‘To such as understand not the English tongue perfectly’ begins the poem by describing a society in which the three ‘principall termes of State’ have been twisted from their original meanings:

Time was a Puritan was counted such
as held some ceremonies were too much
retayn’d and urged: and would no Bishops graunt
others to rule, who government did want.
Time was a PROTESTANT was onely taken
for such as had the Church of Rome forsaken
for her knowne falshoods in the highest point
But would not for each toy, true peace disioynt.
Time was, a PAPIST was a man who thought
Rome could not erre, but all her canons ought
to be Canonica, and blindly led
hee from the truth, for feare of error fled.\(^\text{95}\)

‘But now these words, with divers others more | haue other senses then they had before’;
the author promises to describe these ‘elegancies for our tongue’:

[...] as they are used now, among
our ablest linguists, who mint for the Court
words, fit to be proclaimd; and doe resort
where Lords and Ladies couple and converse
and trade lip learning both in prose, and verse.\(^\text{96}\)

This linguistic corruption is linked to sexual corruption, and both are connected to the people and spaces of the court. *The Interpreter* describes how both language and the polity that it describes have been warped out of shape; the words used in proclamations have been remade ‘for idioms, fashions, Manners, after here, | as frendship and religion euerie where’.
Language, like friendship and religion, is rendered unstable when it should be fixed and consistent. Through the words defined in the poem, the reader is told, ‘the docible may see, | how rich our language is, religious wee’. The state of language and the state of society are closely linked, and both have been dangerously disrupted.

\(^{95}\) *The Interpreter*, p.2.
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Chapter 3. Piety, polemic, and the Palatinate, 1620-23

The Interpreter: the Puritan

Each of the descriptions in The Interpreter resembles a Theophrastan character sketch, a literary form that ‘flourished in the early seventeenth century’. However, as Patrick Collinson writes, Theophrastus’s characters are all negative ones, and ‘while English imitators did attempt sympathetic characters this was somewhat foreign to the genre’. The Interpreter, in contrast, begins with an overwhelmingly positive ‘character’, and uses the following two to reinforce the virtue and insight of the first through contrast. The section describing ‘A Puritan’ comes first, and is the longest; it is subtitled ‘(So nicknamed: but indeed the sound Protestant)’. This ‘Puritan’ is not just presented positively – he is presented as the only one of the three figures who is a good, responsible, caring British citizen. As in Vox Populi, ‘Puritan’ is drastically redefined, as a marker of political loyalty and religious rectitude and conservatism rather than political and religious extremism.

The Interpreter’s ‘Puritan’ is plain-spoken and genuine. He speaks freely, expressing his innermost beliefs; there is no disjunction between what he expresses and his beliefs, actions, and identity. He is defined both by these beliefs and by the fact that he chooses to express them. Key to these beliefs is a deep and sincere loyalty to James and his children:

A Puritan is such an other thing
As saies with all his heart, God saue the King
And all his yssue: and to make this good,
will freely spend his money and his blood.

‘And all his yssue’ introduces a charge into the text straight away: like the repeated references to ‘the Kings children’ in A Tongue-Combat, it foregrounds the idea that the Spanish and Imperial offensive struck at people that both the British King and his country should desire to protect and, if necessary, avenge. This notion is expressed with more force in a manuscript poem in Latin by Sir Robert Ayton, which also circulated in an English translation. Ayton writes that by refusing to act on his son-in-law’s behalf, James has committed a failure of emotion:

Nay with vnwater’d, vndew’d cheekes canst see,
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‘This way perhapps a iust King thow mayst seeme, | But men a cruell ffather will thee deeme’.\(^{102}\) Rhyming ‘seeme’ and ‘deeme’ draws attention to the falsity of James’s position – his misjudgement of his ‘sonnes rash vnluckye armes attempt | ffrom th’ Austrian yoake Bohemian necke t’exempt’, and his concern not to appear a ‘con federate’ in this endeavour, has led him to stand idly by, seeming ‘just’ but in fact being nothing of the sort. It also, implicitly, prioritises the judgement of ‘men’ above that of the King. Clegg points out the degree to which the King himself utilised the rhetoric of paternalism in texts such as *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*; this was published anonymously in 1598 but was ‘widely known to have been written by the King’, and was published as part of James Montagu’s *The Workes of the Most High and Mightie Prince, James by the Grace of God, King of Great Britaine* in 1616/7.\(^{103}\) In *The Trew Law*, James describes his relationship to his subjects as that of ‘a loving Father, and careful watchman, caring for them more then for himselfe’.\(^{104}\) The inconsistency between this rhetoric and James’s ‘cruell’ attitude towards some of his actual ‘yssue’ must have been striking, and worrying – if the King refused to act in the interests of his actual children, could he really be relied on to ‘care’ for his subjects ‘more then for himselfe’? Although James’s foreign policy decisions were – according to his rhetoric, at least – taken in order to quell the conflict on the continent and thus preserve his subjects from the dangers of war, both Ayton and the author of *The Interpreter* leave unsaid, but heavily implied, the idea that the King’s failures as a father lead him to fail in his duties towards his subjects as well.

*The Interpreter* describes the Puritan’s opinions on a range of political and religious topics, with foreign policy right at the start. ‘[I]n his factious and fond mood’, he ‘dare say’:

\begin{verbatim}
‘tis madness for the Palsgraue thus to stay  
And waite the loving leysure of kinde Spaine  
who gets at erst, only to giue againe  
in curtesie; that faithless Hereticks
\end{verbatim}


\(^{103}\) Clegg, p.10.

may tast the faith and loue of Catholiques.\(^{105}\)

The tone is heavily ironic, working through a series of what are, in this context, threatening oxymorons – ‘kinde Spaine’, ‘faithless Hereticks’, ‘the faith and loue of Catholiques’. It is ‘waiting on the loving leysure of kinde Spaine’ that has led to the Palatinate becoming ‘a wasted Countrey’ that the Puritan would ‘on condition | Scorne to receiue’, because ‘false favours he’d not take from a true foe’.\(^{106}\) Measures aimed at consolidating friendship with Spain, such as British naval action against Algerian pirates on behalf of Spanish interests, meet with contempt:

A Puritan is hee that rather had  
Spend all to helpe the States, hee is so mad  
Then spend one hundred thousand pound a yeare  
to guard the Spanish coasts from Pyrats feare,  
The whilst the Catholique King might force combine  
Both Holland, Beame, & Paltz to undermine.\(^{107}\)

These free opinions are matched with a commitment to the free expression of them:

A *Puritan* is hee that speakes his minde  
in Parliament: not looking once behinde  
to others daunger, nor yet sidewayes leaning  
to promisde honour, his direct true meaning.\(^{108}\)

The Puritan is not ‘mad’ or governed by his ‘factious and fond mood’, but rather a brave and angry voice of sanity, governed by unshakeable loyalty to his monarch and religion. ‘His Character abridg’d if you would haue, | *Hee’s one that would a subiect bee, no slaue*.\(^{109}\) The choice the Puritan makes is between two opposed and irreconcilable positions – he chooses to claim the identity of a caring, involved, loyal ‘Subject’.

‘Subjecthood’ is, then, something one consciously strives for, while any lesser engagement – or differing opinions – is held to be ‘slavery’. The Puritan’s identity is formed from three interlinked factors – religious belief and affiliation, a belligerent attitude to international Catholicism (especially as regards the Palatinate), and civic duty. These factors are inseparable – each supports and defines the others. One cannot, within this structure of

\(^{105}\) *The Interpreter*, p.3.  
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^{108} *The Interpreter*, p.5.  
^{109} *The Interpreter*, p.7.
value, be a good British subject without willing greater support for the King’s ‘issue’, or without regular acts of devotion – praying twice a day and going to church twice every Sunday, ‘in open sight of all men’. At the same time, political events at home and abroad are clearly interpreted through the lens of confessional affiliation – ‘the faith and love of Catholiques’ – while the prioritisation of the Puritan’s views on foreign policy, and the conclusion stressing his desire to be a ‘subject’ rather than ‘slave’, emphasises the idea that one’s political ideas and actions are clear markers of religious rectitude.

The intersection of ‘private’ and ‘public’ in the Puritan’s trips to church is significant. Each of these factors, like the categories they describe, is simultaneously deeply personal and social/socio-political. Each requires, in answer to the question it implicitly asks, a fixed position that admits no compromise personally, and no toleration socially or politically. To be a good British subject, and a ‘sound Protestant’, one must hold these fixed attitudes. Any deviation can fatally damage the structure of this identity.

_The Interpreter: the Protestant_

On one level, the Puritan’s antitype is the villainous Papist. However, on another it is the character who follows the description of the ‘Puritan’: the ‘Protestant’. Andrew McRae writes that the depiction of the Protestant ‘is perhaps even more significant [than that of the Puritan], as it satirically defines a type of corrupt statesman who is not stigmatized simply as a papist’.111

The verse at the start of the text describes the ‘original meaning’ of the word: in this the ‘Protestant’ is characterised by his rejection of Rome, but makes a conscious decision to be relatively tolerant on minor points of doctrine for the sake of social cohesion – he ‘would not for each toy, true peace disjoyn’.112

In the poem proper, this tolerance has been twisted into corruption and instability. The Protestant’s opinions are not fixed. He ‘is an indifferent man | that with all faiths, or none,
hold quarter can”; ‘he to all times can his conscience fashion’.113 ‘This malleability of “conscience”’, McRae writes, ‘is directly related to a susceptibility to corruption’.114 Any dishonest person ‘ways can find, | By policy to work him to his mind’, thus leading to utter dissolution of the institutions and virtues of the British state:

And thus the common wealth may conquered bee,  
The Church deflowr’d, beslau’d our libertie  
without all bloodshed, under the pretence of peace, religion, loue, and innocence.115

The Protestant is a bad counsellor, concerned more with saying what his monarch wants to hear and what will advance him than what is right. He carries his apparent devotion to the monarch to blasphemous extremes – he ‘makes within his heart God of the King’, and obeys him uncritically ‘as if hee did with his crowne inherite | A never-errring and infallible spirite’. Instead of engaged and honest counsel, the Protestant ‘[l]abours to blow [James] up by praise of witt | And by false flatteries coosen him of it’.116 He keeps James in a state of ignorance, dangerous both to royal authority and to the state itself:

A Protestant is he that guards the eare  
of soveraigne Iustice, so that truth to heare  
hee’s not permitted; nor to know the danger  
he stands in, twixt the subject and the stranger:  
The plots which strangers haue, greefe of his own,  
which may too late be prevented, knowne.117

His response to the Palatine crisis is characterised by unhelpful hand-wringing, and he casts the blame on Frederick V’s presumption rather than Spanish aggression:

A Protestant is one that shakes the head  
And pitties much the Palsgraue was mislead  
to meddle with Bohemia, and incense  
The Spanish wrath, gainst which there is no fense.118

In contrast to the Puritan’s willingness to ‘freely spend his money’ to further the Palatine Cause, and his concern to recover the Palatinate by arms rather than ‘on condition’, the Protestant is concerned with monetary matters to the exclusion of honour:
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That his Revenewes in the Paltz againe were well restor’de hee wishes, so that Spaine would take the honours of that house, and give Mentz his demaunds, letting the Paltzgrae live.\footnote{The Interpreter, pp.7-8.}

‘[F]or such a favour as [Frederick’s] lands and life,’ the poem continues darkly, ‘no one except the father of his wife, | That King of peace and loue dares bouldly craue’.\footnote{The Interpreter, p.8.} Again, the surface meaning of these words – the King is the only person who seeks to preserve his son-in-law’s life and restore him to his lands – conflicts with a barely-disguised alternate meaning. Only James would be so cowardly as to ‘craue’ the life and lands of his son-in-law as a ‘favour’ from Spain; this stands in stark contrast to the Puritan’s willingness to ‘spend his money and his blood’ on behalf of Frederick. ‘That King of peace and loue’ is bitterly ironic: James’s implicit cowardice may well show his desire for peace, but he has failed in his duty of love to his daughter and son-in-law.

The Protestant’s amoral, corrupt attitude to the conflict on the continent and to his service of his monarch make him one of what Wither describes as ‘[o]ur meere Hispaniolized English men’, whose ‘Trecheries at home’ he hopes to ‘scape’.\footnote{Wither, Wither’s Motto, sig.B5’.}

\begin{quote}
A Protestant is hee whose good intention
Deserves an English and a Spanish pension
both for one service, and obtaynes it too
By winning Spaine more then their armes could doe
with long delayes, and loosing us & ours
what lost to get againe we want both powers
And perhaps will.
Others by treaties and disputes may gaine
But wee by blowes, else old sayd sawes be vaine.\footnote{The Interpreter, p.14.}
\end{quote}

\textit{The Interpreter}’s account of the Protestant ends with ‘His Character abridg’dhe if you will haue | Hee’s one that’s no true subject, but a Slawe’.\footnote{The Interpreter, p.14.} The Protestant rejects true, involved, sincere subjecthood, and instead slavishly panders to what his monarch wants to hear, thus playing into the hands of the Spanish.
The Interpreter does not destabilise the categories of ‘Puritan’ and ‘Protestant’ – or, for that matter, ‘subject’ and ‘slave’ – so much as redefine them according to a different set of values, and according to political values rather than theology. The word ‘Puritan’ is not rendered problematic or ambiguous, but simply redefined according to a different ‘worldview’ to that of the King. The difficulties and ambiguities of the use of ‘Puritan’ in The Interpreter are not found within the text, but rather in the ways in which that text might interact with its political and cultural context. If one attempts to make The Interpreter’s system of value square with James’s, one encounters fundamental conflicts which are not always easy to articulate, and are impossible to reconcile. The Interpreter and James’s proclamations and Directions for Preachers express opposed systems by which one might understand the role of the British subject – and, by their very natures, these viewpoints do not admit of moderation or compromise. What makes them particularly irreconcilable is that both appeal to an essential moral consensus based on loyalty to the monarch and on appropriate speech – but define these things very differently.

The Interpreter: the Papist

The third ‘character’ in The Interpreter is not redefined in the same way: as McRae argues, the short description of a ‘Papist’ is a fairly straightforward expression of the widespread vilification of Catholics and the role of Catholic powers in international politics. The opening couplet of the character is a bald and shocking inversion of the Puritan’s loyalty to James: ‘A Romanist is such an other thing | As would with all his hart murther the King’. The Papist’s loyalty, instead, is to the Habsburgs: according to him ‘the house of Austria is appointed’ by the Pope’s command ‘[t]o rule all Christians’:

And they Rebells are
who dare against this house make any warre
Invasiue or defensiue Iesuits witt
And Indian gould, doe both attend on it,
And all Romes Hyrarchy doe plot, pray, curse,
And spend the strength of body, soule, and purse
to this sole end, that every state beside
may be the vassalls to the Austrian pride.
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Led by his attachment to ‘the house of Austria’, the Papist engages in his own linguistic destabilisation, dubbing any who oppose Imperial interests ‘Rebells’. His interpretation is presented as warped, the clear opposite of the Puritan’s. But, the poem continues, it is not just the Papist whose categories are distorted, but society itself:

[...]
no Romish false opinion
Can make a Papist in the Kings dominion.
Nor absence from the Church, for at this season
Hee is no Papist that commits not Treason
Let him to Church resort, or be recusant
Alls one, hee’s counted a good Protestant.  

Even Guy Fawkes, we are told, would not be counted a Papist nowadays: to be counted as anything other than a ‘good Protestant’, a person’s planned atrocities against the state actually have to work. The implication is damming: British society has departed so much from its Protestant norm that it no longer recognises its traditional enemies.

Here the author of *The Interpreter* invokes the memory of a violent Catholic plot against the British establishment and connects it closely to Spain and to current Spanish political interests. Both the Spanish Match and the conflict in the Palatinate become means through which Spain can damage England; the actions of the Spanish in the ‘wasted Countrey’ under their dominion a stark warning of what will happen to England under Spanish rule. The final line of the poem sums up the Papist’s character, in the same manner as the previous two have been ‘abridg’d’: ‘Hee is Spaynes subiect and a Romish Slaue’. The Papist is ‘enslaved’ by his religious beliefs: Catholicism is described as the antitype of involved subjecthood.

**Good subjects and responsibility**

Both *Vox Populi* and *The Interpreter* define an archetype of a good ‘Subject’ – and they do so against two forms of what *The Interpreter* terms ‘Slaves’, both of whom are presented as threats to the state. The model of subjecthood these texts advocate is active, confessionally partisan, and free-spoken. It is also, crucially, loyal to the King. *The Interpreter*’s Puritan does not wish to seize power from his monarch – he self-defines as a subject of James, and

---
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his opinions and actions are motivated by a desire to serve his King well and honestly. However, the terms of this service are not defined by the King. The Puritan supports what he considers to be the King’s interests, and he prioritises the frank expression of these views over the King’s expressed wishes.

The Puritan, then, may not want to topple the monarchy, but he does believe himself to be better at judging what is beneficial to the King, the King’s family, and the state, than a misadvised monarch. The Palatinate is central to the issues on which the Puritan departs from the King: the Puritan considers the interests of the King’s deposed relatives to be James’s own, and therefore that to voice support for those interests is to display one’s loyalty to the King as well as to international Protestantism.

Both texts argue that rather than persecuting those labelled ‘Puritan’, the King should direct his ire at those at the other end of the religious and political spectrum: towards any subjects who refuse to condemn Spain, whether because they are Catholic or because, like The Interpreter’s Protestant, they hope to gain from the Spanish Match. The real threat to James’s sovereignty comes from the ambition of Spain, who, as Vox Populi’s version of the Duke of Lerma explains, plan to ‘get the whole possession of the world’.  

In Vox Populi, Scott presents Spanish ambition corrupting the relationship between monarch and subject, and the very language used to describe that relationship. Lerma reasons that the title claimed by Spanish kings, that of the ‘most Catholic majesty’, meant that the Spanish King had absolute temporal dominion comparable to the Pope’s ecclesiastical dominion, and thus that he could use ‘any stratageme of war or pretence of peace’ to depose rival monarchs. This reasoning fatally disrupts the language of morality and of state: ‘[w]hat the ignorant call treason, if it be on this behalf is truth; and what they call truth, if it be against him is treason’. In a polity ruled by Catholic Spain, Scott writes, the qualities at the very heart of good British subjecthood – loyalty, truthful and honest counsel – are twisted and corrupted: a similar violence to the desecration of Protestant churches in the Palatinate described in More Newes [...] and more comfort. The influence of Spain on James’s court has caused a similar disruption of the categories of subject – a disruption that The Interpreter claims to rectify. Political and religious language has slipped
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from its original meanings, reflecting and perpetuating the corrosive influence of Spanish Catholicism. According to *Vox Populi* and *The Interpreter*, the King cannot judge his subjects correctly: under the sway of Spain, the categories by which he attempts to do so have warped. It is the duty of the honest, loyal, and religious subject to speak freely in order to bring both King and country back to correct understanding and action.
Chapter 3. Piety, polemic, and the Palatinate, 1620-23

Part 4: Printed sermons and appropriate action

The image of a good British subject presented in *Vox Populi* and *The Interpreter* is, of course, an extreme. These texts are presented anonymously, and make rhetorical capital from an idea of oppositional, dangerous free speech. Those who produced them and those who consumed them partook consciously in the market for illicit squibs and broadsides.

However, the Palatine conflict was also addressed outside of this market. Thomas Cogswell writes that during 1622 ‘[t]he most troubling and persistent criticism came neither from the theater nor the taverns; rather it came from the pulpits’. A number of preachers were punished or cautioned for being, like Sampson Price, ‘to busie with Rochell, the Palatinate, & the Spanyard’. James’s Directions for Preachers instructed clergy not to deal with ‘the Power, Prerogatiue, Jurisdiction, Authoritie, or Duty of Soueraigne Princes’, or to rail against Catholics or Puritans.

However, this did not mean that preachers ceased to deal with the Palatinate. As Kevin Killeen details, preachers could touch on current affairs through their choice of Bible verse without necessarily glossing the parallels. Meanwhile, preachers often mentioned the Palatinate and the Palatine family in ways that were not, it appears, considered ‘to busie’. The fact that references to the conflict, and prayers for the Palatine people and electoral family, were not in themselves necessarily matters for reprimand is indicated by the way in which they frequently feature in those sermons that made it into print, accompanied by the names of the clergymen who preached them. It is these texts that are my focus in the final part of this chapter: printed texts explicitly published to instruct the reader how to believe and behave, which focus on specific religious action.

In fact, many preachers may have seen it as their pastoral duty to refer to the sufferings of continental Protestants. The providential worldview of English Calvinism prompted believers to interpret all events – in particular, those involving conflict between Catholics and Protestants – as part of both the micro and macro levels of Protestant providence. What happened in the Palatinate was significant to individual believers on two levels. Firstly,
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God’s chastisement of the Palatine Protestants carried a powerful prompt to their brethren to repent and reform. Secondly, the conflict was part of God’s eternal plan for the world, which tended inexorably to Protestant victory and the destruction of the Catholic Antichrist; it was important to act correctly both on an individual and corporate level in order to share in that victory. Within this worldview, there was no clear and watertight distinction between dealing with the Palatinate and, in the words of the Directions for Preachers, sticking to matters of ‘Faith and good Life’.

References to the Palatinate in sermons, therefore, might not necessarily indicate an adversarial attitude towards royal foreign policy – or, at least, not only that. Some preachers did call for war, with varying degrees of clarity. However, even while doing so the focus remained on the messages that an individual believer should take from the conflict – the prompts to repentance and reformed behaviour. The individual responses to the Palatine conflict advocated in sermons are, of necessity, more concerned with a believer’s relationship with their own soul and with those of others than with their relationship to the wider polity or to their monarch.

Consequently, a number of printed sermons from this period claim the importance of their own role in persuading the believer to the correct course of action regarding the Palatine conflict, and sometimes dictate the ways in which they should be read. The reader should consider the plight of the Palatinate a prompt to reform their life and repent of their sins, as well as to humbly submit to God’s power. However, several of these writers also stress the importance of caring for and sympathising with the beleaguered Palatine Protestants: of taking action to relieve and support them, not necessarily military, but devotional and emotional.

**Repentance**

Thomas Jackson’s decision to publish the ‘six sermons’ that make up his *Judah Must into Captivitie* was taken, he writes in ‘the Epistle Dedicatory’ to Sir Isaac Sidley, in order to
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reach a greater number of people than were present when the sermons were preached, to preserve the sermons for prosperity, and to facilitate a particular way of consuming them:

It is a true saying, that Printing is a kinde of Preaching; and though not so plausible and effectuall to perswade; (wanting the habit and gesture of a living man, the life of Oratorie) yet is it both of larger extent, (seeing a man may preach to moe with his penne, than he can with his tongue, and be further heard out of the Presse, than the Pulpit) the matter delivered more memorable, (affording greater leave to pause and consider) and also of longer continuance; for a dead man may live in his bookes, and by them preach to the living, though unborne, when he dieth.\textsuperscript{137}

Jackson imagines his readers pausing over his words, considering them, and committing the matter to memory. He is more specific about desired reading practices in his address ‘To the Reader’, exhorting them to ‘[r]egard the matter, and be not offended by the matter, though simple, plaine and popular’, and a promise that ‘[i]f it shall please thee to accept them kindly, read them devoutly, censure them charitably and lovingly, correct such errours, as may have escaped Author, or Printer, being so farre asunder’, he may publish some ‘Lectures, wherein I have taken greater paines’.\textsuperscript{138}

Why should the reader read Jackson’s words with such care? Jackson presents \textit{Judah Must into Captivitie} as an urgent message that should be communicated to as many people as possible, as clearly as possible. ‘Oh, now is the time (if ever)’, he writes, ‘for Ministers of the Gospell \textit{instantly to preach the Word}; and now (if ever) to presse the practice of repentance: \textit{Gods judgements are abroad in the world}, and can no other way be prevented’.\textsuperscript{139} Although the sermons in \textit{Judah Must into Captivitie} `were delivered to many`:

yet me thought, the matter doth so fitly concerne these daies and times, as there arose a great conflict in my bosome, and I could not have peace till I was resolved, to communicate them further: that (by Gods blessing) I might helpe to awaken moe out of security, and provoke them, by fasting and prayer, to make up the hedge and stand in the gap, for the Land, that he should not destroy it. Thus, by Gods providence, these Sermons are come to thine eyes to read,

\begin{flushleft}\textsuperscript{137} Thomas Jackson, \textit{Judah Must Into Captivitie} (London: 1622, STC.14302), sigs.A\textsuperscript{r}-A\textsuperscript{v}. \textsuperscript{138} Jackson, sigs.A\textsuperscript{v}-A\textsuperscript{v}. \textsuperscript{139} Jackson, sig.A\textsuperscript{v}.\end{flushleft}
who (it may bee) wast farre off when they were preached by word of mouth.\textsuperscript{140}

The danger in which ‘the Land’ stands makes it imperative to reach as many people as possible, to ‘awaken [them] out of security’, and to persuade them to take action ‘by fasting and prayer, to make up the hedge and stand in the gap, for the Land, that he should not destroy it’. The calamities visited upon the people of Bohemia and the Palatinate were, Jackson writes, warned of by ‘the faithful servants of God’ in those countries, ‘who zealously reproved their profanation of Sabbaths, taking of Gods name in vaine, drunkennesse, whoredome, pride, covetousnesse, and foretold the judgements of God without repentance’, as well as by the comets seen over Europe in the autumn of 1618 – ‘[t]hey saw that terrible blazon, and heard that stately tongue of Heaven, which preached these things to them that had eares to heare’.\textsuperscript{141}

British readers should not assume that God’s warning refers only to the foreign churches: ‘[w]e saw also that prodigious starre, we heard that Lecture, (I feare you will forget it.).’\textsuperscript{142}

To the warnings of the comets have been added those of the conflict on the continent: ‘[a]nd unto them all adde this, as the greatest of all, that by the calamitie of our neighbours he doth admonish us to repent, who (for any thing that I know) are as great sinners as they’:

\begin{quote}
Assuredly it may be your owne case, if England will not repent but provoke the Lord, trust in vaine and lying words, and not be warned by the fearfull judgements of God upon Bohemia, Palatinate, and other places: hee may sweare in his just anger to be avenged, and not heare his servants though they pray, and cry for it.\textsuperscript{143}
\end{quote}

‘Let vs in the name of God turne before it is too late’, Samuel Buggs writes, ‘lest wee repent when it is too late’.\textsuperscript{144} England is fortunate, especially compared to many countries on the continent, but British men and women should not become complacent – ‘Let vs not cut off our welfare by our wickednesse’.\textsuperscript{145}
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The injunction to react to the misfortunes of foreign Protestants by examining one’s own conduct is the key message in printed sermons and religious tracts that touch on foreign affairs. Cogswell quotes Samuel Buggs’s *Dauids Strait* as an example of a text that urges such focus on inward matters instead of on the rights or wrongs of James’s foreign policy; attention to one’s spiritual state is here interpreted as a withdrawal from contentious political engagement. In other words, Buggs instructs his readers to conceive of themselves as souls in peril, rather than political subjects. Spiritual self-examination is a force for social cohesion principally because it distracts the subject from questioning events and policies beyond themselves.

However, in the light of the politicised Protestant providentialism examined above, religious observance and self-examination can be seen to relate closely to political engagement – or can even be considered forms of political action themselves. John Brinsley’s *The Third Part of the True Watch* describes an overwhelmingly positive view of the role and actions of ‘our dread Soveraigne’: James ‘now only strives to helpe to awaken us out of our deepest securitie, in the midst of our extremest perill, and necessitie; and when the times call us to watch and pray, yea to fast and pray’.¹⁴⁶ For Brinsley, James’s actions proceed from desire not to curtail the freedom of his subjects, but to save their souls, and to protect his country from the wrath of God. The things the King apparently wants his subjects to do – ‘to watch and pray, yea to fast and pray’ – are figured as essentially social as well as internal: all of James’s subjects must do this. Crucially, they are protective, needed because the nation is ‘in the midst of our extremest peril’, and must be deployed tactically – ‘when the times call us’. This recalls Jackson’s hope to ‘provoke’ his readers ‘by fasting and prayer, to make up the hedge and stand in the gap, for the Land, that he should not destroy it’.¹⁴⁷ The observances of individual British Christians are here likened to military action. To pray and to examine one’s soul is not to withdraw from political engagement: in these texts, praying, fasting, and repenting are publically, politically engaged actions.

¹⁴⁶ John Brinsley, *The Third Part of the True Watch* (London: 1662, STC.3786), sigs.*3r-*3v.
¹⁴⁷ Jackson, sig.A3v.
Emotional connection

Brinsley calls upon his readers to ‘pray for the distressed state of all the poore Churches, and our brethren abroad, who mourne and wring their hands by reason of their slaveries, butcheries, manifold feares and miseries, both of their soules and bodies’. ‘Above all’ the reader should pray ‘for them of Bohemia and the Palatinate, the very chiefe of them a principall part of our selves’. Brinsley specifies an emotional response: readers must ‘[take] their case to heart as feeling members, little knowing how soone it may be our owne’. The notion of emotional response is important to many sermons and religious tracts. Jackson hopes ‘to have the praise of teares, rather than of tongue’: ‘My desire was, rather to worke upon the affections than the understanding; there being much more knowledge than devotion. Our forefathers disease, was ignorance; ours, impiety; they sicke in the braine; but we, at the heart’. Thomas Gataker’s 1621 printed sermon A Sparke toward the Kindling of Sorrow for Sion discusses the importance of such a response at length. Gataker deals with a particular sin of omission – that of failing to mourn for the misfortunes of others. His text is Amos 6.6, ‘but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph’. Gataker compares British men and women with the complacent Israelites in Zion described by Amos, who, ‘though their brethren [...] were in great distresse, in grieuous calamities [...] gaue themselves wholly to eating and drinking, to feasting and banqueting, to riot and reuelling’. ‘The affliction of Ioseph’ was, Gataker writes, ‘bitter, (by the incursion of strangers, their enemies) for there was nothing almost shut vp, nor left them, nor any at all that helped them.’ However, the failure that Gataker most excoriates those in Zion for is not the failure to offer physical help, but the failure to feel appropriate sympathy. ‘[T]he dutie required of them, but wanting in them’, Gataker writes, is ‘dolor, aegritudo; griefe, sorrow, yea sicknesse: for so the word properly signifieth: as being a sinne, not to be grieued at the heart, yea not to be heart-sore and sicke againe with griefe, as things then stood’. This duty was occasioned by ‘a most heauie and extreme calamitie, though not personally on
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themselves, yet on those that ought to be right neere and deere vnto them, their brethren’.\footnote{Gataker, p.7.}

British men and women, Gataker writes, are guilty of a similar ‘\textit{Coldnesse} and \textit{Numnesse}’:

we are growne insensible of our owne euils; and notwithstanding the ruefull and lamentable estate of the Church of God, in most parts at the present, and the insupportable afflictions that the Lords Faithfull Seruants, our Brethren, and fellow-members in Christ Iesus, doe by occasion of these hurly-burlies daily endure; yet the most regard it not, nor take any notice at all of it, saue as matter of newes and nouelty, to furnish discourse, or to feed their itching Athenian-like humors withall.\footnote{Gataker, sig.A3r.}

Gataker accuses British men and women of consuming news ‘to feed their itching Athenian-like humors’, but not taking the appropriate divine lessons from what they read and hear. This ‘\textit{[argues]} an vter want of zeale to Gods Truth, and love to his flock, when nothing affecteth men, but what they personally feele, or feare may befall themelves’\footnote{Gataker, sig.A3v.}. Gataker’s ‘\textit{Sparke}’ is intended ‘\textit{[t]}o helpe therefore to re-enkindle this heauenly Fire, that with many seemeth languishing and ready to goe out, and to repaire this holy Heat, so much every where impaired through the Iniquitie of the times’\footnote{Gataker, sig.A3r.}.

‘It is the dutie, and hath bee the practise and propertie of Gods people,’ Gataker writes, ‘to take to heart the crosses and calamities of their brethren, and to be affected with them as their owne’.\footnote{Gataker, p.20.} The ‘\textit{maine vse}’ of Gataker’s sermon ‘\textit{is to admonish vs euery one, laying to heart that which the Prophet heere speaketh, to cast our eyes about into foraine parts abroad, and consider what cause God hath giuen vs to bee euens sicke againe with sorrow}’:

Can we heare daily reports of our brethren in foraine parts, either assaulted, or distressed, or surprised by Popish forces, and a main breach made into the state of those that are by bonds, ciuill and sacred, so nearlye knit to vs, and yet esteeme all as nothing, or thinke that we haue no iust cause to mourne and lament? Neither let any man say; What is their affliction to vs? What are those parts to these? What is \textit{France} or \textit{Germanie} to \textit{England}? For what was \textit{Ierusalem} to \textit{Antioch}? Or what was \textit{Iuduo} to \textit{Macedonia} and \textit{Achaia}? Yea, not to goe farre; What was \textit{Iudah} to \textit{Ioseph}? Or

\begin{footnotes}
\item[153] Gataker, p.7.
\item[154] Gataker, sig.A3'.
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\item[157] Gataker, p.20.
\end{footnotes}
Samaria to Sion? And yet is Sion heere taxed, euen as well as Samaria, for the not commiserating of Iosephs afflictions.  

Failing to feel in this way is ‘[a] signe thou art but a sorie Christian, whosoeuer thou art that so speakest or thinkest, that no more regardest Christs cause’. A strong emotional response to the suffering of Protestants in the Palatinate is, for Gataker, a key marker of true Christian identity. Richard Harris makes a similar argument in Gods Goodnes and Mercy:

as King Richard bestowed himselfe diversly, at his death, so must wee in life; Bohemia claimes a part in our loue, the Palatinate a part, the Churches abroad, our Brethren at home, a part: at home, in selling we must be buyers, in lending borrowers, in visiting patients, in comforting mourners; abroad, we must in our owne peace consider their warres, feele them panting, see them bleeding, heare them scriching; O husband, O wife, O my child, my child, O mother, mother, my father is slaine, my brother is torn, my legge is off, my guts be out, halfe dead, halfe alieue, worse then either, because neither. O that wee had heartes to bleede over them, and to pray for the peace of Ierusalem.

Cogswell argues that in A Sparke toward the Kindling of Sorrow for Sion, Gataker goes beyond calling for ‘a general repentance in England’ to claim that ‘England must as well “helpe and releeve” the foreign Protestants. If England evaded this clear obligation, God would find “other meanes” to relieve Bohemia and the Palatinate’. Failing to provide effective help and relief would lead the British to suffer the same fate as their foreign brethren. ‘This chilling threat turned the plight of continental Protestants into a clarion call for intervention’.

Gataker does indeed argue that British men and women ‘should shew [their] compassion towards [their ‘distressed brethren abroad’], by being forward, according to [their] ability, to helpe and releeue them. Let vs loue, saith the Apostle, not in word and tongue; but in deed and truth’. This help must be tangible: ‘our brethren are not of the Chamoeleon
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kind; to liue with Ephrain upon winde; to bee fed with faire words. We must goe further then so, if we wil shew our sorrow for them to be sincere’. 164

However, it is important to note that most of A Sparke toward the Kindling of Sorrow for Sion is concerned with individual emotional and spiritual response, rather than with direct military or financial action to regain the Palatinate. The call to be ‘forward’ is the last of the four instructions ‘whereby [we must] shew that we are unfainedly affected with the afflictions of Ioseph’. 165 It is preceded by exhortations to keep the ‘distressed brethren abroad’ in mind and imagine oneself in their place, to examine one’s soul and repent of sin, and to ‘striue by prayer to God for them’. 166 First and foremost, Gataker stresses the importance of appropriate feelings; feelings that are produced actively, through reading and mindfulness. These are a key part of sincere Christian British identity: those ‘that doe not heartily bewaile the distresses of those, whom it so neerely concerneth them to haue a regard of [...] are but carkasses of Christians’. 167 Gataker’s true, ideal Christian is quite different to that described in Vox Populi or The Interpreter: the key marker of his or her identity is not willingness to speak out, but willingness to feel and to act. Emotion, in particular, cannot easily be dubbed ‘licentious’; unlike speech or writing, an emotional response does not in itself ‘rail’ at or ‘meddle’ with matters of state. In calling for prayer and fellow-feeling, Gataker advocates engagement with foreign affairs that transcends issues of decorum.

164 Gataker, p.37.
165 Gataker, p.34.
166 Gataker, pp.34-35.


Conclusion

The conflict over who should, speak, write, and read about the war in the Palatinate was also a conflict over different views of subjecthood – both of which used the language of loyalty, duty, and consensus. The view publicised by the King, in the proclamations against ‘excesse of lavish and licentious speech of matters of State’ and the Directions for Preachers, rests on the idea that certain issues were *arcana imperii*, and thus beyond the reach of subjects. Discoursing on such subjects, except in forums and manners expressly permitted by the King, was a breach of decorum and an expression of seditious discontent. Meanwhile, polemicists such as Henry Hexham and, in particular, Thomas Scott took a very different line, arguing that good British subjects should have certain common and inflexible opinions on matters of state and should be prepared to express them vocally, even when that was disadvantageous or dangerous.

In effect, both the texts issued by James to curb discussion of matters of state, and those written by the likes of Thomas Scott, address a consensus that is rhetorically necessary but impossible on a practical level. The discourse which both employ is rooted in ideas of unity and loyalty. Meanwhile, both deal in moral absolutes: the concepts they express are stable, univocal, and non-negotiable. *The Interpreter*’s conception of good subjecthood allows for no deviation from its prescribed attributes. By refusing to define the parameters of ‘matters of state’ and ‘licentious speech’, James’s proclamations both allow for some latitude in interpretation and for the idea that the King’s meanings should be clear to a loyal subject, and thus that transgressions of decorum spring not from misunderstanding but from wilful sedition. In short, this conflict is based, on one level, on competing arguments as to what a loyal subject should do and say – but, on a much deeper level, on competing definitions of what loyalty, and subjecthood, are in the first place.

The opinions expressed by both polemicists and the authors of printed sermons were rooted in an anti-Catholic eschatology that saw God working in the world both on a micro level – chastising specific sins – and on a macro one, in which Protestantism was destined to finally triumph over the Popish Antichrist. It was the duty both of individual Protestants and Protestant States to pay close attention to both narratives, to take the appropriate lessons from God’s chastisement of themselves and others, and to act in such a way that they would partake in Protestantism’s earthly victory. Reading about the Palatinate, in news
texts and in sermons and polemics, could be linked to some of the key tenets of Calvinist belief. For writers such as Buggs and Gataker, this was above all a matter of an individual’s relationship to providence. One’s loyalty and duty to the King and his children, and commitment to the cause of international Protestantism, need not be expressed through oppositional speech or writing: it might be expressed through prayer and emotional response.
Chapter 4. ‘This was the sinne of Israel, now of England’: War, hope and memory, 1623-26

The journey to Madrid made by Prince Charles and George Villiers, Marquess of Buckingham, in 1623 failed to secure Charles a Spanish bride, but brought dramatic consequences for British politics. Charles and Villiers, now a Duke, returned to London in October 1623, and were greeted with widespread public celebrations. Thomas Cogswell has demonstrated that Charles’s abortive trip to Spain precipitated a major political change. The Prince and the favourite worked with Hispanophobic members of Parliament in order to effect ‘one of the more dramatic reversals in early Stuart history; in 1624, James abandoned his longstanding entente with the Spanish Habsburgs for a bellicose policy of confrontation, which the following year led to open war’.1 This ‘blessed revolution’ was not without setbacks and compromises, as Cogswell traces, but does constitute a significant change in British foreign policy.

Charles was greeted by what Cogswell describes as an ‘unprecedented flood of pamphlets’ dealing with issues that had been matters for punishment, censorship, or at least tacit avoidance in the preceding years. Anti-Catholic literature, ‘which had been conspicuous by its absence from booksellers’ stalls at the height of the Anglo-Spanish entente, made a dramatic reappearance in 1624 both in sheer numbers and in the virulence of the contents’.2 Most of these publications were theological works that avoided open discussion of current affairs, but a significant number of texts dealt openly with ‘political themes’, interpreting both domestic and foreign politics according to anti-Catholic thought. Among these works were pro-war pamphlets by polemicists such as Thomas Scott, Alexander Leighton, John Reynolds, and George Marcelline – the main subjects of the first three parts of this chapter. For these writers, the ‘blessed revolution’ was a prompt for publication for a number of reasons: the works they published in 1624-25 celebrate the changes of the present, mourn the inaction of the past, and predict a bright military future.

The first two parts of this chapter deal with the key features of these texts – firstly, the notion that the return of Charles, the 1624 Parliament, and the ascendency of
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Hispanophobic foreign policy unified a country that had been fractured and discordant before, and secondly that the outspoken counsel offered in polemical texts had remained constant even when it was dangerous to utter it. By stressing how the changes of 1624 had brought the country renewed unity and safety, the polemicians who celebrated the ‘blessed revolution’ emphasised that James’s foreign and domestic policies of 1620-23 had been misadvised and morally abhorrent: deviations from the political and religious norm which had endangered the monarch’s subjects, his family, and even James himself. Moreover, they stressed their own role as providers of stable, truthful counsel, who would not change their advice or keep silent even when it was dangerous to speak.

In this version of events, what triumphed in the ‘blessed revolution’ was stable good counsel, and what followed Charles’s return from Spain was a return to earlier values. Cogswell stresses the degree to which the ‘blessed revolution’ was understood as a return to ‘the heroic days of Elizabeth, back to a Spanish war and Protestant unity’. Appeals to national pride in the feats of Leicester and Drake were key to pro-war rhetoric both before and after Charles’s return; these references were facilitated by Elizabeth Stuart’s rather rhetorically convenient name, as well as by the fact that many of those involved with the defence of the Palatinate and, later, the preparations for war in 1624-25 were veterans of Elizabethan campaigns in the Low Countries.

However, polemical writers did not need to reach back to the ‘days of Elizabeth’ to find figures to admire and emulate – and patterns of good action in response to perceived Catholic aggression could be found in the print market as well as in the barracks. The ‘unprecedented flood of pamphlets’ calling for war in 1624-25 contained many which openly referred to a time when such publications would not have been welcomed by the authorities. John Reynolds wrote in his dedication to Vox Coeli that he had originally written the text in response to the Parliament of 1621, but that he did not publish it then for fear of punishment, having seen pro-war preachers, and texts such as ‘Scots loyal Vox Populy’, suppressed. Reynolds thus related his own text to the most famous polemic of recent years. He also claimed that his own position had remained stable since 1621, and that in 1624 government policy had changed to accept this point of view.
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In the third part of the chapter, I examine how these polemicists constructed their roles in relation to that of the figure whose return from Madrid had prompted these changes in foreign policy. Reynolds and Leighton both addressed polemical pamphlets to Charles, both praising his role in bringing about the ‘blessed revolution’, and stressing the need for him to act in certain ways. These writers defined a role for Charles in relation both to his sister and to his subjects.

I then go on to explore, in the fourth part of the chapter, how polemicists envisaged the war that they hoped for, particularly in relation to the individual subject. The ‘good subjects’ presented in pro-war texts published in 1624-25 desire war against Spain, because such a confrontation is justified by Spanish treachery and historical precedent. These writers do not deal with specifics about tactics or finance, instead arguing that Britain is sure to be victorious because of the commitment of its people and the rectitude of its cause.

However, the ‘blessed revolution’ did not precipitate military successes. In fact, the interventions in the war made in the first years of Charles’s reign were expensive failures, while 1625 saw a devastating attack of plague. Disagreements over how to prosecute and pay for the war led Charles to dissolve Parliaments acrimoniously in 1625 and 1626. His subsequent need to raise money without them led to a fraught relationship with many of his subjects, particularly over the Forced Loan of 1626. In the final part of this chapter, I concentrate on reactions to the plague and the ill-fated Cadiz expedition of 1625. Firstly, I look at the ways in which texts dealing with the epidemic interpreted it in light of the international situation, and of Britain’s past and present foreign policy. Interpreting plague as divine punishment was a commonplace; but in texts by writers such as Thomas Dekker and Sampson Price, one of the most prominent sins for which Britain was being chastised was failure to act appropriately in regard to the Palatinate. The plague thus provided a means to discuss the relationship of Britain and the British to the continental conflict, and to the all-encompassing divine providence that controlled both plague and war.

I then examine the response to the Cadiz expedition in Thomas Scott’s Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost, or Englands forewarner, arguing that – despite the failure of the British fleet – Scott’s rhetoric remained consistent. The stability of pro-war rhetoric from 1620-23, through the ‘blessed revolution’ of 1623-24 and the upheavals and disappointments of 1625-26, was a means by which polemical writers dealt with both an unstable present and
an inglorious past. The Palatinate became a space for British heroism, and for revenge, and for divinely-ordained Protestant victory – and also a memory of a failure, a stain on the country’s honour that needed to be wiped away, but which, in the face of England’s problems in 1625-26, proved stubbornly resistant.
Part 1: The Prince’s return

‘[N]ow the Land, which thirty weekes did mourne, | Dries her tear’d face, and finds her ioy returne’ claimed a broadside celebrating Charles’s return in October 1623.\(^5\) A number of texts report an outpouring of popular joy. John Taylor gave a glowing account of the celebrations in *Prince Charles his Welcome from Spaine*:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{THe Bels proclaim’d aloud in euery steeple,} \\
\text{The ioyfull acclamations of the people. […]} \\
\text{The Bonfires blazing, infinit almost,} \\
\text{Gaue such a heat as if the world did roast.}\(^6\)
\end{align*}\]

Such elation was ‘soon immortalized’, Cogswell writes, in ‘poems, squibs, sermons, plays and buildings’.\(^7\) Underlying these celebrations may well have been joy at a predicted break with Spain, as Cogswell argues – but such sentiments were left largely unstated immediately following Charles’s return. Writers focused on the joy that Charles’s return had brought, and the unity that this had brought to the country. The entire country was emotionally devastated by the Prince’s absence, and correspondingly overjoyed at his safe return, which according to John Taylor ‘[did] like the radiant Sun expell all the dismall and moody cloudes of griefe and melancholy’ under which the country had languished.\(^8\) The texts accompanied striking public celebrations, recorded in accounts by writers such as Simonds D’Ewes, John Chamberlain and even Archbishop Laud. While the assertion in *The High and Mighty Prince Charles*, the anonymous broadside mentioned above, of some people ‘for meere ioy, burning their whole estate; | That Brittaines Prince might not find them ingrate’ may be something of an exaggeration, the number and size of the celebratory bonfires lit in London (despite the October rain) seem to have been remarkable.\(^9\) Textual expressions of joy and thankfulness appear to have formed part of an intense atmosphere of public celebration.

Of course, it is impossible to gauge the motivations of everyone who gathered around the bonfires. The celebratory texts by Taylor and others also cannot be taken at face value: as with the polemical texts I discussed in my previous chapter, it is impossible to be certain
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how far they reflected the national mood, or how far they may have shaped it in reality. What these texts and the street-theatre of the bonfires did was express a rhetorical point: the general joy unified the country. *The High and Mighty Prince Charles* features a large illustration, which brings together royals, nobles, and commoners. James welcomes his kneeling son home in the foreground, royal counsellors watch the reunion, and in the background a group of commoners celebrate around a bonfire.

Joy over the Prince’s return did not necessarily mean joy at a predicted break with Spain. Although Charles had returned without the Infanta, the Spanish Match had not been broken off, and writers in 1623 tended to be cagey when describing his time in Madrid, why he had left, and what he might do now. One could interpret the celebrations simply as relief that the Prince had escaped the dangers of international travel. Nathaniel Butter sold two pamphlets translated from accounts by the Spanish newsletter writer Andres Almansa y Mendoza; these celebrated Spanish hospitality and the political links forged between the
two countries. According to Mendoza, Charles was driven from Spain by nothing more sinister than the wishes of his father and his countrymen. James wished for his son’s return not because ‘he feared any malitious danger could fall vpon him, (There,)’, but because he feared the dangers of the return journey, ‘when those two inuincible Pirats of the Sea, (the windes and the waues) should fall out and fight one against another, might play the Traitor and take him from vs’. The High and Mighty Prince Charles stresses that the King of Spain ‘euer to his Highnesse did maintaine | Royall respect’, and does not mention Charles’s motivations for returning.

Expressing joy at the Prince’s return was not, therefore, incompatible with a friendly attitude towards Spain – it all depended on what one believed had happened there. Positive perceptions of Spanish hospitality might even modify long-established Hispanophobia. In a broadside ballad entitled Prince Charles his Welcome to the Court, or, a true subject’s loue for his happy returne from Spain, William Hockham expresses thanks to Charles’s hosts for their kind treatment of him: ‘Spaine we shall loue thee in despite of hate, | Who loued that Prince, that makes vs fortunate’. Hockham describes fears over Charles’s absence as groundless, based on ignorance that has now been dispelled by the Prince’s return: ‘We feard, but fearelesse, was our cause of feare, | Charles was well vsed, while he liued there’. The ‘more than common’ hospitality of Spain is grounds for hyperbole – ‘Greater content was neuer giuen no man’ – and proves that ‘the great King of Spaine’ has ‘[a] princely mind’. Hockham even expresses hope that these good works will ensure the salvation of the Catholic Spaniards: ‘May all that vs’d him well, be vs’d as well, | May they in happinesse eternall dwell’. Moreover, given this good treatment, British people should speak and write kindly of the Spanish: ‘May Britaine striue, to giue that goodnesse praise | That sent our hopes, dispairing here delayes’.

However, this friendly attitude towards Charles’s hosts was soon overtaken by more negative accounts from writers such as Thomas Scott and John Reynolds, especially once
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the 1624 Parliament commenced and it became increasingly clear that the Prince of Wales, at least, favoured breaking off negotiations with Spain.

Unsurprisingly, some of the most scathing criticism both of Spanish hospitality and of glowing accounts of it came from the exiled polemicist Thomas Scott. In *Boanerges*, a pamphlet purporting to be ‘the humble supplication of the ministers of Scotland, to the High Court of Parliam [sic] in England’, Scott describes how the treatment of Charles worsened noticeably following the defeat of Christian of Brunswick at the Battle of Stadtlohn in August 1623. Although Charles ‘[rigged] out a Nauy, and [selected] the Commanders to please the King of Spaine’, following Stadtlohn ‘Spaine with Ixion bosted, he must lie with Iuno: and the house of Austria swelled so big, that if the tumor of pride be not pricked downe, it will burst with her own greatnes and presumption’. In their new-found security, the Spanish started to treat Charles disrespectfully: ‘the noble Prince found a kind of remisnes and relaxation concerning his first entertainment, & peraduenture being a pathick to some indignities, he and the Navy were all dismist without the Lady or any dispatch of the businesse’.

Scott inverts the respectful and hospitable relationship described by Hockham and Mendoza: he associates Spain with the adulterous and treacherous Ixion, who attempted to seduce Juno while Jupiter’s guest. Scott stresses social grace and conformity on the part of the British, and casts the Spanish in the role of the traitorous, ungrateful guest. In this interpretation, it is Charles who has done his hosts great favour, which his hosts have requited with deceitful and insulting behaviour. It is incomprehensible that this behaviour has not caused James to break friendship with Spain: ‘we in Scotland did wonder how so great and so wise a King could either be misinformed, or rely on any Temporiser to go forward with uncertainties’. In the light of this, Scott writes scathingly about those who produced positive printed accounts of the Prince’s stay in Madrid:

and yet for all this you in England printed more books of the Princes royall entertainment in Spaine, and like childrens wormseed it was trimmed ouer with gold and put into candid stuffe, that is, it had
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braue phrases and oratory, with some things that sauored of impossibilitie.\textsuperscript{18}

Scott may be singling Mendoza’s books out for particular opprobrium, as his words – ‘royall entertainment’ – echo the title of Mendoza’s pamphlet \textit{Two Royall Entertainments, Lately Giuen to the Most Illustrious Prince Charles, Prince of Great Britaine}. Scott then refers to ‘a second booke’ which ‘told you of a second entertainment which the Prince had in Spaine’ – he may be referring to a book that is no longer extant, or perhaps he mistakes \textit{Two Royall Entertainments} for two separate texts. This second book ‘had such an exotik phrase, that when it came amongst vs, we reputed it a very Rhomantidos indeed: for the author invented words neuer in any author before’: these foreign pretensions imply, firstly, that this account is a tellingly un-British one, and secondly that it is fictional.\textsuperscript{19}

Scott then goes on to describe ‘a third booke of the Princes farewell, and reciprocall gifts bestowed between Spaine and vs’ – this may well be Mendoza’s \textit{The Ioyfull Returne}, which contains an account of ‘[t]he royall and princely gifts interchangeably giuen’.\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{quote}
this was as vinegar to the teeth and smoake to the eyes of the subiect: for had not their hearts been seasoned with the ioy and gladnes for his returne, their mouths had cursed outright, and wished such deceiuers the womans reward, that for golde betrayed her countrey, and had so much layd vpon her, that they pressed her to death.\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

The ‘deceiuers’ might be those who have received some of Spain’s ‘gifts’ upon Charles’s departure. They may, however, be those who have published positive accounts of Charles’s treatment by the Spanish – and thus profited from subjects’ joy at the Prince’s safe return, while deceiving them about Spanish behaviour. Scott stresses both the truth of his account and his moral duty to deliver it – fitting in a tract titled after the surname meaning ‘the sons of thunder’, given by Christ to two sons of Zebedee, and often used to signify ‘a loud vociferous preacher or orator’.\textsuperscript{22} In Scott’s version of events, the country was unified not just by depoliticised joy at the Prince’s safe return, but by a particular interpretation of events – and by rejection of those who publicised contrary interpretations. The people’s joy may have stopped their tongues, but Scott’s pamphlet is, he writes, there to ventriloquize
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their unspoken thoughts, which are univocal: ‘public opinion’ is simply that, a single opinion. Through this, Scott both stresses national unity and clearly draws its boundaries. The polity is made up of those who reject positive accounts of Charles’s stay in Spain, and those who produce such accounts are ‘deceiuers’ rather than ‘subiects’.

In the address to Parliament at the start of Vox Coeli, John Reynolds goes even further in his description of Spain’s unkindness towards Charles, enumerating their crimes in a sequence of rhetorical questions:

Hath not the King of Spaine dealt treacherously with him about his match with the Infanta his Sister, yea haue they not in his Princely person, violeted the Lawes of Hospitality, and the priueldges of Princes (when being vnder his owne roofe) by attempting to tye him to formes, which were diametrally opposite to his honour; yea, to be so audatiously impudent, as with much violency and virulency to seeke to put a rape vpon his Conscience, and Religion, and proffered inforcement of his Conuersion to Popery

Reynolds also blames the Spanish for breaking the match, having intended all along to marry the Infanta to the Emperor’s son, the Archduke Ferdinand. The Spanish sources examined by Glyn Redworth indicate that Reynolds was correct: Philip appears to have had no intention of allowing his sister to marry a Protestant, and his favourite the Count of Olivares planned to marry her to Ferdinand as part of ‘a grand dynastic revolution’. Reynolds asks whether ‘all these premisses considered, hath not England reason to hate Spaine, in regard Spaine hates it?’

As well as this, Reynolds writes, the Spanish have ‘temporized so cunningly, and subtillized so trecherously’ when pressed about the Palatinate, ‘till in the end they had made the cure worse then the disease’, and were forced to admit that they could not force the Emperor to return the electorate. ‘Thus hauing abused, first our King the Father, and then our Prince the Sonne, they haue now likewise betrayed and ruined our Princesse the
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23 Reynolds, Vox Coeli, sig.A4'.
24 In the light of the transferral of the Palatine electoral dignity to Maximilian of Bavaria, Olivares planned for Prince Frederick Henry, the eldest son of the Palatine couple, to be brought up at the Imperial court as a Catholic, in order to marry him to the Emperor’s younger daughter. Meanwhile, Charles would marry the Emperor’s elder daughter, the Archduchess Maria Anna, and the Infanta Maria would marry Ferdinand. Glyn Redworth, The Prince and the Infanta: The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), pp.18, 66-71.
25 Reynolds, Vox Coeli, sig.B'.
Daughter in their finall Conquest, and resolute detention of the Prince her Husbands Palatinate’. 26

The Spanish had also, Reynolds tells us, instructed Charles ‘vpon his returne into England, to waerr vpon the Protestants’ and offered him ‘an Army to suppresse and exterminate them’. 27 ‘And will our King, and our Prince, our Parliaments, and our Protestants of England, then euer forget this inueterate rage, and infernall malice of Spaine against them?’ Reynolds asks. 28 The British King, both his children, and his subjects, have all in turn been insulted, abused, and endangered by Spain.

Both Scott and Reynolds described Spanish behaviour in terms of entrenched anti-Catholicism; as described in my previous chapter, the actions of ‘Spaine our opposite’ provide a means by which to locate, define, and circumscribe both what was good and what was British. 29 If Catholicism was, in the words of Peter Lake, ‘a perfectly symmetrical negative image of true Christianity’, then the treatment of Charles in the court of the ‘Most Catholic’ King of Spain was apparently a perfectly symmetrical negative image of true hospitality. 30

26 Reynolds, Vox Coeli, sig.B'.
27 Reynolds, Vox Coeli, sig.A4'.
28 Reynolds, Vox Coeli, sig.B'.
29 Scott, The Belgick Souldier, sig.A2'.
Part 2: The country reunited

Boanerges is presented as a ‘supplication’ from Scottish clergy to the English Parliament, to whom Vox Coeli is also dedicated. Through this, both writers focus attention and hope on the 1624 parliamentary session – on its role in uniting the King with his people, both sides of the Scottish border. At the start of Vox Coeli’s dedication, Reynolds reminds MPs of their duty to God and to all of the country’s estates:

To you whom God for his glory, our Soueraigne for his honour and safety, and our Church and Common-weale for their flourishing well-fare and prosperity, doe expect much by your transcendent and honourable imployments: To you I say, and to no other, doe I present this Consultation.

Reynolds presents a united polity as something that can be achieved and preserved – but only through diligent work by the new Parliament. By describing the Prince’s stay in Madrid in such dark terms at the beginning of the session, both Scott and Reynolds made it clear that retribution against Spain should be a parliamentary priority.

The proceedings of the 1624 Parliament – judiciously selected and presented – became, for Thomas Scott at least, an expression of political unity and consensus. A particularly striking expression of this new-found harmony is found in the engraved frontispiece to his Vox Regis, published after the first session had concluded. It shows, as the verses facing it explain, a dramatic piece of political theatre:

[P]Eerless Prince Charles, his Sister doth present
With her lou’d Spouse in publike Parliament:
Pleads their Iust cause, in honourable hight
Of Speech and Passion, vnto which, their sight
In Sable Weedes, adds flame; as Flint with Steele,
When nimble Timber doth the quick sparkes feele.

Scott stages a return even more dramatic than that of Charles from Madrid. Charles, Elizabeth and Frederick kneel before James’s throne, holding hands, gazing up at the King; James sits at the centre of the image, below a cascade of heavenly light pouring from the words ‘VOX REGIS’. He holds his sword unsheathed in his hand. As the poem explains, the

31 Reynolds, Vox Coeli, sig.A3.
32 Scott, Vox Regis, verso of title page.
sight of Elizabeth and Frederick has swayed the King from his former peaceful courses: angered ‘to heare | And see Himselfe, in his owne Flesh [...] abused’; James draws his sword and commands his people to war.

The nobles are also ‘with this sight prouok’d’; ‘led | By him who now pursues, what earst he fled’, they join James, crying ‘Therefore we are Peeres’. The country’s other estates also do their parts: ‘The Clergie pray; The Commons for their parts | Seale their consent with Purses, Tongues, Hands, Hearts’. The estates surround the royals on three sides. To their right two rows of nobles raise their swords, and to their left two rows of clergy raise their hands in prayer. Behind them, at the bottom of the image, a crowd of commoners each raise both of their hands in the air, clutching in one their purses, and in the other their flaming hearts. Unlike the regimented rows of nobles and clergy, the throng of commoners spills beyond the margins of the image; the positioning effectively situates the viewer among them. Placed around the figures are Bible quotations expressing the love and unity of purpose between the monarch, his children, and his people.

---

33 Scott, Vox Regis, verso of title page.
Figure 9: The frontispiece to Thomas Scott's *Vox Regis* ([Utrecht]: 1624, STC.22105.5). © Trustees of the British Museum.
The image depicts the King’s declaration of war as an emotional and physical reaction to an encounter that could not take place, given that Elizabeth and Frederick were in exile in The Hague. The polemical point is clear: if James and his counsellors could just see how losing the Palatinate had affected the couple, they would immediately declare for war. Scott envisages the call to war travelling out through the country’s estates, each of whom prove their worth – ‘Therefore we are Peeres’ – through their reaction to the sight of the Palatine couple. Everything – nobles, clergy, commoners, the kneeling royals, the heavenly light, and the Bible quotations – converges on the figure of the King.

The image and poem illustrate the idea that Charles’s return and the Parliament that followed had effected a remarkable change both in Britain’s foreign policy and in the relationships between the different parts of its polity. Britain had not merely reclaimed the heir to the throne from the clutches of their enemies – the return had prompted an alteration in policy which itself had reunited a fractured country. To the reunion of James and Charles, Scott adds the reunion of the King and his daughter and son-in-law; the resulting resumption of fatherly feeling by James reunites him with his subjects.

Crucially, this reunion takes place ‘in publike Parliament’. The James of Scott’s poem and image no longer treats foreign policy as arcana imperii, conducting it away from public view: his decision to declare war is witnessed and seconded by all of the estates of his realm. Parliament is the setting – quite literally, in the case of the image – in which the country becomes whole again.

The summoning of Parliament in February 1624 represented, for many, an opportunity to repair the mistakes of 1621, when the session had been acrimoniously dissolved by James after he considered MPs to have criticised the Spanish Match too boldly. Following the dissolution of the 1621 Parliament, Scott writes in Vox Regis, ‘[o]ur euils grew great and sweld higher and higher euerie tyde [...] our Ship tost aloft, as high as the Cloudes, saw nothing but Rockes of ruine to light on, and us poore Passengers expected death’. However, the state eventually came to ‘a calme, and the sweet sound of that Trumpet, which bad our hopes, and a new Parliament, arise together from the dead’.

35 Scott, Vox Regis, p.49.
Vox Regis was published after the first session of the 1624 Parliament had concluded in May. Much of it is taken up with a triumphant account of the session’s achievements. Scott’s account of the Parliament is fairly detailed, containing accounts both of the King’s speeches and of Parliamentary actions and petitions. However, he marshals his accounts of Parliamentary events in order to stress agreement, unity of purpose, mutual respect, and alacrity. Any sense of disagreement, or even of diversity of opinion, is missing. The complex negotiations, disagreements, misunderstandings and compromises of the session – carefully traced by Cogswell and Robert E. Ruigh, amongst others – has no place in Scott’s polemical account of the 1624 Parliament as a theatre of national unity.36

Scott’s approach is demonstrated in his treatment of James’s interactions with Parliament in mid-March. Scott describes how James gave a speech to the Commons on 8 March, in which he praised and thanked MPs, and then went on to discuss war finance. Scott presents James’s praise of Parliament as a quotation, and then glosses over the main purpose of the address, merely noting that ‘matter of mony, the summe and the meanes to raise it [...] is the Sinew, yea the verie Soule of Warre, and must be proviided for before any worke could be vndertaken’. Scott then adds that this address had not pleased all of the Commons: ‘because there was something in this Speech of his Maiesties mistasted (perhaps by mistaking) his Maiestie was gratiously pleased to expound and explane himselfe more cleerly and fully by Letter, the seuenteenth of March’.37 The letter cleared up matters: James reiterated his promise to be advised by Parliament, and requested an augmentation of the subsidies for the war effort but nothing for his personal debts. In response, ‘as a glad Eccho to such a gratious and musicall explanation, the whole House of Commons’ expressed ‘harmonious close and consent’.38

The address in question seems to have been that given by James on 14 March. MPs had prepared a general resolution to fund the war, but had not promised specific subsidies: James asked them to discuss the particulars of what they would provide, and ‘still insisted on parliamentary assistance with his debts’.39 James’s demands discomfited many of the

37 Scott, Vox Regis, p.52.
38 Scott, Vox Regis, p.52.
39 BR, p.195.
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Commons. He did indeed reiterate his address in a letter of 16 March, which was distributed to MPs ahead of a complex, heated debate on subsidies on 19-20 March.\textsuperscript{40}

In Scott’s version of events the Commons effectively offer up their purses to the King along with their hearts. Wrangles over finance are almost completely elided, presented as a minor and easily-fixed issue of miscommunication. Scott glosses over any sense of disagreement and confusion, and instead envisages King and Parliament harmonising like music: the Commons echoing the King’s respect for the Parliamentary process, and his resolution for war, much as all the estates of the realm echo James’s response to Frederick and Elizabeth in \textit{Vox Regis}’s frontispiece.

**Criticism through celebration: \textit{Vox Regis}’s uses of the Bible**

However, this apparent harmony contains within it possible criticism of the King. The Bible quotations on \textit{Vox Regis}’s frontispiece seem, on first glance, straightforwardly celebratory. However, when one reads them in their biblical contexts, they can appear ambiguous or even critical. Scott’s readers were immersed in a culture that valorised close reading of the Bible, both personally and in public; meticulous biblical exegesis was an important part of sermons, and reading the Bible alone or with friends and family was crucial to Protestant experience, especially for those who might identify themselves among the godly.\textsuperscript{41} The detailed knowledge of the Bible achieved through these habits of worship meant that, for many readers, a Bible quotation could indicate a range of associations that might challenge or conflict with the way in which that quotation was being used. The quotations on the frontispiece of \textit{Vox Regis} are taken from contexts that do not straightforwardly celebrate national unity or royal authority: contexts that Biblically-literate readers would have been well aware of.

Above the King a quotation from Ecclesiastes 10.2 reads ‘A wise man’s heart is at his right hand’; towards it points James’s sword, held in his right hand.\textsuperscript{42} The clergy are also on James’s right hand, perhaps suggesting that the King is guided by them. However, this quotation becomes rather more pointed if one looks at the verse from which it is taken: ‘A

\textsuperscript{40}See BR, pp.195-226.
\textsuperscript{42}Ecclesiastes 10.2.
wise man’s heart is at his right hand; but a fool’s heart at his left’. Ecclesiastes 10 as a whole deals with the dangers of ‘folly’ in those who wield power, and the verse quoted on the frontispiece is surrounded by verses that are rather less approving of authority, such as ‘there is an evil which I have seen under the sun, as an error which proceedeth from the ruler’ (10.5), and ‘Folly is set in great dignity, and the rich sit in low place’ (10.6). One could apply the latter verse to the image in order to disparage the monarch, given that James sits on a dais, with his children kneeling below him, the nobles and clergy standing below him on each side and the crowd of loyal commoners positioned at the bottom of the image. Perhaps the most potentially critical verse of all is 10.4: ‘If the spirit of the ruler rise up against thee, leave not thy place; for yielding pacifieth great offences’. While none of these other verses actually appear on the image, for those with a good knowledge of the Bible – who presumably made up a good number of Scott’s readers – the short quotation from 10.2 might be taken to gesture towards the issues raised in Ecclesiastes 10 more generally.

Next to Frederick and Elizabeth, a quotation from 2 Samuel 5 – ‘Beholde wee are thy bone and thy flesh’ – may also be intended to imply the whole of the verse from which it is taken: ‘Then came all the tribes of Israel to David unto Hebron, and spake, saying, Behold, we are thy bone and thy flesh’. James therefore takes the role of David, and the imagined reunion of James and his daughter and son-in-law represents also the reunification of a nation. The reunification of Israel under David, and the successful wars that followed, was a popular parallel for polemicists in 1624. Alexander Leighton refers it in his appeal to Parliament at the start of Speculum Belli Sacri (1624):

Which Assembly we pray, may be like that assembly of David and his States in Hebron; where first they made a covenant before the Lord, and thereafter went to warre against the Iebusites, and then against the Philistims, and overcame them both. Strike your Covenant then with the Lord, and your warre shall surely prosper.

Leighton’s celebration also strikes a note of caution – if those assembled in Parliament do not ‘strike a covenant with the Lord’, then it is not necessarily certain that the war will be successful.

---

43 Ecclesiastes, 10.2-6.
44 2 Samuel 5.1.
Another quotation from 2 Samuel is placed at the bottom of the image: ‘And all the people tooke notice of it, and it pleased them: as whatsoever the king did pleased all the people’. However, again this seemingly innocuous expression of unity becomes more problematic when placed in its original context. 2 Samuel 3, from which the quotation is taken, deals with the visit of Abner to David’s court in Hebron, and his murder there by Joab, the commander of David’s army. David buried Abner, and then fasted to prove his own sorrow and innocence – it is this fast that the people ‘tooke notice of’. In context, then, this verse refers to a king distancing himself from an immoral and unpopular crime committed by a prominent subject, and demonstrating his sadness over it.

Above the commoners is a quotation from Judges 5, tilted towards the King: ‘My heart is toward the Governours of Israel, who offered themselues willingly among the people’. Judges 5 recounts Deborah’s song after the victory of the Israelites over the Canaanite King Jabin and his captain Sisera; in it, Deborah describes the apostasy of the Israelites before she began to prophesise to them. The verse before that quoted on the frontispiece is ‘They chose new gods; then was war in the gates: was there a shield or spear seen among forty thousand in Israel?’. Through the prophecies of Deborah and the military leadership of Barak, the Israelites had been led back to God and had achieved victory over the Canaanites; the celebration of their victory is deepened by the remembrance of the sin they had been in before. The ‘Governours of Israel’, in this context, are those who kept the faith, and who volunteered for war even while others were mired in sin and apostasy. In the light of this, the quotation on Scott’s frontispiece becomes rather ambiguous – are the ‘Governours of Israel’ the King, the Prince, and their advisors? Or might they be those, such as Scott himself, who did not waver from opposing Spain, and expressed their opposition despite the danger of doing so?

Another quotation from Judges 5 is placed above the clergy: ‘The starres in their courses fought against Sisera’. Taken from the account of Barak’s victory over the Canaanite captain Sisera, this text describes divine intervention in a just, and successful, war to liberate the people of Israel from Canaanite tyranny. However, the use of this text may also be a reference to more recent history. John Donne had preached on this verse in his 1622

46 2 Samuel 3.36.
47 Judges 5.9.
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49 Judges 5.20.
Paul’s Cross sermon defending the Directions for Preachers. Donne had quoted the verse as ‘The Starres in their order fought against Sisera’, and had focused on the idea of ‘fighting in order’: in Donne’s interpretation, this was to submit to the judgement both of God and of royal authority, and thus to contain oneself within the courses prescribed by the state.\(^{50}\) Donne argues that ‘the Warre, which wee are to speake of here, is not as before, a Worldly warre, it is a Spirituall warre’. In this conflict ‘[p]reaching is Gods ordinance, with that Ordinance hee fights from heauen’, but it needs to be controlled: preachers ‘must fight, as the Stars in heauen doe, In their order, in that Order, and according to those directions, which, they, to whom it appertaines, shall giue them: for that is to fight in Order’.\(^{51}\)

The use of this text in the frontispiece to *Vox Regis* may be a means to emphasise the fact that matters have changed since 1622. In 1624, it appeared that one might ‘fight’ – martially, politically, and spiritually – against international Catholicism, while remaining within the ‘courses’ approved by the King. More controversially, it may be an attempt to reclaim it from Donne’s interpretation and stress its martial import: the idea that fighting ‘in one’s courses’ was both a spiritual matter and a temporal one. Following the King’s change of heart, all the country’s estates were now fighting ‘in their courses’, when previously they had deviated from them. In the harmonious Parliament of 1624, every member of the country’s estates – including the King and his son – had played their appropriate parts. However, this celebration of current joys contains concealed within it recognition that things had not been so harmonious in previous years.

The hidden criticism of James offered in the frontispiece is succeeded, in the text itself, by far more open censure of James’s governance over the previous four years. Perhaps the criticism is concealed on the frontispiece in order to make the book appear, on first inspection, a reasonably uncontroversial celebration of the 1624 Parliament. However, I would argue that these Bible references each offer a sort of hidden message for Scott’s more Biblically-literate readers; they signal to these readers that this text will not provide straightforward celebration of Charles’s return and developments in Parliament. Secondly, these are criticisms that cannot be openly stated. Applying unflattering Bible references to a monarch risks implying that the monarch himself has been found irreligious. To write this

\(^{50}\) See Jeanne Shami’s interpretation of this sermon and its context in *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003), Chapter 4, ““faire interpretation”: the Directions and the Crisis of Censorship’, pp.102-138.

explicitly would be extremely dangerous, and would also damage Scott’s assertion that he has done his civic and spiritual duty by remaining loyal to James throughout the 1620s. Hiding these possible criticisms within quotations that appear celebratory means that the potential criticism can only be realised through the interpretations of readers, and can easily be characterised as misreading.
Part 3: Change and stable counsel

Change

According to Scott’s account in *Vox Regis*, in his opening address to Parliament the King ‘professeth to awake as a man out of a sweet dreame, whose *wants are doubled by the delusion*’. The new-found harmony described by polemicists rested on the notion that it was born from the King’s – and the country’s – ‘deare-bought experience’. The country was brought together in 1623-24, but it had been sundered in 1620-23. Polemicists thus dealt with the earlier period as a formative trauma: a time when true subjects and true citizens had been subjected to mistrust and persecution, at home and abroad, instigated by Spain. The celebrations of change contained within them the castigation of what had gone before.

In Scott’s version of James’s address to Parliament, the King reaffirms his commitment to the struggle against international Catholicism, and undertakes to listen to the counsel of MPs. James, we are told, ‘desired [Parliament’s] councell and assistance, promising to be ruled by them, and to doe no weightie business without them’. Scott follows this with raptures: ‘Is not this wonderfull? Doe not these words, if we had them, and could so set them downe as they were deliuered, deserue to be lodg in euery Subiects heart?’ The active subjecthood expressed in *Vox Populi* and *The Interpreter* was, according to *Vox Regis* at least, now valued by the King – and good subjects, who wished their king to be well-counselled, should treasure this change.

In *Vox Regis*, James blames bad counsel for his previous inaction, explaining to Parliament that he had ‘beene wronged and deluded, by dallying Treaties’. The notion that unwelcome royal behaviour or policies came about not because of failings on the monarch’s part, but because of the greed, malice or stupidity of those who counselled them, was a commonplace of political critiques. Such a position did not entirely neutralise criticism of the monarch – after all, a wise king or queen should be able to tell an honest man from a liar or flatterer – but it did mean that threats to the state could be identified as non-royal figures who could theoretically be removed or marginalised. In *Vox Regis* this
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52 Scott, *Vox Regis*, p.50. Scott’s emphasis.
53 Scott, *Vox Regis*, p.50.
54 Scott, *Vox Regis*, p.50.
role is taken by the Spanish and those British men who support their negotiations. However, Scott also describes James as partially to blame for his own delusion. Honest counsel is, Scott writes, only efficacious when the monarch is prepared to listen to it – which James, in 1620-23, had not been:

\[
\text{doth not this manifest the truth of that what Salomon saith, that The Kings heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the Rivers of Water; he turneth it whithersoeuer he will? Before this change none could moue him, all humane applications were as if men set their shoulders to a Rock: Nay all endeavour this way, procured more violent and resolute opposition: But now his heart is moued by God, it moues him, and he moues them, who would but could not moue him before, wils them to make hast, and to be swift in their motion, thereby to make amends for former delaies.}^{55}
\]

Scott praises this change of heart, but at the same time he stresses that James had previously been wrong. Divine assistance might be necessary to change a king’s mind, but it would have been better for monarch and country if James had listened to those who tried to counsel him to break with Spain, rather than offering them the ‘violent and resolute opposition’ he could more fittingly have directed at the troops that invaded the Palatinate. This contradicts the image of resolution moving from the King outwards depicted on Vox Regis’s frontispiece – in fact, James’s decision to prosecute war is presented as a belated realisation of what ‘every subject’ already knew.

**Free speech in dangerous times**

The stated purpose of Vox Regis is to defend Scott’s decision to publish his most famous polemic, Vox Populi, four years previously. Scott makes three claims for his text, and for himself as its author. Firstly, he defends Vox Populi’s content, claiming that it was truthful, apposite, and that its boldness was not sedition or licence. Secondly, he asserts that it was appropriate for him, a lowly minister, to write such a thing. Thirdly, he describes the peril the country stood in in 1620, and argues that this made a text like Vox Populi not only reasonable but actually necessary.

---

55 Scott, Vox Regis, pp.50-51.
Through this, Scott celebrates the notion that the country has averted disaster, through the Prince’s return and a successful Parliament – and, perhaps, also through the outspoken counsel offered by Scott and others. By breaking with Spain and declaring for war to regain the Palatinate, Scott argues, the fractured British polity had been reunited, and the country had reassumed its dynastic and religious responsibilities. *Vox Regis* is a triumphant celebration of a reformed and rejuvenated nation: but also a cautionary account of just how close Britain had come to disaster.

According to Scott, Britain in 1620 was riddled with sin and religious backsliding. Catholicism was tolerated by the authorities and on the rise among the citizenry, while the country’s foreign policy appeared intended to benefit its enemies rather than assist its allies. Britain was failing to counter ‘the generall combination of Romane Catholiques, both at home and abroad, against the Kings Children: and the forraine enemies violent and bloudie pursuite of all aduantages against them, and such as professe the Reformed Religion’. ‘[A]broad all went to wracke, and at home no remedie was thought vpon’; or, rather, what was decided upon was not sufficient or appropriate: ‘Spinola with speed enters, and possesseth the Palatinate with an Armie; and we seeke to dispossesse him onely with perswasie Arguments of amitie and iustice’. At home, British Catholics openly declared their support for the Emperor, and sought to obstruct the collection of a benevolence for the defence of the Palatinate.\(^{56}\)

Meanwhile, according to Scott, those who spoke out against this state of affairs were mislabelled, their objections neutralised by accusations of sedition:

> I saw it was made an infallible note of a Puritane, and so consequently of an ill subiect, to speake on the behalfe of the Kings Children: and a certaine prooфе of a good Protestant or a discreete and moderate man, to pleade against them for the Empeour, and King of Spaine, who are euer linked and interested together in one cause\(^{57}\)

Like *The Interpreter* in 1622, *Vox Regis* describes a society in which key signifiers of religious and political identity had become dangerously detached from their original meanings, and used to discredit those who sought to amend the sins of the state.

---

\(^{56}\) Scott, *Vox Regis*, p.21.

\(^{57}\) Scott, *Vox Regis*, pp.21-22.
However, like *The Interpreter*, *Vox Regis* describes a form of subjecthood which denies these redefinitions: a good subject, in these texts, is one who speaks out even when speaking out is dangerous. Scott answers the accusation that he had no ‘lawful vocation’ to write *Vox Populi* with the argument ‘That euerie mans vocation bindes him to preuent euill, and to doe good’:

> the generall calling of a Subiect, and of a Christian, warrants any particular action, which I doe for the benefit of the State and Church, whereof I am a member; or for any part thereof, though my particular calling affords me no such Commission.⁵⁸

In fact, Scott argues, his status as ‘a Member of the Multitude’ allowed him to see what the King could not, as ‘the Commons are they, where the disorders of the State, & the mischiefes approching, are first felt, and soonest discerned’. In the light of this, Scott’s ‘Office’ was ‘to see, to watch, to speake, to blowe the Trumpet, to giue warning both of the sinne, and of the punishment for sinne’.⁵⁹

Scott ends each paragraph of his description of 1620 with the words ‘Was it not then a time to speake? Was there not a cause?’. *Vox Populi* was, Scott writes, a responsible response to an intolerable situation: it offered extreme criticism of the country’s ills because those ills required an extreme remedy. Scott’s refrain is adapted from David’s words to his brother Eliab in 1 Samuel 17.29, where David explains his decision to leave his family’s flock in the care of another shepherd and join the battle against the Philistines: ‘And David said, What have I now done? Is there not a cause?’⁶⁰ Scott quotes the original near the end of *Vox Regis*, where he addresses James directly: ‘pardon that which I now write: pardon that which is past. For what haue I now done? Is there not a cause?’.⁶¹ Scott aligns his decision to publish his polemical pamphlets to David’s decision to leave his responsibilities in order to respond to the Philistine threat: a decision that led to a dramatic Israelite victory.

This comparison suggests that concern for the safety of his monarch and state permits a subject to discount issues of decorum and even his monarch’s commands, and express himself freely even though this may be dangerous. In David Colclough’s words, *Vox Regis* ‘offers a series of arguments for the necessity of free speech and for the impossibility of
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silence in the troubled times of the 1620s’. In his examination of how free speech – *parrhesia*, in its rhetorical form – was conceptualised and discussed in the early seventeenth century, Colclough distinguishes *parrhesia* in classical rhetoric and in the New Testament, where ‘[i]t becomes […] a Christian virtue’, but notes that both forms refer both to private interaction and to ‘the duty to counsel and admonish those in a superior position to the speaker’:

*parrhesia* as a Christian virtue was something to be exercised among friends or brethren and in one’s relationship with God through prayer, but also defined the proper relationship of the individual Christian to those in power. This relationship should consist, Scripture made clear, in the bold and truthful witnessing of the word of God without fear, whatever the circumstances.

Speaking freely to the monarch – or, in Scott’s case, addressing him via a book, ‘[b]y which meanes I had hope it should arriue at his Maiesties hand more safely then by any other passage’ – was thus of a piece with the honesty that should be practised in personal religious observance and community relationships. It was both a civic duty and a religious duty, and the two could not be separated. Colclough argues that, for Scott, the ideal of free, outspoken counsel integrated religion and civic humanism:

It would be impossible – and foolhardy – to attempt to separate out these two discourses as if they were useful resources that Scott drew on for argumentative effect: together his pamphlets make a strong argument that the values he promulgates hold together naturally. The Bible and the history of the church combine perfectly, for Scott, with the humanist values of public interest, liberty, and the resistance of tyranny.

Scott promises in *Vox Regis* ‘to speake of the State at home & abroad, and of Religion respectiue in all parts’, and stresses that he cannot speak of one without the other: ‘because these are intermixt and wouen together, and participate of prosperitie and aduersitie, and partake all passions of ioy and sorrow, with each other in common’.
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In his dedication to Charles in *Vox Coeli, or news from heaven* (1624), John Reynolds also sets out to defend and justify an earlier piece of writing – in this case, the lengthy imagined dialogue contained within *Vox Coeli* itself, which Reynolds claims to have written ‘about some three yeares since, at the first sitting of the last high Court of Parliament, when our King was so earnest in proposing the match’. Shocked by what he saw as the sins of the times, Reynolds determined to write in response:

> Then, then it was, (that to pull of the Maske of Spaines ambition and malice, who with the fire of this match sought to set England all flaming in a mournfull and miserable combustion) thereby to bury her glory in the dust, and her safety in the cinders of her subuersion and ruines) that as Prometheus fetch’d fire from heauen, so the fire of my zeale to the good of my Prince and Country, likewise fetch’d from thence this Royall consultation for the discouery of our apparent and imminent dangers, and in knowing them, to know likewise how to preuent them.

However, ‘the Seas of our Kings affection to Spaine went so loftie, and the windes were so tempestuous, that it could not possibly be permitted to pass the Pikes of the Presse’. Reynolds informs the reader that he was rather more circumspect than Scott: having seen ‘Allureds honest letter, Scots loyall Vox Populy, D. Whiting, D. Euerard, and Claytons zealous Sermons, and others, suppressed and silenced’, he was apparently reluctant to bring such punishment down on himself. Accordingly, he writes, he ‘hushed vp [his] said Consultations in silence’, and engaged instead in the sort of religious and emotional action advocated by Thomas Gataker in *A Sparke toward the Kindling of Sorrow for Sion* (1621). ‘[B]ecause I could not serue my Prince and Country in that Booke of mine’, Reynolds writes, ‘I therfore then renewed my constant resolution and zeale to serue them in my most feruent prayers, and my most religious and zealous wishes’.

This silence was, however, unsatisfying. In this state of mute piety, Reynolds ‘was enforced to see [...] the perfidious progresse of Spaines now [sic] trecheries’, notably the complete conquest of the Palatinate, ‘that dainty, rich and fertile Prouince’, by Spain ‘and his factor the Duke of Bauaria’, ‘wherein the honour of our King, and his three famous Kingdomes,
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70 Reynolds, *Vox Coeli*, sig.A4v.
71 See Chapter 3, pp.203-06.
doe most extremely suffer’. The final straw was the treacherous behaviour of the Spanish over the match. As Reynolds writes to Charles:

I would not, I could not be silent thereat, but must expose this Consultation of Vox Coeli to the light and sight of the world: I meane to the light of your knowledge, and the sight of your consideration, vnder the secure Target, and safe shelter and Sanctuary of your auspicious protection.

The return of Charles supposedly allowed Reynolds to publish his parrhesia with less risk than in 1621, under the protection of Parliament, although he did publish under the pseudonym ‘S.N.R.I’, with ‘Elesium’ as the imprint. Neither the change in the political situation nor his anonymity were enough to protect Reynolds from official disapproval: he was imprisoned for writing Vox Coeli and another pamphlet, Votiviae Angliae, in the summer of 1624, and remained in the Fleet until at least 1626.

‘Truth, in likelyhode’

Both Reynolds and Scott stress the truthfulness of their accounts even though, in both cases, the accounts are fictionalised dialogues. Vox Coeli is an account of a ‘consultation there held by the high and mighty princes, King H.8. King Edw.6. Prince Henry. Queene Mary, Queene Elizabeth, and Queene Anne’. Reynolds ventriloquizes his gallery of dead British royals (including James’s wife and son) in order to ‘vnmask’ ‘Spaines ambition and treacheries to most kingdomes and free estates in Europe […] but more particularly towards England, and now more especially vnder the pretended match of Prince Charles, with the Infanta Dona Maria’. All of these royals (including the Catholic Anne, whose faith is not mentioned) condemn the match and Spain’s actions and ambitions, except for Mary, who takes the role of the pro-Spanish, Catholic antagonist.

Meanwhile, Vox Populi claims to be the report made by the Spanish Ambassador to London, Gondomar, upon his return to Madrid in 1619 following his first embassy. Among
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the criticisms of *Vox Populi* that Scott quotes, and answers, in *Vox Regis*, is the objection
‘*That the Plot or Frame was a fiction, and therefore deserved censure*’. Scott does not deny
this – rather, he makes a strident claim for the validity of his fiction as a means to convey a
sort of metaphorical truth. Scott writes of his pamphlet, ‘[w]as it not called *Vox populi*, to
note it only probable, and possible, and likely, not historicall?’ and justifies it through
reference both to prior knowledge and to worried speculation:

> The truth is, those that understand any thing of *Spanish Affaires*,
> know such a course is observed upon returne of Ambassadours, (if
> we may credit Histories or Travellers) and perhaps thus it was: or
> worse: I pray God the successse proues a fiction, and not to be too
> true.\(^76\)

*Vox Populi* is not ‘true’ in any empirical sense, but Scott argues that it is a ‘likely’ truth, an
expression of what might happen, or – more pertinently, perhaps – of an essential truth
about Spanish attitudes and intentions. Since *Vox Populi*’s publication, Scott writes, ‘all
foraine actions have concurred to make good my conjectures’.\(^79\) As well as this, Scott
claims, *Vox Populi* ‘[informed] the State, of that which every man thinkes, and speaks in
their ordinarie discourse’; it represents ‘the vulgar voyce and opinion of the people
deliuere by my Pen’.\(^80\)

John Rous transcribed a copy of *Vox Populi* in his ‘Diary’, and appended a noticeably
similar justification of the text’s truthfulness:

> The truth of those things that are here intimated concerning Spaine &
> Gondomar must be defended by the Title of the booke *Vox populi*. But
> who so doth well understand the Spanish aime, the Condition of our
> Papists, with the estate of many things as they lately haue beene &
> nowe are amongst vs, may say that the author hath for the most parte,
> fitted eche person & realted truth, in likelyhoode, although in some
> things he may haue missed, & done weakely in others.\(^81\)

Rous appears to subscribe to a similar idea of ‘truth’ to that propounded by Scott – the idea
that *Vox Populi* conveyed essential truths about Spanish treachery, which agreed with
general knowledge of Spanish ambition and the discontent of domestic recusants. The
similarity of Rous’s argument to Scott’s may indicate that Rous had read *Vox Regis*; he

\(^76\) Scott, *Vox Regis*, p.10.
\(^79\) Scott, *Vox Regis*, p.45.
\(^80\) Scott, *Vox Regis*, pp.11, 45.
\(^81\) John Rous, ‘Diary’, BL Additional MS 22959. *Vox Populi* is transcribed at ff.8’-16’, note at 16’.
adds, apparently in a different ink, ‘Of the matche with Spaine I alwaies said that I should never believe it vntill I did see it effected’, suggesting either that he transcribed *Vox Populi* after Charles’s return or that he returned to an earlier transcription to note the failure of the match.

Scott and Reynolds both use print to enact self-appointed roles as unofficial, unlicensed counsellors to the King, Prince, Parliament and populace. The fitness of these writers for this role rests not on their ability to acquire privileged information but on the fact that they access and communicate a certain interpretation of events. This interpretation is — in their presentations of it, at least — stable, univocal, and common to all of James’s ‘true subjects’.

**Stability and lineage**

Religious *parrhesia* does not encompass the possibility of differing interpretations: one speaks the truth, and the truth is self-legitimising. In this model, the truth to be uttered does not alter. Scott and Reynolds may have been uttering calls for war with Spain rather than expressions of faith, but in an interpretation of the world which identifies Catholicism with the Antichrist these are, in effect, one and the same. These polemicists rely on the same moral absolutes as those defined in earlier texts like *The Interpreter*.\(^82\) Stressing that one expresses the same truth in 1624 that one did in 1621 emphasised that this was truth, expressed in danger as well as in safety, and not simply an expedient response to a changed political situation. The perceived stability of the advice offered to the monarch (and the future monarch, and the Parliament that was to advise the King and approve or deny his requests for funds) was, in this interpretation, more important than its acceptability to that monarch or to other representatives of government. In the version of events recounted in the works of Scott, Leighton and Reynolds, it was the political situation that had changed, and not their counsel.

Accordingly, writers stressed the continuity between the texts they published in 1624-25 and those that had gone before. Most notable was the afterlife of Scott’s *Vox Populi*. As I argued in my previous chapter, *Vox Populi* became something of a touchstone of pro-war rhetoric in 1620-22, both for readers such as Joseph Mead and for government agents

\(^{82}\) See Chapter 3, p.184-97.
engaged in suppressing expressions of such rhetoric and the people who produced and sold them.\textsuperscript{83}

The success and notoriety of \textit{Vox Populi} may also have prompted writers to echo its title in other texts: see, for example, William Loe’s \textit{Vox Clamantis} (1621) and ‘Jack Daw’s’ \textit{Vox Graculi} (1622). In each case, the writer adapted the ‘vox’ title in a way appropriate to their text – Loe’s imagines a crying voice, suitable for the far-reaching excoriation of sin that his pamphlet contains, while that of \textit{Vox Graculi} – the voice of the jackdaw – means that the same joke is essentially made three times on the title page (which also features a woodcut of a jackdaw writing at a desk), underscoring that the mock-forecast within is not to be taken seriously.\textsuperscript{84} However, it seems likely that both writers invoked an association with \textit{Vox Populi} in order to invoke the scandal over Scott’s text, to connect their own pamphlets to notions of oppositional free speech, or scurrility, or both.

\textit{Vox Populi} did not diminish in importance once war looked likely in 1624; rather, the period 1624-1625 saw a number of texts with titles that claim to represent a range of different ‘voices’. While it is not always clear that these draw on \textit{Vox Populi}, several writers do make explicit reference to Scott’s text. As noted above, John Reynolds’s \textit{Vox Coeli} (1624) refers admiringly to \textit{Vox Populi} in its dedication. Again, the title describes a very different ‘voice’ to that of Scott’s ‘people’. Reynolds’s pamphlet claims instead to represent ‘the voice of heaven’: fitting, seeing as it contains a heavenly dialogue between deceased British royals. However, the echo implies a relationship between the two arguments; the voices of the people and of heaven concur.

The argument and rhetoric used by George Marcelline in \textit{Vox Militis} (1625) strongly resemble those used by Scott and Reynolds. Marcelline even appears to link his call for international action to reinstate Frederick directly to Reynolds’s \textit{Vox Coeli}:

\begin{quotation}
me thinkes this voyce of the Souldier is but as an echo to the voyce of heauen, which sayes the cause is iust, and counselleth all Christian Protestant Princes ioyntly to assume armes to driue this Boare out of
\end{quotation}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{83} Chapter 3, pp.170-74.
\textsuperscript{84} William Loe, \textit{Vox Clamantis. Mark 1. 3} A stil voice, to the three thricely-honourable estates of Parliament: and in them, to all the soules of this our nation, of what state or condition soeuer they be ([London]: 1621, STC.16691); ‘Jack Daw’, \textit{Vox Graculi, or Iacke Dawes prognostication} (London: 1622, STC.6386).
\end{flushright}
the Vineyard, and to re-seate this royall Prince in his Throne and dignitie.\textsuperscript{85}

Scott himself echoed his earlier title in two 1624 pamphlets. \textit{The Second Part of Vox Populi} returns to Madrid to recount the dismay of various Spanish nobles and politicians (including Gondomar) at the failure of their plot against the British. Meanwhile, the title of \textit{Vox Regis} implies that the voice of the King had now joined the clamour for war. The voice of the King now agreed with that of the people: the country had been reunited, much as the estates of Britain had been reunited in \textit{Vox Regis}’s frontispiece. Scott summed up both this change, and why it had prompted him to write \textit{Vox Regis}:

I suppose it is not perillous now to point at that, which the whole State hath taken notice of, and worthily reformed. I spake before, that there might be notice taken of the necessitie, and Lawes made to redresse enormities: for this I prayed to God and the King. I spake now, because there are Lawes made: for this I praise God, who hath opened the heart of our King, Peereis, Prelates, and People, uniting them in one, for a generall reformation of all. To paint out now, what was then, and what compel’d me then to write, is to paint out the glorie of that which now is; and to celebrate the honour of his Maiestie, the Prince, and this Parliament to all posteritie: by whose wisdome, zeale, and diligence (next vnder God) it is, as it is.\textsuperscript{86}

‘Thereby to make amends for former delaies’

In the dedication to \textit{Vox Coeli}, Reynolds casts Parliament in the role of intermediaries between him and the King. He requests that Parliament counsel the King to make war on Spain – ‘Tell him that to transport Warre into Spaine, is to auoide and preuent it in England’ – and to avoid dangerous delays: ‘beware least as your Consultations flie away with the time [...] sith time must be taken by his forelocke, and then as Iulius Caesar saieth, we haue winde and tide with vs’.\textsuperscript{87} Reynolds does not mention Parliament’s role in granting war finance, simply stressing that time is of the essence.

\textsuperscript{85} Marcelline, p.12.
\textsuperscript{86} Scott, \textit{Vox Regis}, p.18.
\textsuperscript{87} Reynolds, \textit{Vox Coeli}, sig.B2'.
Underlying this call for alacrity is, perhaps, the awareness that the ‘heavenly consultation’ that follows was supposedly written three years earlier. The main body of Vox Coeli contains repeated criticisms of James’s policy, often placed in the mouth of Anne, who declares that if James had not been so familiar with Gondomar, he would not ‘haue kept back an Army from my Sonne and Daughter the King and Queene of Bohemia, when so many hundred thousand valiant English Souldiers desired and longed to haue serued them in their warres’. 88 Anne even darkly predicts that her husband will not provide assistance ‘to recouer the Pallatinate if that were lost’. 89 This pointed reference may indicate that the date Reynolds gives for the composition of the ‘consultation’ has more to do with establishing a link to the past than with reality: perhaps Reynolds simply claims to have written it in 1621 in order to stress the continuity of his rhetoric, as well as the perceived change in the political climate that allowed him to publish such opinions in 1624.

By connecting Vox Coeli to this past moment, Reynolds emphasises not only that criticism of James’s policy has remained consistent, but that opportunities have been missed. The Palatinate had indeed been lost; admittedly, there was hope that James would now act to regain it, but from a much weaker position than he had stood in in 1621, when British forces held Heidelberg, Mannheim and Frankenthal. Reynolds’s appeal to Parliament for haste implies a painful awareness of the time that has already been lost.

Similarly, when Scott describes the King willing Parliament ‘to make hast, and to be swift in their motion, thereby to make amends for former delaies’, he does so directly after noting that the King had previously opposed many attempts to persuade him to war. 90 Scott describes Vox Populi in Vox Regis as itself a belated publication: ‘[t]he Pamphlet lay long by me in silence, and had still slept, if necessity had not awaked both me and it’. 91 Scott locates Vox Populi’s composition – and, therefore, the context to which it initially reacted – even before the crisis of 1620. This reference reminds the reader that four years had passed since the ‘necessity’ which prompted Scott to risk his safety by publishing Vox Populi.

The ‘blessed revolution’ may have appeared to some to unite the King, the Prince, the favourite, Parliament and the people, but joy over this rested on the notion that what had
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happened before was wrong. The fact that royal action was welcomed does not mean that perceived inaction in 1620-23 was forgiven. In fact, celebration of the prepared-for war enclosed a degree of disapproval of the King’s previous response to the Palatine issue. Attempts to resolve it peacefully appeared to have been a failure: preparations for war were an inherent admission of this. *Rex Pacificus* had (it seemed) been proved wrong while the polemicists had been proved right, and they had no intention of allowing their readers to forget this. In the eyes of those who had pushed for official British involvement in the defence of the Palatinate, plans for war in 1624-25 were a cause for celebration, but they were also belated. The perceived failure of Jacobean foreign policy during 1620-23 was, and remained, a rhetorical fault-line in the British war effort.
Part 4: Counselling Charles

The Prince’s voice

As well as the ‘voices’ of the people, the King, God, and Heaven, that of the Prince apparently joined the pro-war chorus in 1624. Although Alexander Leighton’s *Speculum Belli Sacri: Or the looking-glass of the holy war* (1624) does not echo Scott’s title, it does feature a reference to it prominently in its dedication to Parliament. Leighton informs MPs that ‘[f]or the discoverie of your Adversaries (which is a main principle of warre) you need not a *Vox populi*, you haue *vivam vocem Principis*’. Charles’s apparent conversion to vocal Hispanophobia has cured the need for polemical texts purporting to represent the voices of the people. Charles had returned from Spain with empirical knowledge of Spanish political practices, and could now call for war in a voice far more influential than that of ‘the people’. It is Charles himself – his person, his actions, his voice – who has instigated the great change in the state that *Speculum Belli Sacri* celebrates.

Thomas Scott also focuses praise on the Prince. In the frontispiece to *Vox Regis*, it is Charles who has brought Elizabeth and Frederick to London and presented them to his father in Parliament. Next to the figure of Charles in the image, a quotation from the Song of Solomon stresses the Prince’s love for his sister: ‘Many waters cannot quench love nor can the floods drown it’. The inclusion of this may also imply the second part of that verse: ‘if a man would give all the substance of his house for love, it would utterly be contemned’.92 Charles’s love for his sister is so powerful that it has transported her across the sea from The Hague, and he is prepared to risk ‘all the substance of his house’ for her – in stark contrast to his father.

Following his return from Spain, Charles became much more of an active political figure in his own right, as Cogswell describes throughout *The Blessed Revolution*. He also became a viable addressee for polemicists. While these texts describe a major political change instigated by the Prince, this was not a completed ‘revolution’: the war was yet to be embarked upon, and it remained unclear exactly what role Charles would take in relation to it. Consequently, polemicists addressed the Prince in terms both of praise and of counsel.
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attempting to persuade him to take a belligerent, Hispanophobic, anti-Catholic role in both foreign and domestic policy.

In this part of the chapter, I examine two texts dedicated to the Prince – Leighton’s *Speculum Belli Sacri*, and another anonymous tract by John Reynold, *Votiviae Angliae* (1624). I focus on the means by which these dedications both construct an ideal version of the Prince’s role, and attempt to persuade him to embrace it.

*Speculum Belli Sacri*

Alexander Leighton’s *Speculum Belli Sacri* is preceded by three dedications – one to Frederick and Elizabeth, one to Charles, and one to Parliament. In the dedication to Charles, Leighton explains his choices: he ‘presumed to dedicate’ the text to the Palatine couple ‘because they are the speciall parties (as the Lord speaketh) that haue seene affliction by the Rod of Gods wrath’, but then added the dedication to Charles as well on their behalf, ‘considering how they and theirs, Gods cause in their hands, and whatsoever is commended to them, stande th both of a protector and revenger’.93

Leighton frames this as a carefully calibrated piece of boldness: he was ‘emboldened on the knees of [his] bounden duetie, and best affection’ to ask Charles ‘to looke into this looking-glasse’, ‘according to [his] accustomed favour’.94 Leighton is doing his ‘duetie’ through offering bold counsel, while Charles demonstrates his fitness for his role as ‘a protector and revenger’ by being ‘accustomed’ to look upon such counsel with ‘favour’.

However, Leighton pointedly notes that Charles has not yet either protected Elizabeth and Frederick or revenged the loss of the Palatinate. Leighton’s address to the Prince starts with the observation that although the Palatine couple’s ‘cause […] in all impartiall judgement shall be found so just, that they and all that loue them may appeale to God for the pleading of it’, Leighton has ‘[perceived] the successse not to answer the cause, and that some for want of love and some for want of judgement, did judge the cause by the events’.95

93 Alexander Leighton, *Speculum Belli Sacri, or, the looking glass of the holy war* (Amsterdam: 1624, STC.15432), sig.A4v.
Leighton expresses hope that his treatise will ‘give an Alarum to [Charles’s] Martiall spirit’. He explains five reasons why Charles should seek war against Spain: firstly, ‘Gods honor in the dust; Religion at the stake; the healing of the beasts wound, and the setting of Dagon againe upon the stumps’; secondly, the honour of avenging the wrongs done to his sister and vindicating her in the eyes of the world; thirdly, the safety of his family and nation; fourthly, the honour ‘to fight Gods battles’ and thus secure his fame for posterity; and ‘[f]ifthly your late, & admirable deliverance out of the paw of the lyon, & out of the law of the Beare, requireth by course that you should encounter with Goliah’. 96

Each of these reasons is presented as clear and irrefutable; accordingly, although Leighton presents his appeal to the Prince as a decorous request, it shades at points into something approaching a demand. ‘Our eies are fixed towards God, and then upon you’, Leighton tells Charles; ‘you are the tree, from whose shade the Saints doe looke for shelter, & refreshing, and which shall kill, by Antipathy, the Snakes of Babel’. Charles must act against Spain, both to rescue the Palatinate and to fulfil his role as prince: ‘your Princely resolution and irrevocable word, hath ingaged you to the service of Sions deliverance: if you should leaue Sion helplesse (which God forbid,) it were in a manner hopelesse’. 97

**Votivae Angliae**

John Reynolds’s use of dedications is particularly telling: as well as dedicating *Vox Coeli* to Parliament, he dedicated another 1624 pamphlet, *Votivae Angliae: or the Desires and Wishes of England* ‘To Great Brittaynes Great Hoape, Charles, Prince of Wales’. 98 Both *Vox Coeli* and *Votivae Angliae* were published under the pseudonym ‘S.R.N.I.’, and *Votivae Angliae* in particular delivers stinging criticism of Jacobean foreign policy.

In *Votivae Angliae*’s address to the Prince, Reynolds claims that the ‘ensueing Discourse’ was sent to James in manuscript ‘on New-yeares day last’:

I wrote it then to his Maiestie, in fauour of the neglected Estate, and deiected, and deplorable Fortunes, of the most Excellent Princesse
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98 John Reynolds [S.R.N.I.], *Votivae Angliae: or, the desires and wishes of England* (Vtrecht [Utrecht] [i.e. London]: 1624, STC. 20946.1), sig.*.iii*.
(the Ladie Elizabeth) your Sister; of the Illustrious Prince Pallatyne her Husband, and theyr royall Progenie, for the vniust losse, and shamefull detention of theyr Pallatynat and Electorat, by the Triumvirat of Usurers, the King of Spayne, the Emperour, and the Duke of Bavaria.

The tract has been redirected to the Prince, Reynolds writes, in order that Charles might persuade his less receptive father to action:

I send it now to your Highness, that (next under God) you (resembling your selfe) will please to lend your best assistance and give your best furtherance, to draw foorth the King your Fathers Sword for the happie restitution and reconquering thereof, whervnto the eyes of Religion, Empire, and Honnor, infalliblie oblige hym.

Reynolds follows his address to Charles with one to James, which offers an extremely critical account of the King’s foreign policy. In his role as ‘your Majesties most obeydient and most faythfull Subject’, Reynolds asserts that he is ‘a thousand times more jealous and zealous for the preservation of your Maiesties, and your royall Childrens welfare and honnor then of myne owne life’. Votivae Angliae is, he writes, intended ‘to incyte and stirre up [James’s] Royall resolutions, for the refetching and reconquering therof, wheron at present the eyes of the whole Christian worlde are constantlie fixed’. Reynolds admits that Frederick showed a lack of judgement in accepting the Bohemian crown, and that James ‘shewed an act of Iustice’ in allowing ‘the Emperour to chastice him from Bohemia’. However, James has erred in allowing the Palatinate to be conquered; Reynolds informs him that if he does not act to recover it for his relatives, it will be a lapse of judgement comparable to Frederick’s, and ‘wilbe a Dishonorable testimonie of too great disrespect, and want of affection in your Majestie as being their Father, and of too much feare & pusilanimitie as beeing a Great and Potent King’. ‘[T]his will not onlie blemish’ James’s reputation, ‘but eclipse it to all the world’.

Soe were your Maiesty onlie a spectator, and not an Actor, or had you noe Interest in the Pallatynat, you should then receiue noe Dishonnor not to attempt, or seeke the restitution thereof. But sith (for the good of your Disinherited Children) you haue as deepe Interest in that famous

99 Reynolds, Votivae Angliae, sig.*.ij.².
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Province, as you haue in the Royall blood which streames in their hartes and veynes, will it not be an honnor for your Majestie to restore it to them, sith it was lost with shame, and a shame if you restore not them to it with honnor.\footnote{Reynolds, \textit{Votivae Angliae}, sig.Aij\textsuperscript{r}.}

Through such inaction, Reynolds informs the King, ‘as you will assuredly make [Frederick] the pittie, soe you will likewise infalliblie make your selfe the laughture of all the rest of the Princes of Christendom’.\footnote{Reynolds, \textit{Votivae Angliae}, sig.Aij\textsuperscript{v}.}

Reynolds directly accuses James of a number of offences against the Palatine family. Amongst other misdeeds, James has permitted the Emperor to disinherit Frederick, by omitting to mention his son-in-law’s restoration to the electorate in his negotiations with Catholic potentates, while demanding that Frederick and his allies disarm, thus preventing their effective defence of the Palatinate. This level of criticism goes far beyond that offered in earlier texts such as \textit{The Interpreter} and even \textit{Vox Populi}.

Reynolds’s dedication to Charles frames this breaking of decorum as two separate texts – or, rather, as one text, which has gone through a transformation in form and in direction. Firstly, Reynolds informs the reader that \textit{Votivae Angliae} was presented to James in manuscript as a piece of advice. In doing this, Reynolds casts himself in the role of the ‘good counsellor’ – stepping outside the bounds of decorum, and far above his station, in order to deliver much-needed free speech to the monarch. Meanwhile, the published version is presented in a different form, redirected to James’s son, and offered for sale to unknown buyers.

Reynolds argues that Charles has a duty to call for war on behalf of his sister, using much the same reasoning that he uses towards James in the main body of the treatise: ‘the whole \textit{Christian} world’ is watching ‘the Glorious action, to see whether Great \textit{Brittayne} (in this iust and famous quarrell) will courageoulsie resolue to redeeme her lost Honnor, or else cowardlie consent to lose it without anie further sence, or hoape of redemption’.\footnote{Reynolds, \textit{Votivae Angliae}, sig.*.ij\textsuperscript{r}.} Charles’s affection and responsibility towards his sister and her children dictates that he must avenge the loss of their patrimony: ‘Your Highness cannot looke on your selfe without seeing your Illustrious Sister, nor see her without looking on her Princele}
Posteritie, sith you have as deepe Interest in theyr Blood, as your owne heart hath in you’.  

Reynolds repeatedly appeals to Charles’s ‘self’, asking him to ‘looke on’ it, and to ‘resemble’ it through calling for war. He calls upon Charles to occupy an identity that he – Reynolds – dictates for him. Latent within this appeal is the knowledge that Charles is heir to an ageing father, and thus perhaps the hope that his succession will initiate a greater transformation than his words can. Again, in doing this Reynolds goes further than the writers I discussed in my previous chapter, who championed a national identity closely linked to particular views on the Palatine crisis. Reynolds does not only seriously criticise the reigning monarch; he defines the duty and even the identity of the heir to the throne. If Charles follows these instructions, Reynolds writes, he ‘will accumilate and heape upp, a whole world of Blessings and benedictions, on [his] Princelie head from [his] Fathers good Subiects’. The clear implication is that, if he does not ‘second’ and ‘fortify’ these ‘Warlike resolutions’, no such ‘Blessings and benedictions’ will be forthcoming from his subjects. Reynolds’s appeal to Charles does not have the same note of reproach as his appeal to James, but it does appear to carry a thinly-veiled warning.

‘Now a King to hir brother’

James died on 27 March 1625; two days into the New Year. The accession of Charles I intensified hopes that the new King would prosecute a swift and successful war to restore his sister to the Palatinate. On 23 April – St. George’s Day – Joseph Mead wrote with barely-disguised glee that upon questioned about ‘the designe of our great fleet’ by the ‘ouer eger’ Spanish ambassador, Charles had told the ambassador to write to Philip ‘[t]hat his Sister had now a King to hir brother’. The ‘ouer eger’ Spanish were now to receive veiled threats instead of courtesy. Charles’s reported speech here illustrates how easily the rhetoric used to persuade James could be adapted for his son: one simply needed to replace a parental relationship with a fraternal one. However, it also stresses the idea that Charles would ‘protect and revenge’ Elizabeth more effectively than his father had done. Again,
celebration of an improved present and a better future contains within it criticism of an unsatisfactory past.
Part 5: ‘(With cheerefull hearts and ioyfull soules) let vs prepare our selues for Warrs’

Desire for war

In texts celebrating the ‘blessed revolution’ in 1624-25, desire for war is key – it both unifies the nation, and defines the boundaries of that unity. In *The Belgick Souldier* (1624), Scott starts by claiming that he ‘must [...] needs incurre the displeasure of time seruers, the scoffs and dirision of Papists, and the repining of Hispanolised English’ through his attempts ‘to proue, that warre hath beene better then peace, and the Commo
Common-wealth and religion of England, haue had their fame and propagation by opposing Antichrist, and in plaine termes, must recouer her ecclipsed prosperitie reputing Spaine our opposite’. The boundaries that Scott describes, however, are ones that, presumably, few English – or, indeed, British – Protestants would want to lie beyond: time-seruers, Catholics, ‘Hispaniolised English’. As with the categories in 1622’s *The Interpreter*, a reader who considers themselves English (or, presumably, British) and Protestant cannot find space for themselves in Scott’s taxonomy if they also oppose war, or even if they are indifferent to it. They can only accept Scott’s terms, or reject them.

A similar view of the British polity is explained in George Marcelline’s 1625 *Vox Militis*, published following Charles’s accession. ‘Neuer was Beare robbed of her whelpes more angrie of reuenge then you of this enterprise’, he informs the reader, and the only people who may be ‘somewhat vnwilling to act a part in this matter’ will be ‘Spanish English (as they terme them) who are neither true to God, their King, or countrey, which haue not the least drop of loyall blood lodged in their hearts’, or cowards ‘who are very well content to enioy the warmth they haue vnder the wings of their Soueraigne, but will not do any seruice in the requital of this benefit’. The reader, by implication, is neither a ‘Spanish Englishman’ nor an ungrateful coward, and thus persuading them to action is ‘needlesse’: ‘I dare say you are easily intreated, nay hardly perswaded from it, and you are as restlesse being staued from the combat, as the Stone violently detained from the Center’. Marcelline’s text is, in the words of its entry in *Halkett and Laing*, ‘[a]dapted, to the point
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of plagiarism, from Barnaby Rich’s *Allarme to England, 1578*.115 This section is one of those that Marcelline added to Rich’s original; one of the ways in which the text is repurposed to suit 1625 is by linking desire for war explicitly to national identity.

**A just war**

Scott argues in *The Belgick Souldier*, as he points out, for something rather counterintuitive: ‘that warre hath beene better than peace’. Such cognitive dissonance is perhaps encapsulated in Reynolds’s exhortation to the reader in *Vox Coeli*: ‘Wars, Wars, then ye (with cheerefull hearts and joyfull soules) let vs prepare our selues for Warrs’.116 The desire for war described above was, polemicists were at pains to point out, a fair and moral thing to feel. War was both a just response to events on the continent and a means to improve matters at home.

Marcelline also argues for the benefits militarism brings to a state: ‘is it not my drift to preferre Warres before Peace, but to intimate, that as Peace is the great blessing of God, so Warres vndertaken vpon due consideration, doe nothing offend him’.

Marcelline frames his call to military action as a warning. Following Rich, he promises to ‘[foreshew]’ the problems that ensue when the people of ‘this, or any other kingdome liue without regard to marshall discipline’, but adds a qualification of his own: ‘especially when they stand and behold their friends in apparent danger, and almost subuerted by there enemies vniust persecution, and yet with hold their helping hand and assistance’.

Marcelline is concerned to demonstrate that the imminent war was a just one: he marshals a wide range of classical, biblical, mythological, historical and contemporary examples in order ‘to shew the lawfullnesse and good approbation of Military proceedings euen by God himselfe’. In *Allarme to England*, Rich lists a number of cities and countries that ‘by warres haue bene sacked, spoyled, robbed, defaced, and sometime layde waste and

117 Marcelline, p.10
119 Marcelline, p.2.
desolate’: from ‘sumptuouse Corinth’ to ‘wealthy Antwerpe’. Marcelline repeats Rich’s list without much alteration, and adds Prague, the Palatinate and Breda ‘in this our moderne and miserable age’. Marcelline follows Rich in arguing that peace and security makes a country sinful and weak, and thus open to attack by enemies or to divine punishment; he adds references to war on the continent and thus adapts Rich’s polemic specifically to the context of 1625.

In case this allusion to the impending war on the continent is not enough, Marcelline promises to illustrate his points with instances ‘collected out of the heroicall examples of Count MANSFIELD’, and accompanies this with a Latin dedication to the mercenary general. Marcelline’s decision to dedicate Vox Militis to Mansfeld reflects the key role that Mansfeld played in plans for war in Germany. The mercenary general visited London in the spring of 1624. James granted him a commission to recruit in Britain, and promised to fund his mercenary force, as long as the French did the same. Mansfeld’s British recruits sailed for the Netherlands in the spring of 1625.

Marcelline notes that some readers might object to his treatise on the basis that the ruin of cities and countries by warfare ‘is but meerely a punishment inflicted by God, vpon some place for some notable sinne and heauy affliction’ as a means ‘to reduce vs from the following of our owne corruptions to the fauouring of Christian religion’, and thus should be borne by the afflicted and their neighbours. However, ‘[i]here is a double kinde of Iniustice, the one in offering, the other in suffering Iniustice: the one is actiuely, the other passively vniust’. One should not break the peace, but neither should one neglect to defend oneself against wrongs:

wittingly to offend against a neighbour, is a sinne against our brother, and wilfully to beare an injury, is an offence against ones selfe, and therefore I will not be a foe to my Neighbour, in wronging of him, neither will I be an enemy to my selfe, in permitting him to offend me, when I am of ability to defend my selfe

120 Rich, sig.A.i.
121 Marcelline, p.2.
122 Marcelline, title page.
124 Marcelline, p.2.
125 Marcelline, p.6.
Marcelline dismisses the doctrine ‘that if one hath received a blow of one eare, hee ought to turn the other’ by claiming that one may avenge wrongs on behalf of God: ‘notwithstanding a Christian doth not goe about to reuenge it, as it is an injury done to himselfe, but as an offence committed against God, who hath forbidden all injustice’. God has ‘commanded to giue vnto Caesar that which belongeth vnto Caesar’ – so if Caesar finds his rights infringed, it is legal to go to war to protect them. Furthermore, monarchs can act in order to put an end to or avenge wrongs committed against others, as ‘it was formerly lawful for Kings to seeke to depose a Tyrant though he had no interest in those which were iniured’; therefore a king should act to protect his kin. Marcelline envisages the wrongs of the Palatinate injuring not only the King’s family, but his person:

Then how much more forcible a motiue hath hee if his posteritie bee abused, and he be wounded in his owne bowels: Surely his sword ought not to rest in his sheath when he hath such iust cause to draw it, but his angry canons to thunder in the eares of his enemies, and tell them they haue injuried him. And is not this the cause of our Soueraigne, if euer Prince had iust cause of warre, it is he, for they haue exiled out of his inheritance the Palsgraue, a Prince so hopefull; they haue layd wast his countrey which was the Paradise of the world, a land so fruitfull, they doe vniustly vsurpe his Diadem, they haue falsely promised the restoring of it, when as the pulses of their promises did not beat according to the motion of their hearts.

Marcelline’s message to his King and countrymen is clear. England should, as he argues in the poem in praise of martial virtues with which the treatise starts, ‘let her Neighbours harmes, her armes be made’. The country did not only risk the loss of honour through inaction – it also endangered itself. Marcelline reminds the reader that the Palatinate was ‘[t]hrough former ease, brought to vnhappy fate’, and exhorts them to ‘stay no longer from God Mars his broyle, | Learne to defend your selues, your foes to foyle’. Similarly, Reynolds calls for action to protect ‘our great Brittaine (the beautie of Europe as Europe is the glory of the world)’ from ‘the apperant danger, and mericles mercy of this Castilian Rat, of this Crocodile of Italy, of this vulture of Germany, and of this woolfe of Ardena’.
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The notion that the country that Scott calls ‘Spaine our opposite’ was uniquely cruel and ambitious crops up repeatedly in works attributed to or associated with these authors. Scott translated a French pamphlet, *Dessein perpetuel des Espagnols a la monarchie universelle*, as *The Spaniards Perpetuall Designes to an Universall Monarchie*; it traced ‘the Conquests of the King of SPAINE, and House of Austria, in Germany, Switzerland, the Grisons Countrie, Italy, and the Frontiers of France, since the death of Henry the Great’. Marcelline also reminds his readers – those ‘that are nothing moued with reading of histories, monuments, or the examples of auncient wryters, vnlesse they haue knowne the like in their age, or seene with their eyes’ – of the tyranny of Spanish rule in the Low Countries.

Key to the notion that Britain should aim to curb and punish Spanish tyranny was the idea that Britain had the military prowess to do so. True British subjects, Marcelline writes, support the war because ‘they know the Prince so worthy, the cause so iust, the successe so certaine’. In *Vox Coeli*, Reynolds strongly implies that Britain would have the upper hand in a military conflict with Spain. The Spaniards’ ‘imperious and insulting cariage towards his Highnesse, and towards Great Brittaine’ reveals an inability to assess the international situation correctly – they undervalue Britain’s worth and strength, while in ‘their boundlesse ambition [...] excessiuely ouer-valew their owne Spaine’ even though Spain is ‘in the Crisis of her weakenesse and misery’. Reynolds argues that war is the only sensible option: ‘to take the length of Spaines foot aright, we must doe it with our swords, not with our necks, for the first will assuredly establish our safety, and the second infaliby ruines it’. As long as war is embarked upon, it will ‘assuredly’ be successful. None of these writers deal with the practicalities of conflict: there is no discussion of tactics, or of finance, or of the means by which troops are to be transported and supplied. These writers are concerned instead to establish war as just, beneficial to the nation, and likely to succeed.
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Part 6: Plague, providence, and war, 1625-26

In early 1625, in the pamphlets of pro-war polemicists at least, the future appeared rosy. Under the new King Charles the British polity were apparently ready to ‘fight in their courses’ in a just war against Spain, with the peers wielding their swords, the clergy their prayers and sermons, and the commons their money and love. This required, as has been seen, a degree of obfuscation and generalisation: polemicists elided the wrangles in Parliament over war finance, and the actual tactics needed to fight the most powerful Catholic nation in Europe. Instead, polemicists stressed national unity and the notion that, because the war was just and fitted an anti-Catholic version of providence, British forces would be sure to win.

However, the war effort was dealt a number of blows during 1625 and 1626. The anonymous author of *Lachrymae Londinenses: or, Londons lamentations and teares for Gods heauie visitation of the plague of pestilence* summed up 1625, in an address to the Lord Mayor and aldermen of London on 27 October 1625, as ‘a Yeere full of fatall and memorable Accidents [...] such an one, as no Age, no Record, no Chronicle ever mentioned the like, within this our faery Land’. It had seen ‘the ending of a mightie and prudent King, the beginning of a mightie and prodigious Plague, besides the marriage of a mightie King, and the setting forth of a mightie Nauy’.¹³⁷ The plague that struck southern England in 1625 was indeed ‘mightie and prodigious’: it was the worst in living memory. It hit London, where conditions were cramped and plague was endemic most summers, particularly hard. Paul Slack has estimated that 26,350 people died in the capital city – over 20% of the population.¹³⁸

The navy referred to in *Lachrymae Londinenses* departed in October 1625 for the Spanish port of Cadiz. However, this expedition was a failure, due to miscommunication and a disastrous decision to allow soldiers to drink wine found in abandoned Spanish houses. By the time *Lachrymae Londinenses* was published in 1626, the fleet had returned, depleted by disease and malnutrition, and ‘a mightie Nauy’ may have taken on a certain irony. Following this expensive failure, the Parliaments of both 1626 and 1628 saw disagreements
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between the King and MPs over war finance and the role of the Duke of Buckingham in foreign and domestic policy; Charles attempted to solve both problems in the autumn of 1626 by levying an unpopular forced loan.139

The hopes of 1623-5 were, then, quickly crushed by political disagreements, military mistakes and mismanagement, and natural disaster. However, polemical writers and clergymen did not abandon the ideals expressed in their earlier works – of stable counsel, of national duty towards the Palatinate, and of a failure in that duty during 1620-23. Rather, these ideas – interpreted in terms of an all-encompassing and accommodating providential narrative – continued to structure how polemical writers responded to the difficulties and disasters that followed the ‘blessed revolution’.

In this final part of the chapter I examine print responses to two of these calamities – the plague and the Cadiz expedition. Firstly, I focus on plague as a prompt for writers to explore the relationship of British readers and congregations to Protestant providence. Interpreting plague as a punishment and warning from God was conventional in plague literature; however, in 1625 writers made specific and alarming connections between the epidemic and British policy and behaviour towards the Palatinate. I argue that the plague was closely connected to the war over the Palatinate by contemporary writers: that the war was part of the mental architecture by which a number of pamphleteers, including Thomas Dekker, Benjamin Spenser, and Sampson Price, conceptualised the movement and purpose of the infection. Epidemic and foreign war were all part of the same divine providence, and thus writing about the plague could be a means to discuss the relationship of people in Britain to Protestant sufferings abroad. This was particularly the case for people in the plague-stricken counties of southern England.

Secondly, I turn to the final extant pamphlet by Thomas Scott before his murder in 1626 – Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost, or Englands forewarner. In this text, published after the unsuccessful British attempt on Cadiz, Scott sets out to defend and praise British military prowess despite such recent failure; to preserve the narrative of martial virtue and destined Protestant victory expressed before the war was under way.

139 See Chapter 1, pp.91-95.
The plague, the Palatinate, and providential history

Texts that described the plague often used the language of war. In *A Rod for Run-Awayes*, published while the plague raged in 1625, Thomas Dekker frames the epidemic as a military struggle – ‘a set Battaile’ in which ‘the Field is Great Britaine, the Vantguard (which first stands the brunt of the Fight) is London: the Shires, Counties and Countries round about, are in danger to be prest, & to come vp in the Reare’. In this imagining, ‘the King of Heauen and Earth is the Generall of the Army; reuenging Angels, his Officers; his Indignation, the Trumpet summoning and sounding the Alarum’, and crucially, ‘our innumerable sinnes, his enemies; and our Nation, the Legions which he threatens to smite with Correction’.  

There is no direct reference here to the conflict raging on the continent, but given that the plague struck at a time when preparations for war were a political priority, there may be more than a passing reference here to the military devastations being visited upon continental Protestants.

Similarly, Benjamin Spenser perhaps hints at the preparations for war when he explains, in *Vox Civitatis, or Londons Complaint Against her Children in the Countrey*, the mysterious movements of the infection:

> this disease is a culling and a picking out of men, to set forward (as in a Muster) which causeth it to take at the beginning one here, and another halfe a mile off, then leape thither againe, where it was first, and take them away, which at first it left

Spenser does not specifically mention the other ‘muster’ taking place in 1625, but does by implication ascribe the seemingly random movements of the plague to a divine plan that might parallel Charles’s plans for war. This divine ‘muster’ is conducted according to a design, albeit an inscrutable one.

Spenser’s analogy is, perhaps, a comforting one: if the plague’s muster resembles the way in which men were mustered for war (at least, the way in which this was supposed to take place), then men would be taken in small numbers from various different places; the burden
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140 Thomas Dekker, *A Rod for Run-Awayes. Gods tokens, of his feareful iudgements, sundry wayes pronounced vpon this city, and on seuerall persons, both flying from it, and staying in it* (London: 1625, STC.6520), sig.A3r.

141 Benjamin Spencer, *Vox Civitatis, or Londons complaint against her children in the country* (London: 1625, STC.23074), pp.10-11.
of recruitment would not fall insupportably on one area. Moreover, those taken might be considered those selected for grace, rather than victims: the divine muster-master selects an effective group of men to ‘set forward’ for conflict – or for heavenly reward. Spenser’s stated intention in *Vox Civitates* is to rebuke those living outside London for their failure to act hospitably towards those fleeing the capital, so describing the movement of infection as unpredictable and divinely ordained gives weight to the argument that such refugees were not inherently dangerous, and should not be shunned simply because of where they had fled from. On the other hand, Spenser’s analogy may speak to a rather less positive image of war – specifically, of how preparations for war are experienced by the populace – than that propagated by Scott et al: one in which men do not enlist eagerly, ‘angrie of reuenge’ like a ‘Beare robbed of her whelpes’, but are recruited more-or-less at random, none sure who will be taken next, none able to rest secure that they have been passed over.142

Dekker reinforces the link between the plague and war by relating ‘this warre’ to other instances in which countries have been punished by God: ‘For, *Iehouah*, when he is angry, holds three Whips in his hand, and neuer drawes bloud with them, but when our Faults are heavy, our Crimes hainous: and those three Whips are, the Sword, Pestilence and Famine’. ‘What Country for sinne hath not smarted vnder these?’ Dekker asks: conflict, disease and death are interpreted as part of a coherent, international system of divine punishment.143 Dekker starts with the observation that ‘Ierusalem felt them all’, but goes on to list examples from closer to home: Hungary, Russia, Poland, Denmark, Sweden, Italy, France – and, particularly, Germany. Dekker’s description of the sufferings of Germany is far longer than his mentions of suffering in other places; Germany has, we are told, been subjected to all three of Jehovah’s ‘Whips’:

> Oh *Germany*! what foundations of bloud haue thy Cities beene drowned in? what horrors, what terrors, what hellish inuention haue not warre found out to destroy thy buildings, demollish thy Free States, and ytterly to confound thy 17. Prouinces? Gods three whips haue printed deepe markes on thy shoulders; the *sword* for many yeeres together hath cut thy people in pieces; *Famine* hath beene weared with eating vp thy children, and is not yet satisfied; the *Pestilence* hath in many of thy Townes, in many of thy Sieges and Leagers; plaid the terrible Tyrant.144
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Dekker here places the sufferings of the German people – and thus the inhabitants of the Palatinate – into a historical, providential narrative. This resembles the narrative that Marcelline adapted from Rich’s *Allarme to England*: Rich, Marcelline, and Dekker all stress the consistency of divine punishment over a wide historical period, grounding recent and current events in the context not only of international Protestantism, but of national suffering going back to Biblical times.

When it comes to Germany’s woes, however, Dekker teases out two worldly factors to be combated by the faithful. Firstly, like the polemical writers I discuss above, Dekker first places the blame for Germany’s troubles on the Spanish:

> In all these thy miseries, the Spaniard hath had his triumphs; his Fire-brands haue been flung about to kindle and feede all thy burnings; his furies haue for almost foure score yeeres stood, and still stand beating at the Anuils, and forging Thunder-bolts to batter thee, and all thy neighbouring Kingdomes in pieces.¹⁴⁵

However, Dekker is clear that England must shoulder some of the blame for Germany’s sufferings as well (here I echo Dekker’s use of ‘England’ and ‘English’, as Dekker was expressly addressing himself to London and the surrounding counties, where the plague was most virulent). Dekker doesn’t frame this responsibility simply in terms of military action. Like Thomas Gataker in 1622, Dekker argues that the English have committed a failure of emotion in response to the suffering of other Protestant nations: ‘Whilst these dreadfull Earth-quakes haue shaken all Countries round about vs, we haue felt nothing: England hath stood and giuen aime, when Arrowes were shot into all our bosomes’.¹⁴⁶

Dekker’s account of English behaviour is scathing. To ‘give aim’ is defined by the *OED* as ‘to provide guidance or assistance in aiming something (originally a shot with a bow), esp. by giving information about the accuracy of a preceding shot’.¹⁴⁷ In other words, for Dekker the English did not simply wink at the violence done to others, but actively colluded in it. At the same time as this, Dekker’s image places the English in a seemingly contradictory position – both aiding the attack on others, and being injured by it. In this

---
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image these two roles shade into each other – as do the ‘bosomes’ of English Protestants and their continental brethren.

One cannot separate the woes of German Protestants from those of England, Dekker argues, and attempts to act as if these things can be separated are violently self-defeating. Through their failure to feel or act appropriately on behalf of others, England has actively aided Spanish aggression, and so become culpable for woes that affect all Protestants, including themselves. England has been spared the conflict raging in continental Europe, ‘[b]ut (alas!) hath this Happinesse falne vpon her because of her goodnesse? Is shee better then others, because of her purity and innocence? Is shee not as vgy as others?’.

Like Reynolds in *Vox Coeli*, Dekker builds up a sense of outrage with a succession of rhetorical questions, and finishes with an emphatic – and almost gleeful – description of the extent to which England has fallen:

> Yes, yes, the Sword is now whetting; Dearth and Famine threaten our Cornefields, and the rauing Pestilence in euery part of our Kingdome is digging vp Graues. The three Rods of Vengeance are now held ouer vs.

The plague has a twofold connection to the sufferings of Germany: failure to act or feel appropriately in response to these sufferings is one of the sins for which England is being punished, while this punishment itself places England into the well-established providential narrative in which Germany’s sufferings have been contextualised. England had become part of the community of suffering nations, unable now to stand aside from the calamities facing Protestants elsewhere because they were clearly implicated in the same system of divine justice.

The notion that England’s failure to care sufficiently about the ills of other counties had contributed to its punishment also appears in William Crashaw’s *Londons Lamentation for her Sinnes and Complaint to the Lord her God*: ‘when other Nations were sighing, and sorrowing for our sin and securitie, wée were lul’d asleep, and cryed peace, peace, when there was none’.

Like Dekker, Crashaw envisages a polity simultaneously inactive – ‘lul’d asleep’ by hostile, corrupting forces – and inappropriately active – crying ‘peace,
peace’ in defiance not only of clear provocations to war, but of an existing state of conflict. In this situation, calls for ‘peace’ are nonsensical, like words spoken while asleep. For Crashaw, this inactive action was a result of a failure to interpret correctly: and the situation to be interpreted was not only that on the continent. Crashaw contrasts these failures of feeling and interpretation with the far more appropriate behaviour of those in ‘other Nations’, who react to Britain’s ‘sin and securitie’ by actively ‘sighing, and sorrowing’ for it. Crashaw leaves the reasons for this reaction unstated – the unnamed ‘other Nations’ may be rueing the fact that Britain has failed to help them during their own sufferings, but it is equally possible that they see the ‘sin and securitie’ in which Britain languishes (and its possible outcomes) as itself worthy of sorrow. In this reading, the plague is not the worst of the country’s problems – rather, it is both the outcome of unthinking sin and the means by which that sin is corrected.

Remembering and forgetting: the plague, the Palatinate, and individual morality

Charles issued a ‘Proclamation for a generall and publike Thankesgiuing to Almighty God, for his great mercy in staying his hand, and asswaging the late fearefull Visitation of the Plague’, on Sunday 22 January 1626.\(^\text{151}\) Either on that day or the following Sunday, according to the relevant title page, Sampson Price, ‘one of his Majesties Chapleins in Ordinarie’, ascended to the pulpit of ‘Christs-Church in London’ to preach a sermon of thankfulness.\(^\text{152}\) This ‘sermon’ was printed as Londons Remembrancer. As its title suggests, it focuses on the action of memory, interpreting the plague as the outcome of a catastrophic failure to remember. Price quotes from Deuteronomy: ‘Doe not wee forget the things which our eyes haue seene? Do they not depart from our hearts?: The Righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart. We remember the least wrong of another to vs, and forget the greatest of our sinnes against God. We write iniuries in Marble, but benefits in the sand. Wee forget our Founders, Patrons, Benefactors. Wee remember not the hand, nor the day when we were deliuered from the enemy, from the land of Egypt, the house of bondage, the doctrine of Rome: the

\(^{151}\) Charles I, A Proclamation for a Generall and Publike Thankesgiuing to Almighty God, for his great mercy in staying his hand, and asswaging the late fearefull visitation of the plague, 22 January 1625/26 (London: 1625/26, STC.8821).

\(^{152}\) Sampson Price, Londons Remembrancer: for the staying of the contagious sicknes of the plague by Davids memoriall (London: 1626, STC.20332).
Chapter 4. War, hope and memory, 1623-26

Spanish Invasion: wee forget the tossings of the Palatinate, Bohemia, and those sweet Royall Princes living amongst Strangers.¹⁵³

Like Marcelline and Dekker, Price places the Palatinate’s misfortunes in a narrative stretching back to biblical events, and accuses his countrymen of forgetting all of it. ‘Ewyer one may be called Manasseh. Forgetting’, Price writes.¹⁵⁴ ‘Manasseh’ means ‘causing to forget’ in Hebrew; in Genesis Joseph gave the name to the first of his sons born in Egypt, saying ‘For God [...] hath made me forget all my toil, and all my father's house’, while Manasseh of Judah infamously returned the kingdom to pagan worship.¹⁵⁵ This lapse of memory is a major stain on the national soul: ‘This was the sinne of Israel, now of England. Wee are like the strange woman that forgot the covenant of her God’.¹⁵⁶ Price ascribes the plague directly to this failure:

\[ \text{It is storied}, \text{that in a great battle, many being slain, and the bodies vnburied, there followed a great Plague; and this so infected men, that they forgot their fathers names, their children, their owne names: I am sure our forgetfulness of God, and our Idolatrie, brought this last Plague among vs.} \]¹⁵⁷

Price’s chronology here is a little confusing – is the plague the means of forgetting, or a means, via punishment, to prompt remembrance? Perhaps this reflects the difficult, double role that the plague had played in relation to the war – for some a divine reminder of England’s sinful inaction and forgetfulness, but also, unavoidably, a distraction and impediment to the war effort. Writers such as Dekker, Crashaw and Price align the plague with the Palatine conflict by interpreting both as part of an integrated system of divine warning and punishment, but this requires one to ignore the practical effects of the infection on the country’s ability to prosecute war.

Price envisages a form of forgetting that is self-annihilating, in which men forget both the closest bonds of kinship and their own identities. This recalls the disruptions in familial relationships described by Dekker – during the plague, he writes, ‘the Mother abhors to kiss her owne Children, or to touch the sides of her owne Husband’ – and Thomas Brewer, who writes in The Weeping Lady of ‘the Sonne’ made ‘A stranger to his Father’, while

¹⁵³ Price, pp.15-6
¹⁵⁴ Price, p.16.
¹⁵⁵ Cf. Genesis 41:51; 2 Kings 21, 2 Chronicles 33.
¹⁵⁶ Price, p.16.
¹⁵⁷ Price, p.16.
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‘Brothers shun | The Partners of their Blood’. 158 However, it also recalls polemicists’ appeals, in addresses both to James and to Charles, to fatherly and brotherly duty and affection.

For Price, the British have gone even beyond forgetting the bonds of family: they, like Manasseh of Judah, have forgotten their God, strayed from their faith into the worship of false idols. The accusation of apostasy may indicate that Manasseh of Judah is the primary reference here, although Price does not specify which of the Old Testament Manassehs he means. Either could be interpreted as relevant to the situation: in both cases, the ‘forgetting’ is both an active choice and one that breaks or disrupts links to the past and to ‘true’ identity. Joseph’s naming of his son represents an active, considered decision to forget both suffering and lineage and embrace a new life as governor of Egypt. However, this decision is neither a lasting nor a positive one: Joseph remembers ‘his father’s house’ when reunited with his brothers and father, while his decision leads eventually to the suffering of the Israelites as recounted in Exodus – and thus to the flight from Egypt, the covenant with God, and the establishment of Israel, which is much an act of remembering, of re-embracing true identity, as it is a new start. 159 Manasseh of Judah led his people to forsake one faith and adopt a different, sinful form of worship, but repented after being held captive by the King of Assyria. 160 In both examples, the ‘forgetting’ is a considered decision to break with the past rather than an unthinking lapse, and takes the form of an active alteration in identity and practice. Both instances of forgetting are also succeeded by suffering, and then by a return to ‘true’ identities, defined through faith and (in the case of the Israelites in Exodus) the return to an ancestral homeland.

Price’s accusation of forgetfulness, then, casts forgetting as a purposeful, sinful act, which has to be atoned for with a similarly purposeful act of remembering. The English have, he writes, forgotten the long narrative of Protestant history – reaching back from recent events to the Reformation, and back again to the delivery of the Jews from Egypt. To stay true to one’s Protestant faith, Price argues, one must remember this narrative; the forgetful man is effectively an apostate. Memory has direct bearing on both the fate of one’s soul and the fate of one’s country: forgetting is an act of sin that can prompt divine correction,

159 Genesis 42-50; Exodus.
160 2 Chronicles 33.
remembering an act of repentance. For Price, memory is active – not merely a repository, but something that one should actively bring to mind, and use to inform one’s identity and future actions. As the references to familial links hint, it is also possible to read a more concrete meaning into Price’s words – that the nation’s ‘forgetting’ was James’s considered decision not to go to war on behalf of his daughter in 1620-23, and that the active ‘remembering’ necessary to atone for this is military action to recover the Palatinate.

**Thomas Scott’s *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost: Cadiz and stable counsel***

Price describes a disruption in the relationship between British subjects and the Palatinate: people have stopped remembering and caring about events in the electorate, and in doing so have brought a painful providential reminder on their heads. This disruption contrasts to the ideas of truth and stability expressed in the work of Scott, Reynolds, Leighton and Marcelline. All these writers can be seen to prompt the sort of active ‘remembering’ advocated by Price. In the light of this, it is important not only that their counsel remains stable, but that it is continually repeated.

This remained the case following the defeat at Cadiz in late 1625. Thomas Scott’s *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost, or Englands forewarner*, published in 1626, indicates the extent to which defeat could be accommodated within a triumphant providential narrative, as long as both subjects and state continued to believe in, and work towards, eventual Protestant victory. In this pamphlet, Scott returns to a familiar scenario for his readers: Gondomar in Madrid, plotting against Britain with the King of Spain and the Count of Olivares. In Scott’s version of events, the British defeat at Cadiz has rattled the Spanish. Gondomar’s meeting with the King has taken place ‘through the necessity of some special affaires’:

> the greatest wherof seemed to be gathered from the last attempt of the English vpon the Fort & Castle of Punetall & the town of Cadiz or Cales, wherin though the losse was not so great or materiall as might either make the Assailant or Assailed offer Roses, or Nettles vpon the Altar of Fortune; yet the affront seemed to strike a more deepe impression in the hearts of the Spaniards, then could be well taken away with scorne (which is the ensigne of their pride) or with
the hope of future advantage (which only gives life unto their Enuie and Malice).\textsuperscript{161}

Rather than an embarrassing failure, in Scott’s account the Cadiz expedition served to warn the Spanish of the danger posed by Britain. Olivares worried about ‘the generall, warlikenesse of the British Nation’, noting that British children play at war games – something that Spanish children do not.\textsuperscript{162} Olivares also opines that the Cadiz expedition marked a new British militarism, unseen since James’s accession:

since the death of King James, of euer-liuing and famous memorie, the Englishmen, who for the space of twenty yeares before, had but as it were dallyed 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 themselues ouergone in a moment, & that to be made familiar in an instant at which they had laboured to obtaine to in divers ages.\textsuperscript{163}

After the meeting, Gondomar is tormented by a vision of the ghost of Sir Walter Raleigh, whose execution in 1618, Scott writes, was instigated by Gondomar. This wasn’t the first time Scott had ventriloquized a figure he believed to have been unfairly executed: in \textit{Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost} (1624), he envisaged the executed Elizabethan favourite advising ‘the nobility, gentry, and communalty of England’ to seek war with Spain.\textsuperscript{164}

Raleigh deplores the events in the Palatinate: ‘O the lamentable estate, of those once most happie Princes! how hath the house of Austria drownd them in blood? […] Is there any thing in this age more lamentable or remarquable, then the losse of the Palatinate?’ – and attacks ‘the lyes which [Gondomar] didst vtter to abuse the Maiestie of England, and to breed delays till [his] Masters designes were effected’.\textsuperscript{165} However, while he castigates Gondomar’s malice, he denies that the Spanish diplomat is truly in control of events. Speaking of his own death, Raleigh tells Gondomar ‘poore despised mortall, know, it was not you, but a more diuine and inscrutable finger which pointed out my destinie to this manner of end & destruction’. Raleigh’s execution was brought about by divine

\textsuperscript{161} Thomas Scott, \textit{Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost, or Englands forewarner} (Vtricht [Utrecht] [i.e. London?]: John Schellem, 1626, STC.22085), p.2.
\textsuperscript{162} Scott, \textit{Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost}, p.3.
\textsuperscript{163} Scott, \textit{Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost}, p.4.
\textsuperscript{164} Thomas, Scott, \textit{Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost, sent from Elizian: to the nobility, gentry, and communalty of England} (‘Paradise’ [i.e. London]: 1624)
providence, to which Raleigh submits: ‘It sufficeth me that the great God who is Judge of life & death, hath disposed of my life, & after this early manner, that in it he might expres the effects of his Justice’.\(^\text{166}\) Gondomar has been the unwitting agent of a force that he cannot control or understand – or escape. Raleigh promises him that his plans will fail, and that God – and Raleigh – will protect Britain and its royal family:

\begin{quote}
I thy *Tormentor* will neuer be absent from thine elbow, and whatsoeuer thou shalt contrieue or plot for the hurt of Great *Britaine*, I with the helpe of the holy Angels will returne vpon thine owne bosome and the bosome of thy Countrie, for the good of heauen and earth, who is the Protector of the Innocent; hath made Royall King CHARLES and his Throne precious in his sight, therefore if thou desirest to liue and see good dayes, touch not his annointed and doe his *Prophets* no hurt.\(^\text{167}\)
\end{quote}

For all his Machiavellian plotting, Scott’s Gondomar cannot win; he is within a Protestant eschatological narrative in which Protestants will always, ultimately, be favoured and protected.

\(^\text{166}\) Scott, *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost*, p.23.
Conclusion

The consistency of the rhetoric used in the polemical texts of 1624-26 – from *Vox Populi* to *Vox Regis* and *Vox Coeli* and then to *Sir Walter Rawleighs Ghost* – expresses a consistent political and moral narrative with anti-Catholicism at its heart. The Spanish are the declared enemies of British people and interests, so they should be fought, and those who express such a view utter ‘truth’ even when it is unwelcome.

By casting the changes of 1624 as a return to a norm, polemicists stressed the remarkable idea that the champions of religious and political conformity during 1620-23 had not been the King and his advisors but, in fact, the likes of Thomas Scott. In this interpretation, the remarkable changes in Stuart foreign and domestic policy in 1624-25 represented the King turning away from ‘bad’ counsellors – those who had supported Spain, and indeed the Spanish ambassadors themselves – and towards his ‘good’, Hispanophobic counsellors, in court, in Parliament, and in the print shops. Stressing change also meant stressing continuity – the observable fact that Scott, for example, had been calling for a break with Spain consistently since well before it became safe to do so. Those who had been punished for writing or preaching against the Spanish Match and in favour of war in the Palatinate thus began to look, in this light, like they had unjustly suffered simply for saying a truth that a misguided monarch had not wanted to hear at the time. This narrative is bound up with Protestant eschatology: Protestants were destined to triumph over Catholicism on earth, and it was incumbent upon Britain to make sure that they were on the side that won.

Neither the plague nor the failure of the Cadiz expedition meant that writers like Thomas Scott needed to change their ‘line’ on the Palatine conflict. The eschatological narrative was sufficiently accommodating. Defeat and suffering were, like everything, divinely ordained. God’s actions were beyond human understanding, but the belief that he would eventually guide Protestantism to victory was assured. Earthly sufferings were intended to prompt the believer to repentance and thus bring him or her closer to God. As long as one took the appropriate message from these chastisements, they need not necessarily disrupt the notion of an ordered Protestant providence.

In texts dealing with the plague, one of the sins for which God is punishing the nation is that of failing to care sufficiently about the sufferings of the Palatinate. In Price’s *Londons*
Remembrancer, forgetting the narrative of Protestant suffering in which the woes of the Palatinate sit is ‘the sinne [...] of England’; by castigating Englishmen as ‘Manassehs’ who actively forget this past, he promotes the notion of remembering as itself actively virtuous. The self-conscious ways in which the writers I discuss in this chapter draw attention to the past – whether the ‘long perspectives’ of biblical history, or the shorter ones of 1620s polemical publishing – are a means of prompting such active remembrance, of making the past present, of reflecting on the providential narrative in which both individual and state were involved.
Conclusion: Prince Rupert’s shoes

The Shepherd in Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale* meets with ‘things newborn’ on the coast of Bohemia: the baby Sicilian Princess Perdita, abandoned on the orders of her father, Leontes, who wrongly believes her to be illegitimate.¹ Miraculously preserved from the dangers of storms and bears, Perdita – Latin for ‘lost’ – represents the continuation of hope for the Sicilian dynasty. Her survival is a promise that the story is not over, that the infant girl will one day redeem her father’s cruelty and misjudgement.

In 1620, John Taylor also met with a ‘thing newborn’ while in Bohemia: Frederick and Elizabeth’s son Rupert, born in Prague just under eight months earlier. Taylor informs the reader that he held ‘Robert’ in his arms, and describes the young Prince as ‘a goodly child as euer I saw of that age, whom with the rest I pray God to blesse; to his glory and his Parents ioy and comfort’. However, Taylor goes beyond the conventional offering of hopes and prayers, through an unusual act of larceny:

There (for a token) I did thinke it mette,
To take the shoes from off this Prince his feete:
I doe not say I stole, but I did take,
And whilst I liue I’le keepe them for his sake:
Long may his Grace liue to be stylde a man,
And then I’le steale his bootes too, if I can.²

Taylor’s story may well be exaggerated. It is certainly presented humorously: but as with the anecdote from *Taylor his Trauels* with which I began this thesis, Taylor’s playfulness is revealing. Taylor’s interaction with the infant Prince gives an insight into the ways in which writers conceptualised the conflict on the continent, the people at the centre of that conflict, and their own position in relation to both.

The subject and the Stuart international

Taylor’s theft is comically bold – he brazenly removes the shoes from the Prince’s feet himself, without (it seems) asking permission from the child’s royal parents – but he appears to get away with it without offending anyone. On the contrary, he informs the reader, the ‘vndeserued fauours’ shown to him by Elizabeth continued throughout his stay and even during his ‘tedious iorny home-ward’. The relationship between Taylor and Elizabeth is an idealised version of the bond between a subject and a monarch: the subject shows the monarch respect and devotion, and the monarch recognises the subject’s worth, despite his humble origins, and shows him favour accordingly. The fact that Taylor is permitted to steal Rupert’s shoes as a token of esteem can be interpreted as evidence of Elizabeth’s good judgement. Although Taylor breaks decorum and transgresses his role as a subject, he does so as an expression of overflowing loyalty and affection, qualities that Elizabeth recognises and rewards.

Implicit in the emphasis on Elizabeth’s kindness is recognition of a specific connection between a British traveller and a British-born queen. Elizabeth is referred to simply as ‘the Queene’ throughout Taylor his Trauels, but in another text by Taylor published in 1620, she appears not just as an allied monarch, but practically as a British one. In An English-Mans Love to Bohemia, Taylor addresses British volunteers departing for Bohemia with ‘I know your valiant minds are sharpe and keene | To serue your Soueraignes daughter, Bohems Queene’. Elizabeth’s British identity is not subsumed within her Bohemian one, or her Palatine one. The soldiers go to serve Elizabeth as an extension of the Stuart monarchy, rather than the Wittelsbach dynasty into which she married.

This national connection underlies Taylor’s larceny: and, in particular, his hopes for the future. Taylor, hoping to ‘steale [Rupert’s] bootes too’ if Rupert ‘[lives] to be stylde a man’, envisages a future in which British subjects and the children of Frederick and Elizabeth still have reason to interact with each other, and indeed to repeat past acts of homage. The duties of British subjects extend to their monarch’s children and grandchildren, and they have personal, optimistic investment in the futures of these figures.

---

4 John Taylor, An English-Mans Love to Bohemia (Dort [Dordrecht] [i.e. London]: 1620, STC.23751), p.2.
Many of the texts I have examined in this thesis testify to such particular interest. Books and broadsheets celebrating the ‘Palatine Match’ in 1613-14 established the essential compatibility of Stuart and Palatine Wittelsbach lineage, faith, and culture. They projected a glorious future in which both Britain and the Palatinate had a stake. It is in the light of these representations that John Taylor travelled to Bohemia, and urged volunteers to fight bravely for Frederick and Elizabeth’s cause. Following the defeat at White Mountain, Taylor wrote a broadsheet celebrating the Parliament of 1621, *The Subjects Ioy, For the Parliament*. This concludes with a prayer for the succour and success of Stuarts both in Britain and abroad:

Preserve for evermore, our gracious Prince,
And strength him, his and thy Foes to convince,
The Prince and Princessesse *Palatines* high Grace,
With all the Royall and the hopefull Race:
Defend them Against all that them oppose,
And fight their Battels still against their Foes.
Grant that of this Seed we may ne’re want one,
To magnifie thy Name in *Britaines* Throne:
Vntill our Sauiour, and thy onely Sonne,
Shall come in Judgement, and the world be done.\(^5\)

However, the hopes for the Parliament were not realised: it was dissolved acrimoniously, on the King’s orders, before agreeing to grant subsidies for the war effort. Over the following two years, James’s continued refusal to countenance official British military action came under criticism from many of his subjects, as well as from his daughter and son-in-law. In this fraught context, assertions of loyalty to the Stuart dynasty could be deployed in ways that criticised royal policy. In contrast to James’s apparent unwillingness to support his Palatine kin, the ‘Puritan’ in *The Interpreter* (1622) ‘saies with all his heart, God saue the King | And all his yssue’, and is prepared to venture life and property in defence of the Stuart international.\(^6\)

This care, readiness to speak freely, and willingness to act become, in many polemical texts, markers of involved subjecthood. It is an ideal that remained remarkably stable during the upheavals of 1620-26. When John Reynolds asserts in a 1624 address to James that he is ‘a thousand times more jealous and zealous for the preservation of your Maiesties, and your royall Childrens welfare and honnor then of [his] owne life’, he links

---


\(^6\) [Scott, Thomas?], *The Interpreter wherin three principall termes of state much mistaken by the vulgar are clearely unfolded* ([Edinburgh?): 1622, STC.14115), p.3.
himself closely to those, like Thomas Scott, who suffered for the expression of such ideas before the ‘blessed revolution.’ Like Taylor’s envisaged relationship to Rupert, the role polemical writers take in regard to their monarch and his relatives does not alter with time and events.

The Bohemian conflict – and, more importantly, the war in the Palatinate – thus came to be a means to discuss national identity: what Britain’s place was in relation to the powers of Europe, and what both the King and his subjects would do to protect James’s kin abroad. However, the relationship between Britain and the Palatinate was not abstracted from its charged European context. In these texts, both Britain and Protestants on the continent faced an integrated international threat. Henry Hexham writes that in 1620-23 ‘the Kings children, Religion, the Reformed Church, suffered shipwracke, by the insulting, cruell, and blody Spaniard’. The Spanish injured the Protestant international, at the same time as – and partly through – injuring the Stuart one.

In An English-Mans Love to Bohemia, Taylor lists the different Protestant powers that have come together ‘T’oppose foule wrong, and to defend faire right’: Bohemia and both parts of the Palatinate, Denmark and Hungary, ‘The vpper and the lower Bavaria’, Sweden, Maurice of the Netherlands, and a host of German princes. Taylor’s cheery assessment was to prove both overconfident and inaccurate – Maximilian of Bavaria actually fought against Frederick, while Frederick’s Protestant allies proved much less willing to aid his cause than he had hoped. However, this does testify to the importance of a notion of international Protestant unity.

The Palatine family, their forces, and the lands they at various points ruled over thus stood in a double relationship to Britain and the British: both British and foreign simultaneously, representative of a European Protestantism united by perceived threat from the Catholic Habsburgs. This unity was played out between spaces that were closely connected through faith and shared action, but which remained geographically distinct from each other, crossed by the movements of armies and knit together with networks of textual exchange. This is a key aspect of British presentations of Bohemia and the Palatinate. Taylor does not

---

7 John Reynolds, [S.R.N.I.], Votivae Angliae: or, the desires and wishes of England (Vtrecht [Utrecht] [i.e. France?] : 1624), sig.A'.
collapse Bohemia within Britain: on the contrary, in *Taylor his Trauels* he describes his journey between the two places in detail. The geographical distance between Britain and the Palatinate was important for the metaphors of unification used in texts celebrating the ‘Palatine Match’; the awareness of the time it took for news to travel over this distance then became a source of anxiety during the military action of 1620-23. Distance was recognised, but so was the fact that this distance was crossed – in person, by news texts and polemical tracts imported from the continent, in ‘interest’.

**Trampling the Antichrist**

In travelling to Prague, Taylor performs an intensified, exaggerated version of this international British subjecthood. He undergoes privations and danger in order to bring back an account of this distant, but closely connected, royal court – and a pair of pilfered baby shoes. The theft is a striking manifestation of the complex, sometimes problematic interest that British subjects had in their King’s offspring. In Taylor’s account, the baby Prince is one of the sights of Bohemia. Taylor sees him, interacts with him, and goes home with a prized souvenir – and then he boasts about this to his compatriots. Taylor’s interest here seems to border on ownership: he takes something of the Prince back to London with him, and promises to keep it for the rest of his life.

Moreover, Taylor doesn’t just preserve the shoes as a keepsake. He interprets them for his readers as if they were themselves a text:

```
    The shoes were vpright shoes, and so was he
    That wore them, from all harme vpright and free:
    He vsde them for their vse, and not for pride,
    He neuer wrong’d them, or ne’re trod a side.
    Lambskin they were, as white as Innocence,
    (True patternes for the footsteps of a Prince,)¹⁰
```

Taylor’s pun on ‘pattens’ (a form of shoe) here emphasises the absurdity of his analysis – but also the way in which the shoes can stand in for the Prince himself, or at least an idea of him. Elizabeth Eisenstein writes that ‘the circulation of royal portraits and engravings of royal entries made it possible for a reigning dynast to impress a personal presence in a new

way upon the consciousness of all subjects’. The shoes appear to function, for Taylor, in a similar fashion. However, instead of purchasing a text produced in multiple copies and intended for circulation, he pilfers items that are unique, and which are not intended for such purposes. Taylor appropriates and reinterprets the shoes – he removes them from their original context, and repurposes them as a memento, and as a prophetic text. Furthermore, what circulates is not the shoes themselves – they are not made available to readers’ individual interpretations – but Taylor’s reading of them, framed within his account of his journey. Taylor’s commercially available printed text engages with what Raymond calls the ‘publicity dynamic’ in a way that the shoes cannot.

This is more complex, and potentially more disruptive, than the circulation of royal power described by Eisenstein. The ‘personal presence’ that travelled back from Bohemia with Rupert’s shoes was not controlled by the infant Prince, or even by his parents or his grandfather. Similarly, the texts examined in this thesis have shown how, when it came to representation in prose and pictures, ‘reigning dynasts’ were not in complete control of their own public image – how it circulated, what it was used for, and what it meant. The use of likenesses of James, Charles, Elizabeth, and Frederick on the frontispiece of Scott’s Vox Regis (1624) is a striking illustration (quite literally) of this. The frontispiece has been issued by a notorious exiled polemicist, rather than by the Stuart regime, and the figures of the monarchs are arranged like dolls in a tableau that expresses Scott’s argument. To an extent, the images of James and his children are available to anyone with the skills, cultural and economic capital, and effrontery to claim them. The texts discussed in this thesis do not, by and large, mock or castigate Stuart monarchs. They frame interactions between subjects and Stuarts in terms of fidelity and duty, on both sides. However, some of them do claim the right to define that relationship: to interpret and exploit it, as Taylor does both with the shoes and the story of how he came by them.

For Taylor, the baby shoes function not just as a memento, but as a focus for future hopes. Taylor expresses confidence that the Prince will come to embody a hoped-for Protestant ascendancy:

---


And time will come (as I do hope in God)
He that in childhood with these shooes was shod,
Shall with his manly feete once trample downe,
All Antichristian foes to his renowne.13

This optimism chimes with the militaristic hopes expressed regarding Rupert’s father and his late uncle Henry Stuart. The stolen shoes, carried from Prague to London, represent a glorious predicted future as much as they memorialise Taylor’s visit to Prague. Taylor’s interaction with the new Bohemian regime is closely tied to these hopes, as is his notion of how one should write and read responsibly about the conflict. In the 1620 edition of Taylor his Trauels, he accuses people who report bad news from Bohemia of lying, and of opposing ‘the Bohemian prosperity’.14 In the 1621 edition he opines that news of the defeat at White Mountain may have come from the mouths of ‘Great Britaine and Bohemiae\textsuperscript{es} foes’.15

This can perhaps be interpreted in the light of the Protestant eschatological narrative explored in my third and fourth chapters. Taylor may prioritise the expression of hope – and doubt bad news – because he interprets defeat as part of the inscrutable progression of a providence that tended inexorably to Protestant triumph over ‘Antichristian’ Catholic foes. This providential narrative bound together Protestants from across Europe, and gave millenarian meaning to the actions of British volunteers in Bohemia and the Palatinate:

\begin{quote}
Since God then in his loue did preordaine
That you should be his Champions, to maintaine
His quarrell, and his cause; a fig for foes,
God being with you, how can man oppose?16
\end{quote}

Through the period covered by this thesis, repeated defeats – in Bohemia, the Lower Palatinate, and Madrid – did not put a dent in this narrative. Rather, they could strengthen it: the apparent cruelty of Spanish forces could be seen as evidence of their sinfulness, and that right was on the Palatine side. Rupert and his siblings came to represent, not just British and Protestant interests abroad, but also the unforgiveable injury done to those interests.

13 John Taylor, Taylor his Trauels (1620), sig.D'.
14 Taylor, Taylor his Trauels (1620), sig.A3'.
15 John Taylor, Taylor his Trauels: from the citty of London in England, to the citty of Prague in Bohemia [...] The second edition, corrected, and much enlarged (London, 1621, STC.23802.5), sig.D3'.
One did not have to be in possession of a pair of stolen royal baby shoes to access both these hopes and this sense of injury. In 1624, a print by the Dutch engraver Willem van de Passe was produced in London by the King’s printer, John Bill. It shows an enthroned James flanked by his family – another imagined reunion, in some ways even more dramatic than the frontispiece to *Vox Regis*. On his right hand are a group of Stuarts, with a cherub holding a banner proclaiming their names. Charles stands with his hand resting on a copy of the Bible, in front of a crowd of the deceased: Anne, Henry, and Maria and Sophia, two of the four children of James and Anne to die in infancy. On James’s left hand stands another group: Frederick and Elizabeth, behind their seven children. None of this group hold skulls, unlike most of the Stuarts. They dominate the composition through sheer numbers, crowding up to the front of the image. They have their own cherub hovering above them, with a banner proclaiming them ‘Progenies RR: Boheme’. Of the five verses below the image, the first two refer to the Stuarts, the last three to the Wittelsbachs.

![Image](image1.jpg)

Figure 10: Willem van de Passe, *Triumphus Jacobi Regis Augustaeque ipsius Prolis* (London: 1624, STC.11511.3), © Trustees of the British Museum.
The message is clear. The future of James’s dynasty lies as much in the figures of his daughter and her children as it does in that of his surviving son. The fourth verse, addressed to Frederick and Elizabeth’s children, hammers this point home:

Who sees not! that your numbers large increase,
And noble virtue, these praesages giue;
God by your means will mightÿ things atchieue.17

If the Palatine family stay true to their Protestant faith, the writer promises them that God will ‘to ſyou and ſours restore | More then ſyou haue, with what ſyou had before’. Antony Griffith writes that ‘the plate is known in four states, in each of which the plate was updated by adding children as they were born, moustaches or beards as sitters aged, or skulls if they had died’; he argues that an earlier version was probably published in around 1622, shown by the fact that ‘the tail of the dog that was removed to make space for [the infant Louis, born in 1624] can still be seen’.18

Figure 11: Detail from van de Passe, *Triumphus Jacobi Regis Augustaeque ipsius Prolis*. The dog’s tail can just be seen to the lower left of the image.

---

These editable, reusable royals demonstrate the way in which the narrative of Protestant triumph remained stable, even while events and actors changed. What was at stake, and what needed to be continually restated, was the relationship in which Britain and the British stood to the divine providence that, inescapably, controlled their destinies as well as those of the Palatine family. Rupert, standing among his siblings, continues to embody the glorious Protestant future envisaged for him by Taylor. This image expresses the hopes engendered by the ‘blessed revolution’ of 1624, but also a broader narrative. It is an image of victory – one that has not happened yet but is, within Protestant ideas of providence, inevitable.
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**Manuscript sources**

Note: Recto and/or verso have only been given when several items are included on the same folio.

**British Library, London (BL)**

Additional MS 22959          John Rous, ‘Diary’
Harley MS 389               Joseph Mead, weekly letters of news, 1621-25
Malone MS 19, p.20           Sir Richard Ayton, *De Rebus Bohemicis*, ‘Dum gener infaustis tentat temerarius ausis’, contemporary translation

*Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart*

Additional MS 5015*, f.1     Elizabeth Stuart to Prince Charles, September 25/15 [1620?]
(previously Harley MS 7502 f.1)

Egerton MS 2651 (f.25)       Bohemian Estates to Elizabeth, 7 September 1619
Lansdowne MS 1237, ff.50-51  Elizabeth Stuart to King James I and VI, 13/23 November 1620
Writings of James I and VI

Egerton MS 923, ff.32-33 and ff.37-38r
 [King James I and VI], ‘The wiper of the peoples teares’

Lansdowne MS 498, ff.32-34
 [King James I and VI], ‘The wiper of the peoples teares’

The National Archives, London (TNA): State Papers

Documents relating to the imprisonment of John Reynolds

SP 14 169 f.41
 Locke to Sir Dudley Carleton, 11 July 1624

SP 14 170 f.105
 Lord Brooke to King James I and VI, 29 July 1624

SP 14 171 ff.74-77
 Sir Francis Nethersole to [Sir Dudley Carleton], 14 Aug 1624

SP 14 174 f.25
 George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury to Edward Conway, Secretary of State, 5 November 1624

SP 14 214 f.84
 Edward Conway to John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln (Lord Keeper of the Great Seal), 2 November 1624

SP 16 44 f.149
 John Reynolds, ‘The Humble Petition of Iohn Reynolds Gent, nowe Prisoner in His Maiestes Prison of the Fleet’ [undated, probably 1626]

Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart

SP 81 17, ff.59-60
 Sir Thomas Roe to Elizabeth Stuart, 7/17 June 1620

SP 81 17, ff.62-63
 Elizabeth Stuart to Sir Thomas Roe, 9/19 June 1620

SP 81 21, ff.30-31
 Elizabeth Stuart to Sir Thomas Roe, 21/31 May 1621

SP 81 27, ff.192-93
 Elizabeth Stuart to Sir Thomas Roe, 25 November/5 December 1622
Primary printed texts: *STC*

Note: Where relevant, I have given reference numbers for Folke Dahl’s, *A Bibliography of English Corantos and Periodical Newsbooks 1620-1642* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1952), e.g. ‘BEC.26’.

**STC.33**  
*The coppie of a letter sent from my lords grace of Canterburie shewing the reasons which induced the kings majestie to prescribe directions for preachers* (Oxford: J. Lichfield and J. Short, 1622)

**STC.385**  

**STC.533**  
Almansa y Mendoza, Andres, *Two Royal Entertainments, lately given to the most illustrious Prince Charles, Prince of Great Britain, by the high and mighty Philip the fourth King of Spaine* (London: [J. Haviland] for N. Butter, 1623)

**STC.1037**  
*Certaine Letters declaring in Part the Passage of Affaires in the Palatinate, April 1621* (Amsterdam [Amsterdam] [i.e. London?]: 1621)

**STC.1602**  

**STC.3171**  
[Scott, Thomas], *Boanerges. Or the humble supplication of the ministers of Scotland, to the High Court of Parliamet [sic] in England* (Edinburgh [Edinburgh] [i.e. London]: 1624)

**STC.3208**  
*The Last Newes from Bohemia with all the Adioyning Prouinces that be now vp in Armes* ([London: J. Bill?], 1620)
STC.3206  Bohemiae Regnum Electiium. That is, a plaine and true relation of the proceeding of the states of Bohemia [...] taken out of vnpartiall and classicque authors ([London: W. Jones?] 1620)


STC.3211.5  Newes from Bohemia. A true relation of the now present warres in Bohemia, transl. by William Philip (London: E. Griffin for R. Rounthwaite, 1619)

STC.3211.5  Newes from Bohemia. A true relation of the now present warres in Bohemia, transl. by William Philip (London: E. Griffin for R. Rounthwaite, 1619)

STC.3212  Harrison, John, The Reasons which Compelled the States of Bohemia to reject the Archduke Ferdinand &c. and inforced them to elect a new King (Dort [Dordrecht]: G. Waters, [1619])

STC.3212.5  The Reasons which Compelled the States of Bohemia to reject the Archduke Ferdinand &c. and inforced them to elect a new King (Dort [Dordrecht]: G. Waters, [1619]) Another edn. of STC.3212, this one anonymous.

STC.3213  Troubles in Bohemia, and Diuers other Kingdomes. Procured by the diuellish practises of state-medling Iesuites (London: W. J[aggard] for J. Pyper, 1619)


STC.3786  Brinsley, John, The Third Part of the True Watch (London: J. Haviland for T. Pavier, 1622)

STC.4022  Buggs, Samuel, Davids Strait. A sermon preached at Pauls-Crosse, 8 July 1621 (London: G. Eld for N. Butter, 1622)
STC.4869  De Caus, Salomon, *La Perspective, avec la raison des ombres et miroirs* (London: [R. Field (London) and J. Mommart (Brussels)] for J. Norton, 1612)

STC.5024.5  *The High and Mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Wales, &c.* (London: 1623)


STC.5742.7  Verstegan, Richard, *The Copy of a Letter sent from an English gentleman, lately become a Catholike beyond the seas, to his Protestant friend in England* ([St Omer: English College Press], 1622, STC.5742.7)

STC.5900  Cowell, John, *The Interpreter: or booke containing the signification of Words* (Cambridge: J. Legate, 1607)

STC.6017.5  Crashaw. William [W.C.], *Londons Lamentation for her Sinnes: and complaint to the Lord her God* (London: [W. Stansby] for G. Fayerbeard, 1625)

STC.6386  ‘Daw, Jack’, *Vox Graculi, or Iacke Dawes prognostication* (London: J. H[avilah] and E. Allde?] for N. Butter, 1622)

STC.6520  Dekker, Thomas, *A Rod for Run-Awayes. Gods tokens, Of his feareful judgements, sundry wayes pronounced vpon this city, and on seuerall persons, both flying from it, and staying in it* (London: [G. Purslowe] for J. Trundle, 1625)


<p>| STC.8806 | — <em>A Proclamation for the Commanding of all Souldiers, lately employed in the fleet, upon their arryval, not to depart from their colours</em>, 15 December 1625 (London: B. Norton and J. Bill, 1625) |
| STC.8821 | — <em>A Proclamation for a Generall and Publike Thankesgiuing to Almighty God, for his great mercy in staying his hand, and asswaging the late fearefull visitation of the plague</em>, 22 January 1625/26 (London: B. Norton and J. Bill, 1625/26) |
| STC.10784 | Fennor, William (Wilhelmus Vener), <em>Fennors Descriptions, or a true relation of certaine and diuers speeches, spoken before the King and Queenes most excellent Maiestie, the Prince his highness, and the Lady Elizabeth’s Grace</em> (London: E. Griffin for G. Gibbs, 1616) |
| STC.10811 | <em>A Cleare Demonstration, that Ferdinand is by his owne demerits fallen from the Kingdome of Bohemia, and the incorporate Prouinces</em>, ‘written by a noble-man of Polonia’ (Dort [Dordrecht]: G. Waters, [1619]) |
| STC.10814 | <em>A Plaine Demonstration of the Vnlawful Succession of Ferdinard the Second, because of the incestuous marriage of his parents</em> (the Hage [The Hague] [i.e. London: W. Stansby for N. Butter, 1620?]) |
| STC.11309 | Franchis, Joannes Maria de, <em>Of the Most Auspicatious Marriage</em> (London: G. Eld for W. Blainchard, 1613) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STC.11351</td>
<td><em>A Declaration of the Causes, for the which, wee Frederick [...] haue accepted of the crowne of Bohemia</em> (Middelburg: A. Schilders [i.e. London: W. Jones? or W. Stansby?], 1620)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC.11351.3</td>
<td>Another edn. of STC.11351, <em>A Declaration of the Causes, for the which, wee Frederick [...] haue accepted of the crowne of Bohemia</em> (Middelburg: A. Schilders [i.e. London: W. Jones? or W. Stansby?], 1620)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC.11353</td>
<td><em>A Briefe Description of the reasons that make the declaration of the ban made against the King of Bohemia [...] of no value, and therefore not to be respected</em> (the Hayf [The Hague]: A. Meuris [i.e. London: E. Allde for T. Archer?], 1621)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC.11356</td>
<td><em>The Late Good Successe and Victory, which it pleased God to giue to some of the King of Bohemia’s forces</em> (Middelburg: A. Schilders [i.e. London: W. Jones? or W. Stansby?], 1620)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC.11357</td>
<td><em>The Magnificent, Princely, and most Royall Entertainments giuen to the high and mightie Prince, and Princesse, Frederick, Count Palatine, Palsgraue of the Rhyne: and Elizabeth, sole daughter to the high and mighty King of England, Iames, our soueraigne lord</em> (London: [T. Snodham] for N. Butter, 1613)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC.11406</td>
<td>Rusdorf, Johann Joachim von, [Volradius Trubach, (misprint for Frubach)], <em>The Evaporation of the Apple of Palaestine: that is, the sifting of the answeres and rescripts, lately given, in the cause of the restitution of the Palatinate</em> (London: A. G[riffin] for Joyce Norton and R. Whitaker, 1637)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STC.12859 Harrison, John, *A Short Relation of the departure of the high and mightie Prince Frederick King Elect of Bohemia: with his royall & vertuous Ladie Elizabeth; And the thryse hopefull yong Prince Henrie, from Heydelberg towards Prague, to receiue the Crowne of that Kingdome* (Dort [Dordrecht]: G. Waters, 1619)

STC.13264.8 Hexham, Henry [H.H.], *A Tongue-Combat lately happening between two English Souldiers in the Tilt-boat of Grauesend* (London [i.e. Holland]: 1623)

STC.13541.7 Hockham, William, *Prince Charles his Welcome to the Court, or, A true subject's love for his happy returne from Spaine* (London: E. Allde for J. Wright, 1623)

STC.14115 [Scott, Thomas?], *The Interpreter wherin three principall termes of state much mistaken by the vulgar are clearely unfolded* ([Edinburgh?]: 1622)


STC.15432 Leighton, Alexander, *Speculum Belli Sacri, or the looking glass of the holy war* ([Amsterdam: successors of Giles Thorp], 1624)

STC.16691 Loe, William, *Vox Clamantis. Mark 1. 3 A stil voice, to the three thrice-honourable estates of Parliament: and in them, to all the soules of this our nation, of what state or condition soeuer they be* ([London]: T. S[nodham] for J. Teage 1621)

STC.16729.2 Goare, John, Mayor of London [I.G.M.], *By the Major. Whereas the infection of the plague is daily dispersed more & more in diuers parts of this city* (London: I. Jaggard, 1625)
STC.16741.7 Worshipful Company of Parish Clerks, *A Generall or Great Bill for this Yeere* (London: William Stansby, 1625)


STC.17125 *A Relation of the Passages of our English Companies from time to time, since their first departure from England to the parts of Germanie, and the United Provinces* (London: [E. Allde] for H. Gosson, 1621)

STC.17700.5 Maxwell, James, *The Imperiall and Princely Pedegree of the two most noble and vertuous princes lately married* ([London: E. Allde for H. Gosson?] 1613)

STC.18327.5 Verstegan, Richard, *A Young-Combat, lately happening, between two English Souldiers in the Tilt-boat of Grauesend* ([Mechlin [Mechelen]: printed by H. Jaye], 1623)

STC.18507.1 *The new tydings out of Italie are not yet com*, 2 December 1620 (Amsterdam [London?): G. Veseler for P. Keerius, 1620, BEC.1)

STC.18507.6 *Courant out of Italy, Germany, &c*, 9 April 1621 (Amsterdam: G. Veseler for P. Keerius, BEC.6)

STC.18507.7 *Courant newes out of Italy, Germany, Bohemia, Poland, &c*, 25 May 1621 (Amsterdam: G. Veseler [for P. Keerius], 1621, BEC.7)

STC. unknown *Courante, or, newes from Italy and Germanie*, 20 June 1621 (Amsterdam: G. Veseler [for P. Keerius], 1621, BEC.8)

STC.18507.13 *Newes from the Low Countries, or a courant out of Bohemia, Poland, Germanie, &c*, 9 August 1621 (Amsterdam [England?): Ioris [G.] Veseler, 1621, BEC.12)
STC.18507.19  Courante, or, newes from Italy and Germany, &c, 22 April 1621 (Amsterdam: [B. Jansz], 1621)

No printer’s name, but STC suggests attribution to Jansz.

STC.18507.20  Courante, or, newes from Italy and Germanie, 6 June 1621 (Amstrelredam [Amsterdam]: B. Ionson [B. Jansz], 1621)

STC.18507.21  Courante, or, newes from Italy, Germanie, Hungarie and Spaine, 25 June 1621 (Amstrelredam [Amsterdam]: B. Ionson [B. Jansz], 1621)

STC.18507.22  Courante, or, newes from Italy, Germanie, Hungarie, Spaine and France, 3 July 1621 (Amstrelredam [Amsterdam]: B. Ionson [B. Jansz], 1621)

STC.18507.23  Courante, or, newes from Italy, Germanie, Hungarie, Spaine and France, 9 July 1621 (Amstrelredam [Amsterdam]: B. Ionson [B. Jansz], 1621, BEC.22)

STC.18507.24  Courante, or, newes from Italy, Germanie, Hungarie, Poland, Bohemia and France, 20 July 1621 (Amstrelredam [Amsterdam]: B. Ionson [B. Jansz], 1621, BEC.23)

STC.18507.25  Corante, or, newes from Italy, Germany, Hungaria, Bohemia, Spaine and Dutchland, 2 August 1621 ([Amsterdam]: B. Johnson [B. Jansz], 1621, BEC.24)

STC.18507.26  Newes from the Low Countries, 29 July 1621 (Altmore [London?): ‘M.H.’, 1621, BEC.25)

STC.18507.37  Newes from the Palatinate. A true and comfortable relation of the wonderfull proceedings of Count Mansfield, March 1622 (The Hague [London: E. Allde], 1622, BEC.36)

STC.18507.38  More Newes from the Palatinate; and more comfort to every true Christian, that either fauoureth the cause of religion, or wisheith well to the King of Bohemia's proceedings, March 1622 ([London?): 1622, BEC.37)
STC.18507.40  *Good Newes for the King of Bohemia?*, 8 April 1622 ([London: B. Alsop], 1622, BEC.38)

STC.18507.42  *The King of Bohemia’s Welcome to Count Mansfield*, April 1622 (London: [E. Allde], 1622, BEC.39)

STC.18507.44  *Three Great Overthrows [...] collected out of two letters*, 3 May 1622 ([London: B. Alsop], 1622, BEC.40)

STC.18507.45  *It is certified from Palermo in Sicilia, that Don Francisco di Castro*, [14 May 1622?] ([London: N. Bourne and T. Archer, 1622], BEC.40A)

STC.18507.51  *Good Newes from Alsasia and the Palatinate*, 5 June 1622 (London: B. Alsop for N. Bourne and T. Archer, 1622, BEC.46)

STC.18507.51A  *A Continuation of More Newes from the Palatinate*, 13 June 1622 (London: J. Haviland for N. Butter, 1622, BEC.48)

STC.18507.52  *The True Copie of a Letter Sent from Franckfort*, 14 June 1622 (London: J. Dawson for N. Bourne and T. Archer, 1622, BEC.49)

STC.18507.53  *Weekly Newes from Italy, Germanie, Hungaria, Bohemia, the Palatinate, and the Low Countries*, 18 June 1622 (London: J. Dawson for N. Newbery and W. Sheffard, 1622, BEC.50).

STC.18507.54  *A Letter Sent from Maynhem concerning the late defeate given the Duke of Brunswicke by Monsieur Tilley*, 20 June 1622 (London: B. Alsop for N. Butter, 1622, BEC.51)


STC.18507.57  The Late Proceedings in all Troubled Parts of Christendome, 25 June 1622 (London: W. Jones for N. Bourne and T. Archer, 1622, BEC.53)

STC.18507.60  A True Relation of the Murther of Osman the Great Turke, 4 July 1622 (London: B. A[lsop] for N. Butter, 1662, BEC.56)

STC.18507.66  A Continuation of More Newes from the Palatinate, and diuers parts in Europe, and out of Europe, 26 July 1622 (London: B. A[lsop] for N. Bourne and T. Archer, 1622, BEC.62)

STC.18507.68  The Certaine Newes of this Present Weeke, 2 August 1622 (London: J. H[aviland] for N. Butter, 1622, BEC.64)

STC.18507.72  The Certaine Newes of this Present Weeke, 23 August 1622 (London: G. E[lims] for N. Butter, 1622, BEC.70)

STC.18507.75  Newes from Sundry Places, both forraine and domestique, 4 September 1622 (London: N. Butter, 1622, BEC.73)

STC.18507.77  A Relation of Many Memorable Passages from Rome, Italy, Spaine, France, Germany, the Low-Countries, the Palatinate, and other places, 14 September 1622 (London: N. Butter, B. Downes, and W. Sheffard, 1622, BEC.75)

STC.18507.78  The Newes Which Now Arrive from Divers Parts, 20 September 1622 (London: N. Butter and W. Sheffard, 1622, BEC.76)

STC.18507.79  Newes from Most Parts of Christendome, 25 September 1622 (London: [G. Eld] for N. Butter and W. Sheffard, 1622, BEC.77)

STC.18507.80  A Relation of Letters, and other advertisements of newes, sent hither unto such as correspond with friends beyond the sea, 27 September 1622 (London: [Eliot’s Court Press?] for N. Butter and T. Archer, 1622, BEC.78)
STC.18507.81  *A True Relation of the Affaires of Europe, especially, France, Flanders, and the Palatinate*, 4 October 1622 (London: [B. Alsop?] for N. Butter and N. Bourne, 1622, BEC.79)


STC.18507.95  *Numb. 16. Weekely Newes, containing the propositions of the ambassador of the Emperor at Wolfenbuttel*, 31 January 1623 (London: [G. Eld] for N. Butter, N. Bourne, and W. Sheffard, 1623, BEC.96)


STC.19126  *A Briefe Information of the Affaires of the Palatinate* ([London?): 1624). Sometimes attributed to Thomas Scott; these sheets appear in STC.22064

STC.19129  *A Faithfull Admonition of the Paltsgraues churches to all other Protestant churches in Dutchland*, transl. by John Rolte with a ‘Preface to the Reader’ by Thomas Beard (London: E. Griffin for G. Gibbes, 1614)

STC.19130  *A Full Declaration of the faith and ceremonies professed in the dominions of the most illustrious and noble Prince Fredericke, 5. Prince, Elector Palatine*, transl. by John Rolte with an ‘Epistle to the Reader’ by Thomas Beard (London: W. Welby, 1614)

STC.20946.1  Reynolds, John, [S.R.N.I.], *Votivae Angliae: or, the desires and wishes of England* (Vtrecht [Utrecht] [i.e. France?]: 1624)

STC.20946.3  — *Votivae Angliae: or, the desires and wishes of England* (Vtrecht [Utrecht] [i.e. London]: 1624). Another edn. of STC.20946.1

STC.20946.8  — *Vox Coeli, or, newes from heaven* (‘Elesium’ [i.e. London]: 1624)


STC.22065  — *Aphorismes of State: or certaine secret articles for the re-edifying of the Romish Church* (Vtrech [Utrecht] [i.e. London]: 1624)

STC.22069  — *The Belgick Pismire: stinging the slothfull sleeper, and awaking the diligent to fast, watch, pray* (London [i.e. Holland]: 1622)

STC.22071  — *The Belgick Souldier: warre was a blessing* ([London]: 1624)

STC.22072  — *The Belgick Souldier dedicated to the Parliament. Or, warre was a blessing* (Dort [Dordrecht] [ie. London]: 1624)

STC.22073  — *Certaine Reasons and Arguments of Policie, why the King of England should hereafter give over all further treatie, and enter into warre with the Spaniard* ([London]: 1624)
STC.22076 — *Englands Ioy, for suppressing the papists, and banishing the priests and Iesuites* ([London: N. Okes?], 1624)

STC.22077 — *An Experimentall Discoverie of Spanish Practises, or, the counsell of a well-wishing souldier, for the good of his Prince and State* ([London]: 1623)

STC.22078.5 — *A Second Part of Spanish Practises* ([London: N. Okes], 1624)

STC.22079 — *The High-Waies of God and the King. Wherein all men ought to walke in holinesse here, to happinesse hereafter* (London [i.e. Holland]: 1623)

STC.22080 — *Newes from Pernassus. The Politicall Touchstone, Taken From Mount Pernassus* (‘Helicon’ [i.e. Holland]: 1622)

STC.22084 — *Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost, sent from Elizian: to the nobility, gentry, and communaltie of England* (‘Paradise’ [i.e. London: J Beale?], 1624)

STC.22086 — *The Spaniards Perpetuall Designes to an Vniuersall Monarchie* ([London]: 1624)


STC.22089 — *Symmachia: or, a true-loues knot tyed, betwixt Great Britaine and the Vnited Prouinces, by the wisedome of King Iames, and the States Generall* ([Holland: 1624])

STC.22097a — *Vox Dei* ([London: Printed by I.L. for Richard Rounthwait, 1623])

STC.22100.2 — *Vox Populi, or Newes from Spayne* ([London]: 1620)
| STC.22104 | — *The Second Part of Vox Populi, or Gondomar appearing in the likenes of Matchiauell in a Spanish Parliament* (Goricom [Gorinchem] [i.e. London]: A. Ianss [i.e. William Jones], 1624) |
| STC.22105.5 | — *Vox Regis* ([Utrecht: A. van Herwijck, 1624]) |
| STC.22085 | — *Sir Walter Rawleghs Ghost, or Englands forewarner* (Vtricht [Utrecht] [i.e. London?]: J. Schellem, 1626) |
| STC.23074 | Spencer, Benjamin, *Vox Civitatis, or Londons complaint against her children in the countrey* (London: J. Dawson for N. Bourne, 1625) |
| STC.23751 | Taylor, John, *An English-Mans Love to Bohemia: with a friendly farewell to all the noble soouldiers that goe from Great Britaine to that honorable expedition* (Dort [Dordrecht] [i.e. London, G. Eld]: 1620) |
| STC.23784 | — *The Pennyles Pilgrimage, or the money-lesse perambulation* (London: E. Allde, 1618) |
| STC.23788 | — *The Praise of Hemp-seed* (London: [E. Allde] for H. Gosson, 1620) |
| STC.23789 | — *The Praise of Hemp-seed* (London: H. G[osson], 1623) |
| STC.23789.3 | — *The Praise of Hemp-seed* (London: E. Allde for H. G[osson], sold by E. Wright, 1623) |
| STC.23789.7 | — *Prince Charles his Welcome from Spaine* (London: G. E[ld] for J. Wright, 1623) |
| STC.23795.7 | — *The Subjects Joy, for the Parliament* (London: E. Allde for H. G[osson], sold by E. Wright, 1621) |
| STC.23802 | — *Taylor his Trauels: from the citty of London in England, to the city of Prague in Bohemia* (London, N. Okes for H. G[osson], sold by E. Wright, 1620) |
STC.23802.5 — *Taylor his Trauels: from the city of London in England, to the city of Prague in Bohemia [...] The second edition, corrected, and much enlarged* (London, N. Okes for H. G[ossen], sold by E. Wright, 1621)

STC.23807 — *Three Weekes, Three Daies, and Three Houres Observations and Trauel* (London: E. Griffin for G. Gybbs, 1617)


STC.24915 Mansfeld, Ernst von, *The Appollogie of the Illustrious Prince Ernestus, Earle of Mansfield* (Heidelbergh [Heidelberg] [i.e. London: E. Allde], 1622)

STC.25233 *A True and Ample Relation of all such occurrences as have happened in the Palatinate since the first of Iune. 1622* (London: J. Dawson for J. Bartlet, 1622)


Primary printed texts: non-STC

Salomon de Caus, _Hortus Palatinus a Friderico Rege Boemiae Electore Palatino Heidelbegae extractus, Salamone de Caus Architecto_, simultaneously pub. French and German edns. (Frankfurt: J.T. De Bry, 1619)

— _Institution Harmonique_ (Frankfurt: J. Norton, 1615)

— _Les Raisons de Forces Mouvantes_ (Frankfurt: J. Norton, 1615)

_Courante, or, newes from Italy and Germanie_, 20 June 1621 (Amsterdam: G. Veseler [for P. Keerius], 1621, BEC.8)

Printed primary sources: Later collections and editions

Akkerman, Nadine (ed.), _The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, Volume 1: 1603-1631_ (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming)


D’Ewes, Sir Simonds, _The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D’Ewes, Bart._, ed. by James Orchard Halliwell, 2 vols (London: Richard Bentley, 1845)


**Secondary printed texts**
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### Appendix 1: Dutch-printed corantos enclosed with Joseph Mead’s letters of news (BL Harley MS 389)

**Corantos published by Petrus Keerius in Amsterdam:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>STC Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f.56</td>
<td>STC.18507.6</td>
<td><em>Courant out of Italy, Germany, &amp;c,</em> 9 April 1621</td>
<td>(Amsterdam: G. Veseler for P. Keerius, BEC.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.79</td>
<td>STC.18507.7</td>
<td><em>Courant newes out of Italy, Germany, Bohemia, Poland, &amp;c,</em> 25 May 1621</td>
<td>(Amsterdam: G. Veseler [for P. Keerius], 1621, BEC.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.106</td>
<td>STC. unknown</td>
<td><em>Courante, or, newes from Italy and Germanie,</em> 20 June 1621</td>
<td>(Amsterdam: G. Veseler [for P. Keerius], 1621, BEC.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corantos published by Broer Jansz in Amsterdam (possibly published in London):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>STC Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f.68</td>
<td>STC.18507.19</td>
<td><em>Courante, or, newes from Italy and Germany, &amp;c,</em> 22 April 1621</td>
<td>(Amsterdam: [B. Jansz], 1621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No printer’s name, but STC suggests attribution to Jansz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.82</td>
<td>STC.18507.21</td>
<td><em>Courante, or, newes from Italy, Germanie, Hungarie and Spaine,</em> 25 June 1621</td>
<td>(Amstrelredam [Amsterdam]: B. Ionson [B. Jansz], 1621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.83</td>
<td>STC.18507.22</td>
<td><em>Courante, or, newes from Italy, Germanie, Hungarie, Spaine and France,</em> 3 July 1621</td>
<td>(Amstrelredam [Amsterdam]: B. Ionson [B. Jansz], 1621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.84</td>
<td>STC. 18507.23</td>
<td><em>Courante, or, newes from Italy, Germanie, Hungarie, Spaine and France,</em> 9 July 1621</td>
<td>(Amstrelredam [Amsterdam]: B. Ionson [B. Jansz], 1621, BEC.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.87</td>
<td>STC.18507.20</td>
<td><em>Courante, or, newes from Italy and Germanie,</em> 6 June 1621</td>
<td>(Amstrelredam [Amsterdam]: B. Ionson [B. Jansz], 1621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.104</td>
<td>STC.18507.24</td>
<td><em>Courante, or, newes from Italy, Germanie, Hungarie, Poland, Bohemia and France,</em> 20 July 1621</td>
<td>(Amstrelredam [Amsterdam]: B. Ionson [B. Jansz], 1621, BEC.23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: News pamphlets published by Nathaniel Butter in 1622 bearing a representation of Frederick V’s coat of arms on the verso of their title pages

| STC.18507.68 | *The Certaine Newes of this Present Weeke*, 2 August 1622  
(London: J. Haviland for N. Butter, 1622, BEC.64) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No longer extant</td>
<td>‘[...] The Certen newes of the present weeke, with the Present state of Count Mansfeilds Army &amp;c.’ (Arber, IV, p.77; BEC.67). Entered in the Stationers’ Register for a fee of sixpence on 13 August 1622.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| STC. 18507.72 | *The Certaine Newes of this Present Weeke*, 23 August 1622  
(London: G. Elms for N. Butter, 1622, BEC.70) |
| STC.18507.75 | *Newes from Sundry Places, both forraine and domestique*, 4 September 1622 (London: N. Buter, 1622, BEC.73) |
| STC.18507.77 | *A Relation of Many Memorable Passages from Rome, Italy, Spaine, France, Germany, the Low-Countries, the Palatinate, and other places*, 14 September 1622  
(London: N. Butter, B. Downes, and W. Sheffard, 1622, BEC.75) |
| STC.18507.78 | *The Newes Which Now Arrive from Divers Parts*, 20 September 1622  
(London: N. Butter and W. Sheffard, 1622, BEC.76) |
| STC.18507.79 | *Newes from Most Parts of Christendome*, 25 September 1622  
(London: [G. Eld] for N. Butter and W. Sheffard, 1622, BEC.77) |