

The Opposition Court of Henry, Prince of Wales, in the Reign of James I, 1610-1612

by

Joshua Reese Barronton

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Auburn, Alabama
May 14, 2010

Keywords: Court, Henry, Wales, James I, Stuart

Copyright 2010 by Joshua Reese Barronton

Approved by

Donna Bohanan, Chair, Professor of History
Abigail L. Swingen, Assistant Professor of History
Christopher J. Ferguson, Assistant Professor of History

Abstract

Henry Frederick Stuart, eldest son of James VI and I and Anne of Denmark, died at the age of eighteen after only two years as Prince of Wales. In his short life he developed a large following and served as the focal point for anti-Jacobean policies. Shortly after his death he developed into a near mythical figure in English history, and as a result the historical person of Henry has been lost in that legend which portrayed him as the quintessential militant Protestant prince. Henry has assumed this persona largely because his historical record is overwhelmingly literary. This thesis seeks to look beyond the myth to the reality of Henry's court, and its significance in early Stuart rule. An analysis of Henry, his court, and the policies they supported provides a means of looking at the dissatisfaction with James, and how that dissatisfaction was connected to the memory of Elizabeth I.

Acknowledgments

I would first like to thank my advisor, Dr. Donna Bohanan, for her continued guidance and patience throughout this process. She served as a calming influence during those frequent moments of panic. I owe her a debt of gratitude for helping focus my writing, despite our occasional disagreement over my use of the comma. Thanks also go to Auburn University faculty members Christopher Ferguson, for reading this work and offering numerous helpful insights, and Ralph Kingston for his support and feedback. I would like to especially thank Dr. Abigail Swingen for helping guide and develop this project from a seminar paper to a thesis, and most of all, for continuing to serve on this committee after her departure from Auburn. From Texas Tech she has offered her invaluable support, advice, and expertise. This was not required but is greatly appreciated.

I would like to thank my parents and grandparents for their constant support and faith in my abilities, and for being shoulders to lean on during this process. Thanks also to Professors Ruth Truss, Robert Barone, and Sally Bell of the University of Montevallo for first encouraging me to go to graduate school, and for continuing to serve as mentors and sounding boards as I worked on this project. Special thanks go to Nick Faucett and Abby Sayers. I could not have completed this thesis without their continued support, encouragement, and friendship.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Sins of the Father: The Establishment of Prince Henry’s Opposition Court	7
Chapter 2: Two Religions in One Bed: Marriage, Religion, and Foreign Policy	33
Chapter 3: Our Rising Sun is Set: Tudor Memory, Commemoration, and Henry’s Legacy in Early Stuart England	53
Conclusion	73
Bibliography	76

Introduction

On June 4, 1610, Henry Frederick Stuart, eldest son of James VI and I and Anne of Denmark, was created Prince of Wales before Parliament, at the age of sixteen. Henry, England's first Prince of Wales in over a century, soon became the center of an opposition party that found its home at his court at St. James's Palace. For two years Henry's satellite court served as the focal point for those dissatisfied with James's rule. Henry died in November 1612, and in the time after his death developed into a near mythical figure in English history. As a result, the historical person of Henry has been lost in the legend that portrayed him as the quintessential militant Protestant prince. While the mythologizing of Henry is certainly worthy of study, this thesis seeks to look beyond the myth to the significance of Henry and his opposition court in the reign of James I.

This thesis contributes to the understanding of the mechanics of Henry's satellite court and how it came to represent opposition to King James's policies both foreign and domestic. Henry did become nearly legendary after his death, but what was the reality of his life, and his time spent as Prince of Wales? Why did such a following develop around him and what can that tell scholars about Jacobean dissatisfaction after the first decade of Stuart rule? How did Henry become so connected to the memory of the Tudors? What effect, if any, did his satellite court have on England and the Continent? This thesis will address those questions, using a variety of political, financial, and literary sources to look beyond the myth of Henry to attempt to uncover the reality behind his two years as Prince of Wales, from 1610 to 1612. What Henry might have done as Henry IX is irrelevant. What is important is how he shaped the early years of James's reign, and how he developed such a following at a relatively young age, and in a remarkably short span of time.

Perhaps due to the limited sources and his near-mythical status, there is not a large body of scholarly work available on Henry or his court. In contrast, there is an immense historiography on James I, though Henry rarely factors into these works in any significant way. In most biographies of James, Henry is primarily mentioned as his oldest son who became Prince of Wales, achieved a modicum of popularity, and died young.¹ Rarely does Henry play any larger political role. Maurice Lee has acknowledged that Henry's court began to outshine that of his father, though this is a brief section that does not indicate the seriousness of the growing rift between the two.² Alistair Bellany, in his work on court scandals in early Stuart England, studied Henry's role within court by discussing his public protests against James's favorite, Robert Carr, and discussed the rumors that the prince had been poisoned by Carr.³ David Bergeron's study on the royal family includes a section on Henry and his interactions with his parents and younger siblings. Bergeron does not focus on the myth of Henry, but instead discusses his brief career within the context of familial relationships. Henry is merely a minor player in a larger work that focuses mostly on James, Anne, and Charles.⁴ Queen Anne's biographer, Leeds Barroll, studied Henry within the context of Anne, arguing that her influence, above that of Cecil, James, and the members of Henry's court, shaped his interests and

¹ See Roger Lockyer, *James VI and I*, (London: Longman, 1998), 81, 90, 141-142; Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King: The Life of James VI and I*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003), 184-185, 216-218, 244-249; Maurice Lee, *Great Britain's Solomon*, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 105-106, 134-135, 155, 176.

² Lee, 155.

³ Alistair Bellany, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 44, 47.

⁴ David M. Bergeron, *Royal Family, Royal Lovers: King James of England Scotland* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991), 91-108.

personality.⁵ She imparted to her son her love of culture, the arts, and through her relatives promoted his relationship with the German territories and the Low Countries.⁶ Ironically, though infrequently mentioned, Henry is often better served in the historiography of James and Anne than his own, which tends to read more as hagiography.

The most complete work on Henry is Roy Strong's study. Strong looked at Henry's life largely through his identity as a patron of the arts and regular subject of court masques. He tends to devote less space to Henry's devout Protestantism that shaped his interactions with the courts of continental Europe.⁷ The true focus of Strong's work is Henry as England's lost "Renaissance king", a monarch who would have brought glory to England, artistically, militarily, and religiously.⁸ Still, Strong's work serves as the only modern biography of Henry and has proven invaluable to every scholar researching Henry and his court. In a similar vein, J. W. Williamson's more literary study looks at the formation of the myth of Henry and how he came to reach such iconic status.⁹ While the available sources on Henry's life reveal evidence that the English people, and indeed other Protestants throughout Europe, placed their expectations for the future of the monarchy and the nation on him, this trend towards the counterfactual and mythologizing history that surrounds Henry is not the most effective means of analyzing the significance of his court and position within the early Stuart government.

⁵ Leeds Barroll, *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 73.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Roy Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986), chs. 2, 4, 5.

⁸ Ibid., 9, 223-225.

⁹ J. W. Williamson, *The Myth of the Conqueror*, (New York: AMS Press, 1978), chs. 1, 2, 4, and 7 in particular.

The most recent work on Henry is an essay collection edited by Timothy Wilks. Wilks, an art historian, assembled an impressive group of essays that primarily look at the images and portraits of the prince and Henry in the literature of his day. The contributors to this collection came from various disciplines including art history, English literature, and Renaissance studies as well as history. The collection includes essays on paintings of the prince, Henry's humanist education, and James's foreign policy in the aftermath of Henry's death. Still, at the center of these essays is the heroic figure of Henry and the construction of that image.¹⁰

With the exception of the financial crisis of 1610 and the failure of the Great Contract, dissatisfaction with James is most often discussed as part of his final years as king, within the context of the Thirty Years War and the Spanish Match. This thesis shows that the same problems that faced the government in 1623 existed a decade earlier, and that unhappiness with James was just as prevalent at that mid-point in his reign. That discontentment is illustrated through Henry's satellite court. Frustrations with James' continued peace-making efforts, which by the early 1620s involved marrying Charles to the Spanish Infanta, dominate the discussions of James's popularity in most studies.¹¹ Given the significance of both the Thirty Years War and the Spanish Match in early modern history, this is perhaps not surprising. Still, the complaints cast towards James during the latter part of his reign, namely that he avoided military conflict, pursued an alliance with Spain, and ignored the wishes of Parliament, were all present in the mid-part of his reign as well. Many of the frustrations with James that are most often discussed as problems of the 1620s were the same policies against which Henry's court reacted.

¹⁰ Timothy Wilks (ed), *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England* (London: Southampton Soylent University in association with Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007).

¹¹ See Lee, 261-293, & Lockyer, 147-157.

Henry the person cannot be easily separated from his court. His views, and just as important, the views of those that surrounded him, became the court, which came to represent everything that James was not. Not before or after in early modern English history did a court like Henry's exist. Conflict between the monarch and his heir became a hallmark of Hanoverian behavior in the eighteenth-century; however, never again did a court specifically come to represent opposition to the policies of the king or queen. In this regard, Henry's court was a unique phenomenon. The history of Henry and his court is not one of self-fashioning, where the prince intentionally constructed his identity to be counter to that of his father. From a young age, noblemen flocked to Henry. It would be impossible to determine whether Henry himself chose to become the antithesis to James, or whether this behavior was encouraged by those unhappy with the king. The former seems less likely given Henry's youth, though without a doubt he embraced that image once it was placed upon him. Instead, Henry's court developed as a process of "othering" James. Linda Colley, in her article "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument," states that "we usually decide who we are by reference to who and what we are not."¹² The members of Henry's court defined themselves, and by extension Henry himself, based on what they were not, James. The king, his policies, and his court became the other to Henry and his court.

Chapter one will examine the formation of Henry's court in opposition to James, and how his installation as Prince of Wales in 1610 fits within the context of the dispute between James and Parliament over The Great Contract. It will examine the position of the Prince of Wales in early modern England before then turning to the individuals who comprised Henry's inner circle and finally turning to the prince himself, his interests, and the ways in which he

¹² Linda Colley, "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument," in *The Journal of British Studies* 31, no. 4 (1992), 311.

defined himself in opposition to his father. The second chapter will investigate the marriage negotiations that surrounded Henry and his sister, Elizabeth, from 1609 to 1612. This matter above all others consumed the courts of Henry and James during his tenure as Prince of Wales. The chapter will first review the potential matches and their political and religious implications. It will then look at some of the tracts written by members of Henry's circle and what they reveal about the anti-Spanish ideology of Henry's court and in England at large during the early seventeenth-century. The final chapter addresses Henry's connection to the Tudors, particularly the memory of Elizabeth, through an analysis of some of the dramatic works and masques written and performed for Henry or on his behalf. It concludes with an examination of Henry's death, commemoration, and legacy. The prince and his court represented the high levels of dissatisfaction with James and his policies during the mid-point of his reign, and for a two year period threatened to outshine the king and his court.

CHAPTER ONE

Sins of the Father: The Establishment of Prince Henry's Opposition Court

Introduction

Henry's investiture as Prince of Wales signaled the beginning of his rise to political prominence. The decision in 1610 to go through with the ceremony was inspired by several factors. Organized by Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury and Lord Treasurer, the installation was part of his larger program to repair the financial problems that plagued James's government at this time, in conjunction with Henry's own desire to break free of his minority.¹³ Financial matters did not come naturally to James. In his speech before Parliament in March 1610, he informed members that he was "less naturally eloquent, and have greater cause to distrust mine elocution in matters of this nature, than in any other thing."¹⁴ He went on to emphasize that he was under no obligation to discuss his accounts with Parliament, and did so only as a favor at Salisbury's request. Cecil, unlike James, recognized their importance in helping the nation out of the severe financial strain it was under by 1609.¹⁵

From the start of his reign, financial difficulties plagued James. He inherited debt from Elizabeth and never managed to escape it, spending large amounts of money in his first year as King on entertainments, masques, and Elizabeth's funeral.¹⁶ James, like most of his Stuart successors, did not spend wisely. He spent an exorbitant amount on progresses, jewels, masques,

¹³ Pauline Croft (ed.), "A Collection of Several Speeches...of the late Lord Treasurer Cecil" in *Camden Miscellany XXIX*, Camden 4th ser., xxiv (London: Royal Historical Society, 1987), 258.

¹⁴ James I, "A Speech to the Lords and Commons...on Wednesday the XXI. Of March. Anno 1609," *James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Somerville, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 192-93.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Lockyer, 81.

and building projects in addition to having to pay for the households of Queen Anne and Henry.¹⁷ James also expanded the size of his court and engaged those present in constant celebrations and festivals. The wardrobe costs of court increased by over £25,000 from Elizabeth's reign to James's, who spent, on average, £6,000 more a year than his predecessor on entertainments.¹⁸ By 1608 the Crown was over £1,000,000 in debt, with that number increasing annually.¹⁹ In 1610, Salisbury proposed a solution to the king's financial problems in a plan that came to be known as the Great Contract. In this plan James would willingly give up certain feudal rights of the crown, such as wardship and purveyance in exchange for continued funding from Parliament.²⁰ Purveyance, or the right of the Crown to purchase goods at a lesser cost than the market value, was initially the main prerogative that Salisbury offered to the Commons, but they demanded the right of wardship be included. These two feudal rights alone were worth approximately £40,000 each.²¹ Salisbury wanted Parliament to agree to pay £600,000 in order to alleviate the debt, followed by £200,000 a year to aid in staving off further financial problems. The Commons agreed only to the latter sum, but they still did not reach an agreement with the king. The debate between king and Parliament continued, and by the early summer of 1610 James and Parliament had reached a stalemate over the issue. Already unpopular for his pro-Spanish sentiments and pacifist leanings, this economic crisis only compounded other problems that many had with James's rule. During this time those dissatisfied with James began to turn to

¹⁷ Ibid., 81-81.

¹⁸ Lee, 148.

¹⁹ Lockyer, 83.

²⁰ Ibid., 86.

²¹ Ibid., 87.

his son more than ever before, and it is within the context of this crisis that Henry's court developed.

The Installation, James, and the Great Contract

Henry's installation as Prince of Wales coincided with Salisbury's attempts to settle England's financial difficulties with the Great Contract. Salisbury hoped to use the installation to further woo Parliament into funding the Crown, relying on the tactic of spending money to make money. Establishing a proper household for the Prince after his installation would put a further drain on the Treasury, with an estimated £28,000 per year devoted to paying for his court.²² In addition, the revenues from Wales and Chester, traditionally transferred to the prince upon his installation, would be a further financial loss to the crown. With this knowledge James and Salisbury might have hoped to put off the installation until a later date; however, Henry increasingly made known his desire to end his minority.²³ In February 1609, shortly before Henry's fifteenth birthday, Marc' Antonio Correr, the Venetian ambassador to England, wrote that, "the Prince of Wales, who is now old enough, shows a wish to enter on his estates, from which are derived various emoluments at present enjoyed by some of these great Lords."²⁴ Though Wales and the Earldom of Chester were historically granted to the heir to the throne upon investiture, they had to be given by the ruling monarch. Impatient to gain control of these lands and their revenue, Henry asked Richard Connock, an auditor in his service, to compile a report on the previous princes of Wales, the titles bestowed upon them, the revenue they took in,

²² Ibid., 259.

²³ Pauline Croft, "The Installation of Henry, Prince of Wales," *Historical Research* 65, no. 157 (1992), 180.

²⁴ 'Venice: February 6, 1609,' *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice*, Volume XI, 1607-1610, edited by Horatio F. Brown (London: Kraus Reprint, 1904), 227.

and if possible, to discover what prompted their installations.²⁵ Connock discovered that all of the past princes had been fourteen or younger at the time of their investitures, all younger than Henry.²⁶ Henry used this information to further argue his case for the installation to go forward.

Salisbury was caught in a difficult situation. He struggled to solve the crown's financial difficulties through Parliament, and in addition, had to contend with a young prince anxious to gain independence. Always politically clever, Salisbury attempted to preserve his relationship with both his current monarch and the heir to the throne. The balancing act of trying to pacify the king, prince, and Parliament resulted in the installation. Reluctant to lose the revenue from Wales and Chester, but with his options dwindling, Salisbury hoped that a formal and lavish display before Parliament would reveal the impressive figure of Henry and encourage them to pay for the expensive celebrations and his new household.²⁷ Pauline Croft has argued that "the appearance of Henry in person...would, it was hoped, stir deeper reserves of loyalty and patriotism, leading to a vote of sufficient supply."²⁸ This also served another purpose. The installation guaranteed that James could not prorogue Parliament again, at least for a while, for Parliament was a necessary component of the investiture. Since 1607, though not dissolved, Parliament had been extended five times.²⁹ The installation provided a way to stall James until Salisbury could work out his Great Contract. The involvement of Parliament in the ceremony itself was of critical importance.

²⁵ Croft, "The Installation of Henry," 181.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Croft, "A Collection of Several Speeches....," 258-259.

²⁸ Croft, "The Installation of Henry," 185.

²⁹ Ibid., 182.

The significance of the installation itself cannot be overstated. The last ceremony creating a Prince of Wales occurred on February 18, 1504, when the future Henry VIII assumed the role after the death of his brother, Arthur. Salisbury used that event as a blueprint for Henry's installation, with the help of contemporary historian William Camden.³⁰ Since Edward I created the future Edward II Prince of Wales in 1301, nine subsequent heirs held the title. All but three were installed during a Parliamentary session. Pamphleteers took this information and used it as historical evidence of Parliament's crucial role, citing the misfortune that followed those princes that had not been installed before Parliament. One such pamphlet stated that "those that were created out of Parliament were Princes of a hard and disaster fortune. For Richard the Second was deposed, Edward the Fifth murdered, and Richard the Third his son died within three months after."³¹ Given this history, Salisbury's own desire for Henry to understand Parliament's importance, and the delicate financial settlement still unresolved, it is not surprising that Salisbury continually emphasized Parliament's involvement in the ceremony. James, on the other hand, as he reiterated in his Parliamentary address early in 1610, did not see the significance of their role in government.

An analysis of James's speech before Parliament in March of 1610 reveals his reluctance to surrender any amount of revenue or power. Much of his rhetoric during the 1610 Parliament revolved around his theory of the divine right of monarchs. He stated "Kings are justly called Gods, for that they exercise a manner or resemblance of Divine power upon the earth: For if you

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ *London's Love to the Royal Prince Henrie...* in John Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court*, vol. II, (New York: Burt Franklin, 1828), 317. The last mentioned was the only son of Richard III, Edward of Middleham, who died before his tenth birthday. It is ironic that this argument was used as reason to proceed before Parliament, given Henry's untimely death a little over two years after the installation.

will consider the Attributes to God, you shall see how they agree in the person of a King.”³² Not unusual to his speeches, this rhetoric also encompassed the paternal relationship between the monarch and his people, reminding them that a father had the right to make arbitrary decisions about the fate of his children’s inheritance, a right that he as King held over his subjects.³³ Again, it must be emphasized that while he acknowledged his lack of financial savvy in the speech, he informed Parliament in very clear terms that its duty to him required that members supply the monarch with funds, though the amount “must come of [their] loves.”³⁴ Reminding members of their obedience while also asking for assistance was James’s way of attempting to make peace with Parliament in order to secure funding for the Crown while also hoping to keep them from overexerting their, from his point of view, limited authority.

This divine-right rhetoric James deployed in 1610 was a hallmark of his political writings and speeches throughout his lifetime. He clarified this view in *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* (1598) and again a year later in *Basilicon Doron*, his guidebook on how to be a successful monarch, dedicated to Henry.³⁵ *The Trew Law*, written while he was still in Scotland but distributed around London upon his succession, outlined his views on kingship, emphasizing his belief that God appointed kings and only to him were they accountable.³⁶ The responsibility of a king, according to James, was to preserve the religion of the nation and the laws passed by their predecessors, and to “maintain the whole country, and every state therein, in all their

³² James I, *Political Writings*, 181.

³³ *Ibid.*, 182.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 193.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 1-84, 132-146.

³⁶ Lockyer, 37.

ancient Privileges and Liberties, as well against all foreign enemies, as among themselves.”³⁷

The Basilicon Doran reiterates several of the points made in *The Trew Law*, but, as historians have argued, is less severe, with only brief mentions of the divine right of monarchs.³⁸ He again reemphasized these points in speeches before Parliament in both 1604 and 1607 when disagreements arose between them.³⁹ Given these precedents, James’s reassertion of his theories on kingship in 1610 came as no great surprise. This is not necessarily to suggest that Henry’s court, in addition to reacting against James’s military, diplomatic, and religious policies, also fundamentally disagreed with the king on a Constitutional level. There is no strong evidence to support the notion that Henry did not also believe in the divine-right theory of kingship. Rather, the importance of the 1610 speech is in the persistent reemphasis of his position as a divinely-appointed monarch in a time of growing financial crisis, with Salisbury and other chief ministers encouraging a peace with Parliament.

By the fall of 1610, several months after the installation, Parliament reconvened to further discuss the Great Contract. At this point, only Salisbury maintained any degree of enthusiasm for the project.⁴⁰ As illustrated above, James fundamentally did not believe he owed anything to Parliament, and certainly did not understand their refusal to cooperate given the concessions he had already agreed to. When it became clear that no resolution would present itself, James dissolved Parliament, halting any potential benefits the Great Contract might have brought to the Crown.

³⁷ James I, *Political Writings*, 65.

³⁸ Lockyer, 36-37; Jenny Wormald, ‘*Basilikon Doron*’ and ‘*The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*,’ in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 46-47.

³⁹ James I, *Political Writings*, 132-146, 159-178.

⁴⁰ Lockyer, 88.

The Novelty of the Prince of Wales

The position of the Prince of Wales was a curiosity in the early seventeenth century. In the medieval era the prince served as a ceremonial ruler over Wales, without any real authority. The monarch did not bestow this title on his heir automatically and often the son only held the position for a brief time.⁴¹ Edward IV, when he made his infant son Edward Prince of Wales in 1471, changed the nature of the title. He sent Prince Edward to Ludlow Castle on the Welsh border, where he remained for the rest of his father's reign. Here, tutors educated him on the art of kingship. Henry Tudor adopted this policy for his eldest son, Arthur, after his investiture in 1489. In 1610, after a century without the title, members of James's court and Parliament wondered what role Henry's new office afforded him. Could a teenage boy sit in the House of Lords in an official capacity? Salisbury believed this to be part of his official duties as prince, but Henry did not live long enough to perform this task. The MPs from Wales also feared what Henry's investiture meant for the principality. As a result, they petitioned that a clause from Henry VIII's 1535 Act of Union be removed. The clause, according to Lloyd Bowen, drew "on precedents from the time of Edward I, allowed the monarch to make laws in Wales under the great seal which would be as valid as if they had been enacted by parliament."⁴² The Commons included this repeal in the Great Contract, which James supported. After the failure of the

⁴¹ Ibid. For example, Edward II, the first prince of Wales, did not invest his son, the future Edward III, with the title. Edward III installed his son, the Black Prince, before Parliament, and he held the title for over thirty years. His son, Richard II, served as prince of Wales for only a year, and it then went unoccupied for twenty-three years until Henry IV invested his son before Parliament in 1400. Henry VI held the position for less than a year as an infant, as did his son Edward.

⁴² Lloyd Bowen, *The Politics of the Principality: Wales, c. 1603-1642* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2007), 74-75.

Contract and the prorogation of Parliament, the matter went unresolved until 1624.⁴³ The significance of this motion was in the panic that Henry's installation caused the Welsh MPs. No one was certain what, if any, authority his new title gave him. In the end, like so many of his predecessors, Henry held no authority in Wales, and there is no evidence that he even traveled there during his two years as their prince.

Despite of the lack of precedent and initial trepidation over what power the investiture meant, plans for Prince Henry's installation moved forward. The matter of finances, a recurring theme in James's reign, dominated the ceremony. Salisbury hoped the installation would help bring revenue back to the Crown, but first he had to pay for it. The Great Contract not yet settled, neither king nor Parliament financed the ceremony. In the end, Salisbury obtained a loan from the City of London in the amount of £100,000.⁴⁴ Salisbury set the date as June 4, 1610, Trinity Monday. The economic crisis caused fears of postponement, as did the assassination of King Henri IV of France in May, which sent the court into a period of mourning. Despite Henri's death, the installation proceeded as planned.

Just as Salisbury desired, the people of London saw the installation as a time of great celebration and joy. In May, not long after Henri IV's death, Henry returned to London from his palace at Richmond. Upon his arrival, a large crowd met him with cheers and a variety of entertainments, including a pageant where the nymph Corinea, mounted on a whale, greeted him:

Gracious Prince, and great Duke of Cornwall, I, the good Angel...Corinea, Queen to Brute's noble companion Corineus, the first of fair Britain's regions, and your own worthy Dukedom...express the endeared affections of London's Lord Mayor, his Bretheren the Aldermen, and all these worthy Citizens, Merchants that hold commerce with me and the wide world, in our very best and richest commodities, do thus usher

⁴³ Ibid., 76.

⁴⁴ Croft, "The Installation of Henry," 186.

them the way, to applaud in this Triumph, and to let you know their willing readiness by all means possible to love and honor you.⁴⁵

Similar speeches full of praise for their young prince followed. This was one of many planned celebrations throughout the city. Firework displays, tilts, and masques filled the days immediately after the investiture.⁴⁶

A pamphlet printed in 1610 provides a detailed account of the installation. Though the author is unknown, it remains the best source of the day's activities. Traveling by barge on the Thames, Henry and James landed at Westminster Bridge and moved into the Houses of Parliament. Both houses attended the event, as well as twenty-five Knights of the Bath created the previous day, various members of the nobility who served specific roles in the ceremony, such as Salisbury, Rutland, Worcester, and Suffolk, foreign ambassadors, the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London, and the king. Henry entered, wearing "a surcote of purple velvet close girt unto him."⁴⁷ He knelt before James while Salisbury read the Letters Patent. Once finished, James invested Henry and draped the robes around him, placed a ring on his finger and a coronet on his head.⁴⁸ Afterwards, they moved to Whitehall where Henry hosted a feast in the Great Hall, while James retired to his private chamber to dine. The installation, in terms of the image Salisbury wanted to build of the prince, was successful. The failure of the Great Contract that summer, however, precluded any of the desired financial benefits. More importantly, Salisbury cemented a firm bond with Henry. Over a year and a half after the installation Ambassador

⁴⁵ *London's Love to Royal Prince Henrie...*, in Nichols, 320.

⁴⁶ *The Order and Solemnitie of the Creation of the High and Mightie Prince Henry...* in Nichols, 360-361.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 359.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 328.

Foscarini reported that Henry was “almost always with the Earl of Salisbury.”⁴⁹ Another result of the installation, argues Croft, was that Salisbury demonstrated to the prince the importance of Parliament.⁵⁰ Again, there is no direct evidence that Henry rejected the notion of the divine-right theory of kingship; however, it seems clear that Salisbury did hope to instill in the Prince an appreciation of Parliament and the benefits of a good relationship with them.

The Court

In addition to being the first Prince of Wales in over a century, Henry’s court was the first of its kind to be located in London. Again, no precedent existed for the location of the court of the Prince of Wales, or even that he have a separate court. When Edward IV sent his son to Ludlow in 1471 he hoped to create there a mock court for the prince, which he would “rule” over until his accession. Henry VII adopted this philosophy and sent Arthur to the same castle, where he died in 1502. Left with only one male heir, the king kept the future Henry VIII at his court during his tenure as Prince of Wales. He feared for Henry’s health and safety, and insisted that the prince could learn better from him how to be a good king.⁵¹

Whether James or Salisbury decided to locate the court at St. James’s palace is not known. It is doubtful Henry had any say in the location of his court, but it is possible he voiced an opinion. From 1603 to 1609, James situated his son’s household primarily at Richmond Palace, though it traveled at times. Perhaps his court as Prince of Wales remained in London because he had lived there since his arrival from Scotland. There is evidence that he actually

⁴⁹ ‘Venice: October 21, 1611,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 227.

⁵⁰ Croft, “The Installation of Henry” 192.

⁵¹ Chrimes, 245-46.

resided at St. James's before the installation.⁵² There was no reason for him to relocate to Wales, especially since he had no power there. Whatever the reason, locating Henry's court so close to Whitehall later proved to accentuate the tensions between father and son and their two courts.

If little precedent existed for the installation and the location of Henry's court, none existed for what it eventually became. His court developed a distinct personality, separate from that of James. Henry, and those that surrounded him, intentionally established a court that contrasted sharply with that of his father. Comprised of a mixture of young noblemen and former Elizabethan war dogs, it became a hotbed of anti-Spanish, anti-Catholic sentiment. Henry and those around him took on a martial ethos that contrasted with the peaceful James. Love of art and collecting as well as a keen interest in the New World also permeated St. James's Palace.

In addition to the officers of the household, Henry kept two distinct circles around him. A small group of young noblemen, all close to Henry in age, comprised one group. The second was made up of men older than the prince, many of whom had served in the court of Elizabeth, and included the Earls of Southampton and Salisbury, and perhaps the most well known, Sir Walter Raleigh. The members of these groups came from varied backgrounds. Most were alike, however, in that they each had experience abroad, a connection to the court of Elizabeth I, and a devotion to the Protestant cause. The combination of these three traits created an atmosphere of militant Protestantism that relied on Elizabethan memory to define the young man who resided at the center of the court and distinguish him from his father. At the same time, it developed strong ties to other European courts and customs.

Henry, noted for his maturity, spent much of his life in the company of adults. Three notable exceptions comprised the smallest circle at Henry's court, young noblemen all close to

⁵² *Prince Henry's Letter to the Dauphin* in Nichols, 290.

him in age. James placed them in Henry's household in 1603, to be educated alongside him. Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, William Cecil, Lord Cranborne, and John Harington, Baron Harington of Exton all grew up in Henry's household as his constant companions, creating friendships that extended to his court at St. James. Essex, Cranborne, and Harington all had strong ties to the court of Elizabeth through their famous fathers. They also inherited strong anti-Spanish, anti-Catholic sentiments which endeared them to Henry.⁵³

Essex, the only son of Elizabeth's fallen favorite, was restored to royal favor by James I in 1603. From 1607 to 1609 he traveled the continent, touring France, Germany, and the Low Countries, frequently writing the prince during this time.⁵⁴ In 1611, the friendship collapsed alongside Essex's arranged marriage to Frances Howard. Frances, well known for her public affair with the Robert Carr, the Earl of Somerset, was also rumored to have had an affair with Henry. A series of letters indicates a flirtation between the two, though no proof exists that they had an affair.⁵⁵ Henry and Essex fought publically over the matter during a game of tennis. Surviving letters indicate, however, that Essex attempted to heal the rift between them, although their friendship never fully recovered.⁵⁶

John Harington's father was the quintessential Elizabethan war dog. Devoutly Protestant, the senior Harington served with the Earl of Leicester in the Netherlands and became one of his closest friends, a relationship that extended to Leicester's stepson, the 2nd Earl of Essex. He served as the MP from Rutland in the 1590s, though he lost favor with Elizabeth for supporting

⁵³ Strong, 42.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Frances Howard to Prince Henry, July 1, 1611, from Hertford House, British Library Harleian 7008, f. 278.

⁵⁶ Robert Devereux to Prince Henry, c. 1611, BL Harleian 7008, f. 197.

Essex's rebellion in 1601. James elevated him to Baron Harington of Exton upon his succession two years later and allowed his son to be educated with Prince Henry. The two developed a strong friendship, perhaps one of the most genuine that Henry ever knew. James took notice of this friendship just before Harington departed for a tour of the Continent in early 1609, asking him, "What hast thou done John that thou art so master of the Prince's favor?"⁵⁷ Harington's tour included visits to the Low Countries, Switzerland, France, and Italy. While in Venice he was welcomed by Henry Wotton, England's ambassador there and another of Henry's frequent correspondents. Wotton wrote of Harington, "being the right eye of the Prince of Wales, this world holds that he will one day govern the kingdom."⁵⁸ Harington shared the prince's tragic fate, however, dying less than two years after Henry, in 1614.

The Earl of Salisbury's heir, William, completed this group of peers. The only one of the three not connected to the Essex faction, Cecil, Lord Cranborne, represented the future of one of the most politically successful families in early-modern England. Cranborne, like Essex and Harington, traveled on tour to the continent in 1609, keeping a journal of his experiences.⁵⁹ Henry did not share in these travels due to his position; however, all three wrote him frequently while on the continent, keeping him abreast of news from abroad. Cranborne, writing from Bordeaux in 1609, informed the prince that:

Your person is better known at home, but the rare perfections both of your mind and body (daily increased by your studies and exercises) do most gloriously shine abroad; the fame whereof (being infinitely spread by a number of most worthy and noblest gentlemen of this nation, who have frequented his Majesty's court and had the honor to be

⁵⁷ 'Venice: January 13, 1609,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1607-1610, 216.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 216.

⁵⁹ Strong, 45.

eyewitnesses of your virtues) overcomes the envy that is wont to be, in so near bordering neighbors.⁶⁰

This letter indicates that in a sense, these young men served as Henry's ambassadors abroad. Engaged in constant contact with all three of them, Henry toured the continent through their letters, which no doubt stirred in him a desire to interact with the courts of Europe that was so prevalent during his tenure as Prince of Wales. In addition, they promoted his image in the courts of France, Germany, Venice, and Florence.

Henry did not rely solely on these young men to maintain contact with the great courts of Europe. Numerous letters survive that indicate that he, even from a young age, wrote constantly to friends and relatives abroad. He frequently exchanged letters with Maurice of Nassau, Henri IV of France, Christian of Denmark, and Frederick of the Palatinate among others. He also often wrote Henry Wotton in Venice.⁶¹ Through this epistolary exchange with his friends and relatives abroad he kept abreast of affairs in Europe, though his interests appeared to lie primarily in the Protestant nations. Henry's interest in European affairs no doubt developed for several reasons. Marriage negotiations for his bride were underway at this time and he eagerly took an active role in these proceedings. In addition, since Henry did not turn to his father for an example of what a good Protestant prince should be, he turned to European counterparts, more militaristic in nature, such as Maurice and Nassau, Gustavus Adolphus, and especially Henri IV of France.⁶²

⁶⁰ Letter from William Cecil to Prince Henry, September, 1609, Bordeaux, BL Harleian 7007, f. 295.

⁶¹ See the letters in BL Harleian series 7007 and 7008.

⁶² His marriage negotiations and impact on Protestant Europe will be discussed in more detail in chapters 2 and 3 respectively.

Henry

The noblemen comprising Henry's inner circle fostered in him the belief that he was the next great Protestant defender, and though others constructed this image, he embraced it. Henry embodied the personality of his court, which can be seen in his actions and interests. He pursued a military education and expansion of the navy, and he involved himself in the expeditions to the New World. In addition, he maintained a strict code of conduct at St. James's Palace that contrasted starkly with his father's court.

The hope placed on Henry put him at odds with James's policies. The king valued peace and diplomacy over military action, and throughout his reign sought to establish a closer relationship with Spain by marriages proposed first for Henry and later for Charles.⁶³ Henry, however, devoted himself to the study of military strategy, which he hoped to use against Spain at the first available opportunity.⁶⁴ In 1612, Ambassador Foscarini sensed that many supported Henry's position rather than that of James, stating that "the whole kingdom desires war" with Spain, even though James "naturally love[d] peace."⁶⁵ According to Foscarini, the people saw Henry as the one hope for that war, since James attempted to avoid international conflicts.⁶⁶ The young prince responded vocally by seeking to expand the navy. He appeared before the Privy Council in November 1611 to encourage the construction of eight new galleons, and the previous month made it clear that he was interested in the position of Lord High Admiral. In fact, he spoke to the king directly about this matter, despite the fact that James had planned to give the

⁶³ Lockyer, 140-141.

⁶⁴ R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1987), 29.

⁶⁵ 'Venice: September 7 1612,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 419.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

position to Charles.⁶⁷ Nothing came of these requests, however; their importance lies in the fact that he asserted his authority and actively involved himself in government, representing the interests of his court. Foscarini wrote that the court expected Henry to begin sitting in the Council more often, “for he takes great pleasure in the conduct of important affairs.”⁶⁸

In addition to the eight new galleons he requested, Henry also asked the king to have a ship built in his honor, called the *Prince Royal*.⁶⁹ This ship, christened in September, 1610, was the largest one constructed during James’s reign. Designed by Phineas Pett, it took over sixteen hundred loads of timber to construct and over eight hundred pounds to paint.⁷⁰ Henry personally oversaw the ship’s construction. His friend and mentor, Raleigh, wrote a letter to him in the fall of 1607 instructing him on the proper way to construct a sturdy ship, thoroughly covering all possible topics, from the type of wood used to the exact location of the guns.⁷¹ Pett designed a sister ship for the *Prince Royal*, called the *Phoenix*, which was not completed until the year after Henry’s death.⁷² It is clear that Henry had a genuine interest in the navy. According to Cornwallis, he frequently acted to “advance the Affairs of the Navy, to his Power, now and then

⁶⁷ ‘Venice: October 21 & November 25, 1611,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 227, 240.

⁶⁸ ‘Venice: November 11, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 231.

⁶⁹ Sir Charles Cornwallis, *An Account of the Baptism, Life, Death, and Funeral of the most Incomparable Prince Frederick Henry, Prince of Wales*. London, Printed for J. Freeman in Fleet Street, 1751, 25-26.

⁷⁰ Strong, 57-58.

⁷¹ Sir Walter Raleigh to Prince Henry, November 1607, Tower of London, in *The Letters of Sir Walter Raleigh*, edited by Agnes Latham and Joyce Youings (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1999), 301-303.

⁷² Strong, 59.

got Leave of his Majesty to go in Person to view the Ships and Store-houses, which divers Times he did.”⁷³

Alongside actual military policy that Henry pursued, a martial ethos developed at his court. Keith Thomas argues that in the early modern period humanist thought caused a shift in emphasis from martial matters to legal and rhetorical concerns. Education became more valuable in the minds of many. In a sense, Thomas argues, the pen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, really did become mightier than the sword.⁷⁴ The idea that the aristocracy served as the military force of England became a thing of the medieval past. As Thomas points out, the early modern period was a time when soldiering evolved into “a specialized occupation, rather than an activity in which all gentlemen and many citizens could and would effectively participate.”⁷⁵ The aristocracy, however, resisted this notion, using Rome as a negative example of England’s fate if the “martial discipline and ‘manly exercises’ were neglected.”⁷⁶

Jousts and tilts were one of the means by which courtiers flexed their martial muscles during the Tudor and Stuart era, and Henry’s court proved no exception. These activities gave him a means to practice the art of war and display his prowess. He participated in jousts from the age of twelve, an activity encouraged by all around him, including some of his more well-known European correspondents. Maurice of Nassau and Henri IV sent him gifts of armor.⁷⁷

⁷³ Cornwallis, 26.

⁷⁴ Keith Thomas, *The Ends of Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 46.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 62.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 57.

⁷⁷ Strong, 34.

Salisbury and other members of his entourage presented him with horses and ponies regularly.⁷⁸ Though Thomas labels jousts as an anachronism, they nonetheless helped maintain in the minds of many English noblemen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the medieval notions of military valor and honor.⁷⁹ In addition to tilting, Henry also practiced “charging on horseback with pistols, after the manner of the wars, with all other the like inventions.”⁸⁰ On at least one occasion Maurice of Nassau sent one of his soldiers to Henry for the furtherance of his military education.⁸¹ It is clear that Henry invested much of his time to the study of war and, other than his devotion to the Protestant religion, it is this description of him that has gone down in posterity.

The military culture that developed in Henry’s court was, in many ways, a response to James’s pacifist policies. No martial culture existed at Whitehall. James made peace with Spain a year after succeeding to the throne and sought to maintain that peace. He hoped to mediate a peace between the Catholic and Protestant nations, seeking to put an end to the religious conflict that plagued Europe in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.⁸² In masques performed at his court the theme shifted to one of peace and harmony. One of the earliest masques performed for James in 1603 reflected this:

Whose strong and potent virtues have defac’d
Stern Mars’s statues, and upon them plac’d
His, and the world’s bless’d blessings. This hath brought
Sweet Peace to sit in that bright state she ought,

⁷⁸ Letter from Salisbury to the Prince, 1609, BL Harleian 7007, f. 324; Cornwallis, 26.

⁷⁹ Thomas, 54.

⁸⁰ Cornwallis, 26.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Smuts, 24.

Unbloody or untroubled.⁸³

The masques performed in honor of Henry continued to display him as a martial figure. Ben Jonson's *Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers*, performed in 1610 in honor of his installation, is one of the quintessential examples of this. In it the Lady of the Lake, observing Henry, asks

Does he not sit like Mars, or one that had
The better of him, in his armour clad?
And those his six assistants, as the pride
Of the old Grecian heroes had not died?
Or like Apollo, rais'd to the world's view
The minute after he the Python slew?⁸⁴

These two masques illustrate the differences between father, son, and their two courts. Whereas James desired to tear down Mars and his statues, bringing peace to England and the continent, Henry represented the god of war, reviving the Elizabethan cult of the late sixteenth century that sought to glorify England through war against Spain and against Catholicism.⁸⁵ Those dissatisfied with James's efforts at a religious peace in Europe found a place within Henry's circle.

In addition to his military ambitions Henry became interested in the New World, though the two were not unrelated. Historians credit this interest to Henry's admiration for and friendships with Sir Walter Raleigh and the Earl of Southampton. Southampton financed an expedition to Virginia in 1605 and joined the Virginia Company Council in 1609. Southampton and Raleigh represented an older generation of explorers. Henry also served as patron to younger

⁸³ Nichols, *Progresses*, vol. 1, 393.

⁸⁴ Ben Jonson, *The Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers*, in *The Works of Ben Jonson*, vol. 7, edited by W. Gifford (London: Bickers and Son, 1875), 154.

⁸⁵ The cult of Elizabeth and its revival in Henry's court will be discussed in greater detail in chapter three.

men, like Sir Thomas Roe. Roe was on the Royal Council for Virginia in 1607, and later joined the Virginia Company as its Treasurer in 1620. In 1614 the East India Company chose him as their ambassador. In Henry's lifetime, with his and Raleigh's support, Roe traveled to the Amazon. He went in search of El Dorado, new mines, and "a more aggressive policy towards Spain."⁸⁶ Like most explorers of the day, Henry's interest in the New World lay not simply in the desire to examine the unknown, but also the desire to profit from it. He probably realized that his military ambitions required funding, and acquiring wealth from the New World was a means to that end. In addition, establishing a presence in the New World provided a means of attacking Spain without actually going to war. Given James's indifference to the Virginia Company and the New World in general, it is not surprising that Henry, with his anti-Spanish aspirations, should want to establish himself and his court in Virginia in an effort to fight off the Spanish monopoly in the New World. Six months after Henry's death, in May 1613, John Digby, one of England's ambassadors to Spain, wrote to the king, in regards to a matter in Virginia,

It is hoped in Spain that the business will fall of itself, though Don Pedro de Cuneaga (the Spanish Ambassador) when last in England, demanded the removing of the plantation might be no longer deferred...the Spaniards hope the plantation will fall of itself. To endeavor to discover the true state of Virginia, one Clarke, an English pilot, was kept a close prisoner and sent to the galleys. It was hoped "business of that nature" would grow much colder after the death of Prince Henry.⁸⁷

Based on this report, it can be inferred that in both England and Spain Henry became associated with the colonies, not his father. Digby seems to be saying that with Henry dead, the belief was

⁸⁶ Alison Games, *The Web of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 154-155.

⁸⁷ 'America and West Indies: May 1613', *Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies, Volume 1: 1574-1660* (1860), pp. 14, [http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=68943&strquery=Prince Henry](http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=68943&strquery=Prince+Henry), Accessed March 27, 2010.

that the Spanish would cease their interference in the affairs of Virginia given the king's lack of interest in colonial matters.

While most of Roe's achievements occurred after Henry's death it is important to note that Henry supported his earliest explorations even though he was relatively untested at the time. The prince also helped finance Henry Hudson's journey to discover the Northwest Passage in 1610.⁸⁸ In fact, Henry had been involved in colonial expeditions at least as early as 1607, when he received a letter from Robert Tindall updating him on the conditions at Jamestown, including that they were suffering a drought.⁸⁹ Two years later, in February 1609, Ambassador Correr reported, in regards to Virginia, that "the Prince has put some money in it, so that he may, some day, when he comes to the Crown, have a claim over the Colony."⁹⁰ While that never came to pass, Cape Henry and Henrico County, Virginia, are both named in honor of the prince. Henry, with the help of Salisbury and Southampton, established Sir Thomas Dale in Virginia in 1611, giving him leave from his service in the Low Countries to form a settlement. Dale, famous for his involvement in the Pocahontas affair, founded the city of Henrico in the fall of 1611 in honor of his patron.⁹¹

Evidence survives indicating that by late 1611, Henry's focus had shifted from South America and the colony in Virginia to the discovery of the Northwest Passage. In a letter to Dudley Carlton dated December 1611, John Chamberlain wrote that ships were preparing to

⁸⁸ Park Honan, 'Wriothesley, Henry, third Earl of Southampton (1573-1624),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30073>

⁸⁹ Robert Tindall to Prince Henry, June 20, 1607, from Jamestown, Virginia, BL Harleian 7007, f. 139.

⁹⁰ 'Venice: February 27, 1609', *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1607-1610, 237.

⁹¹ 'America and West Indies: Addenda 1617', *Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies, Volume 9: 1675-1676 and Addenda 1574-1674* (1893), pp. 54-55, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=70043&strquery=PrinceHenry>, Accessed on March 27, 2010.

leave in early 1612 in search of the Northwest Passage, an operation which “the Prince is become patron and protector of.”⁹² A similar report from the Venetian ambassador supports this.

He wrote:

The Prince as Patron of the North-West passage intends to send out four ships to explore. Hopes are very high, and it is thought that it will be a blow to Spain. There are those who tell the Prince of the discovery of a continent much more handy and much richer than Virginia. The Prince listens graciously and guides all his actions towards lofty aims.⁹³

Henry’s interest in the Northwest Passage continued the trend of his interest in Virginia and South America. First and foremost, he wanted to weaken Spain and add to his coffers.

In April 1612 a ship under the command of Captain Thomas Button embarked on this journey. Instructions from Henry to Button survive that offer insight not only into Henry’s interest in this voyage, but further illuminate the type of behavior he expected at his court. He opened and closed the letter with detailed instructions on how the crew was to behave while aboard the ship, “Let there be a religious care daily throughout your ships to offer unto his divine Majesty the ...praise and thanksgiving for his fatherly goodness and protection.”⁹⁴ He goes on to prohibit all forms of “lewd behavior,” including arguing, swearing, blaspheming, and drunkenness.⁹⁵ Henry insisted that they keep a record of their travels and all the ports and towns visited, which was to be given to him upon their return. Button’s expedition did not return, however, until seven months after the prince’s death.

⁹² John Chamberlain to Dudley Carlton, December 4, 1611, in *The Chamberlain Letters*, edited by Elizabeth McClure Thomson (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1965), 208.

⁹³ ‘Venice: December 31, 1611,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 265.

⁹⁴ Henry, Prince of Wales, *Certaine orders and instruccions set downe by ... Henry Prince of Wales ... 1612 ... & delivered unto ... Captaine T. Button....* A facsimile of the original document produced by P.A. Hanrott (London: c. 1840), BL G7218.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

Henry's instructions to Button and his men were indicative of the type of behavior he expected at his court. In this way, he was consciously distinguishing his court from that of his father. St. James's became a model of virtue, where even swearing warranted a fine from the offender, later donated by Henry to the poor.⁹⁶ Henry did not approve of the manner in which James ran his court, and sought to establish a more proper setting, one where corrupt favorites, rumors of homosexuality, and excessive cursing, drinking, and gambling did not exist.⁹⁷ Orders to his household officers stated that none within the court curse in front of Henry, or appear drunk or disorderly. He required everyone at court to "repair to divine service" at least twice a day unless their duties specifically prevented them from attending. Writing the month after his death, the English ambassador to Venice wrote, "His household was as it were an academy of young nobles submitted to the severest discipline and entirely devoted to the pursuit of glory, so that the noblest deeds were confidently expected of them."⁹⁸

Malcolm Smuts attributes Henry's code of conduct to his desire to emulate Elizabethan ideas of court virtue.⁹⁹ This, in addition to the anti-Spanish military policies that Henry and his court championed caused a tension to develop between St. James's and Whitehall. In particular, Henry came into conflict with the king's new favorite, Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset.¹⁰⁰ Somerset, not much older than Henry, rose to prominence in 1610. James elevated him in 1611 to the position of Viscount Rochester and Lord Chamberlain. Both Henry and Queen Anne

⁹⁶ Cornwallis, 22.

⁹⁷ Strong, 15.

⁹⁸ 'Venice: December 23, 1612,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1610-1613*, 464.

⁹⁹ Smuts, 82.

¹⁰⁰ Leeds Barroll, *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 133

opposed Somerset and the disproportionate amount of attention James lavished on him.¹⁰¹ The tension between the courts, and between father and son, eventually became public. On May 4, 1611, the Venetian ambassador reported an incident in which James and Henry quarreled while out hunting, and James moved to hit the prince with his cane. The argument in question fell on the day after the Earl of Somerset's creation as a Garter Knight, which surely aggravated the situation. Ambassador Correr reported that Henry left, followed by a large majority of the hunting party.¹⁰² Later in the day Henry apologized formally; however, this incident is still indicative of a mounting tension between father and son.

Robert Carey, Earl of Monmouth, reported another dispute in 1611. James appointed Monmouth Master of the Robes to Prince Charles, however; Henry thought this position beneath Monmouth, instead recommending him to be made Charles's Surveyor of the Lands.¹⁰³ Henry traveled to Whitehall to settle the matter in person. Carey reported that "after long dispute, and that the Prince saw the King was unwilling to alter what was resolved by the Council...they parted, and the Prince came to St. James's much troubled."¹⁰⁴ The problem went unresolved for several days until Monmouth himself requested that Henry grant him the position of Master of the Robes, claiming that he did not feel qualified for the more prestigious title Henry recommended.¹⁰⁵ Although this clash was over a relatively minor issue it shows another example

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 134.

¹⁰² 'Venice: May 4, 1611,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 141-42.

¹⁰³ Robert Carey, *The Memoirs of Robert Carey*, ed. F. H. Mares (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972), 71-72.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 71.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 72.

of rising tensions between the two. Despite reports of this nature, it must be emphasized that Henry rarely openly defied his father, and sought to be the obedient son.

Conclusion

Henry's court developed as a reaction against James's pacifist, pro-Spanish policies, and during a time when the king's popularity had dipped further due to the financial crisis. Though he became defined in direct opposition to James, Henry recognized his father's superior position. It is for this reason that there is no primary source from Henry's own hand complaining of his father or his father's court. He expected a certain standard of behavior from those in his court, but also from himself. As heir to the throne, he maintained a certain respect for protocol. Occasionally Henry's emotions overwhelmed this sense of protocol, resulting in a public disagreement with the king as the examples above show. However, the prince was too proper to ever commit his thoughts about his father's court to paper. An analysis of his court and how it differed from James's, as well as an examination of the few public instances of quarrelling between the two provide evidence of Henry's dissatisfaction with the king and the court at Whitehall. No direct evidence from the prince himself exists because to do so was not proper. In a sense this further illustrates his persona. Henry held himself to a standard of behavior that elevated him above making petty comments about the king. The improprieties of James's court required that Henry's behavior be above reproach. Henry's court at St. James became a known center of anti-Spanish militant Protestantism and the prince and his courtiers actively promoted this image. As James's popularity declined, the noblemen who comprised Henry's court began to mold the young heir to be a king that corrected his father's mistakes. In this process of preparing for the future they connected Henry to the past. The next Stuart monarch would be the ideological heir not to his father, but rather, to Elizabeth.

CHAPTER TWO

Two Religions in One Bed: Marriage, Religion and Foreign Policy

Introduction

During his two years as Prince of Wales Henry's primary role in James's government was as the main player in a variety of potential matches for his marriage. This, above all other matters, dominated Henry's life from 1610 to 1612. As heir to the throne, the nationality and religion of his future bride was of the utmost importance. While this took place, James conducted negotiations for the hand of Henry's sister, Elizabeth, only two years his junior. It is important to remember that first and foremost the decision for his children's marriages belonged to James, and it was he who opened each negotiation based on advice from his councilors. Henry, for the most part, remained in the background, recognizing his father's authority in the matter. The strained relationship between father and son grew ever more apparent during this time, however, but Henry chose not to worsen the situation. When he did speak out against a match, he did so with careful language and the utmost respect. An analysis of the marriage negotiations provides a glimpse into not only key events that Henry and his court took part in, but it also allows for a closer examination of the anti-Spanish, anti-Catholic beliefs of that court. These sentiments were not limited to Henry and those around him. This chapter will place Henry and his court within the larger context of anti-Spanish attitudes in England during the early seventeenth century, and will show the important role that Tudor memory and history played in shaping those beliefs.

The Negotiations

James hoped to use the marriages of Henry and Elizabeth to further his efforts to unite Protestant and Catholic Europe by marrying Henry to a Catholic princess and Elizabeth to a

Protestant prince.¹⁰⁶ He feared the religious wars that had plagued Europe in the late sixteenth century and hoped to avoid future conflicts both at home and abroad. James entertained the prospect of marrying his son to nearly all of the eligible princesses of Europe at one point or another. From 1609 to 1612 he proposed matches with Spain, France, Tuscany, Savoy, and the Palatinate. For his daughter, however, Frederick of the Palatinate was the only seriously considered suitor. As early as 1610, rumors of Elizabeth's marriage permeated the court at Whitehall, accompanied by speculation about the possibility of Henry marrying Frederick's sister.¹⁰⁷ Not until the following year did negotiations seriously get under way; the Venetian ambassador reported that "those Princes do meet...with a view of binding this Crown to the Union, the Princess will be asked in marriage for the Elector Palatine."¹⁰⁸ With the alliance between England and the great Protestant power on the continent secured, James turned towards the two major Catholic powers for Henry's bride.

James negotiated with Philip III of Spain for a union between the prince and Philip's daughter, Anne. Rumors of this match first surfaced in 1602, approximately six months before James took the throne, in a letter written to Elizabeth I by James. At that time he reported his distrust of Spain to the Queen, written no doubt to please Elizabeth rather than to convey his true feelings on the match.¹⁰⁹ The Spanish match remained James's preferred union for a number of years, despite its unpopularity among certain members of court, notably Salisbury. The king hoped to secure a match with Spain before France did, fearing the potential outcomes of a union

¹⁰⁶ Thomas Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 16.

¹⁰⁷ 'Venice:February 11, 1610,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 420.

¹⁰⁸ 'Venice:November 20, 1611,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 239.

¹⁰⁹ James I to Elizabeth I, October 1602, in *Letters of King James VI&I*, edited by G.P.V. Akrigg (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 194.

of the two great Catholic nations.¹¹⁰ The assassination of Henri IV of France in the spring of 1610 brought this fear closer to reality. His widow, Marie de Medici, rather than following her husband's anti-Habsburg policies, pursued an alliance with Spain.

In April of 1612 the French ambassador formally offered the hand of Henri IV's daughter Christine, age six at the time, to Henry. Raleigh, and later Henry, favored this match, but James did not. James considered the dowry offered, 500,000 crowns, insufficient. The equivalent of nearly £150,000, this proposed sum did not rival that of the Duke of Savoy, who had offered £210,000.¹¹¹ By the summer of 1612 it was apparent that the match between Henry and the Infanta would not come to pass, and Marie de Medici arranged for the Spanish Princess Anne to marry her son, Louis XIII, and for her daughter to marry the future Philip IV of Spain.¹¹² Eventually, James entertained the idea of an alternative match with the Duke of Savoy whereby Henry would marry the duke's daughter Maria, and Elizabeth the duke's son, the Prince of Piedmont. Still, James never seriously considered marrying Elizabeth to the Prince of Piedmont, though he favored marrying Henry to Maria of Savoy, and sent Henry Wotton as his ambassador to the duke's court.¹¹³

Among Henry's circle, the Earls of Salisbury and Arundel opposed the Spanish match, but willingly supported a Catholic union, albeit an Italian one. In Salisbury's mind this solved multiple problems; it provided Henry with a Catholic bride and the crown with a rich dowry

¹¹⁰ 'Preface', *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, vii.

¹¹¹ Andrew Thrush, "The French Marriage and the Origins of the 1614 Parliament," in *The Crisis of 1614 and The Addled Parliament*, edited by Stephen Clucas and Rosalind Davies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 26-27.

¹¹² Lockyer, 142.

¹¹³ 'Preface,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, xi.

from the Medici family.¹¹⁴ He actively encouraged the Florentine match, as did Sir Thomas Challoner, Henry's chamberlain. They courted the duke with lavish gifts and promoted the union to the king by emphasizing the high dowry offered. Neither James nor Queen Anne favored a Florentine match, however, and it soon stalled.¹¹⁵ Raleigh, on the other hand, encouraged a French match.¹¹⁶ Throughout, Henry remained obedient to his father, recognizing the limitations of his role in the matter; however, he did express his opinions. He did not relish the thought of a Catholic bride, reportedly stating that "two religions should never lie in his bed."¹¹⁷

Over time, Henry became more vocal in the negotiations surrounding his impending marriage. As the Savoy match came closer to fruition, the Duke of Tuscany offered the hand of his sister, with a large dowry. Henry made it clear that he did not favor the match, according to Ambassador Foscarini, who wrote:

The Prince was not disposed towards this match because the large dower which is offered would not come into his hands nor be applied for the good of the Crown, but would very soon be scattered by the King's profusion, besides which he thinks he need have no difficulty in finding money, as he is heir to so many Crowns...He says he would rather marry a subject.¹¹⁸

By his expression of a willingness to marry a British subject, Henry wanted to emphasize how little he favored the match with Tuscany. However, it might also have been an indication of

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Raleigh, *A Discourse touching a Marriage between Prince Henry of England, and a Daughter of Savoy*, 270-280. The reasons for Raleigh's support of the French match will be discussed later in the chapter.

¹¹⁷ Preface, *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, xi.

¹¹⁸ "Venice: March 2, 1612," *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 300. The matter of the dowry being of little use to Prince or Crown will be revisited in the following section.

Henry's desire to marry a Protestant, a match that would link him further to his Tudor predecessors. Henry VIII had wed four of his subjects, all of whom had Protestant leanings.

According to historian Andrew Thrush, James gave the French match more serious thought in October 1612 after they increased their offer to match that of the Duke of Savoy.¹¹⁹ The French feared the Savoyan match, given that country's close relationship with Spain, and realized they needed to increase the dowry to alleviate James's mounting debts. By that point, the negotiations with Tuscany had collapsed, and it seemed that even the Savoy match was stalled.¹²⁰ Elizabeth's union with Frederick went forward as planned, however; he arrived in October 1612 to great pomp and celebration. Henry attended the celebrations along with the rest of the royal family, who welcomed Frederick enthusiastically.¹²¹ Rumors circulated at the time that Henry planned to travel with his sister and brother-in-law back to the Palatinate, where he hoped to secure a German Protestant bride for himself, though there is no direct evidence that he ever planned or could have realistically made such a trip.¹²² With so many controversial prospects, it is not surprising that Henry's marriage was the topic of much debate. Raleigh and Cornwallis both put their opinions to paper in a series of tracts written between 1610 and 1612. These tracts are useful in determining the significance of the marriage negotiations to Henry's court and within James's reign.

¹¹⁹ Thrush, 27.

¹²⁰ John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, October 22, 1612, in *The Chamberlain Letters*, ed. Elizabeth McClure Thomson (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1965), 69.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 68-69.

¹²² 'Venice: November 23, 1612,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1610-1613*, 450.

The Rhetoric of Marriage

Elizabeth I is best known to history as England's Virgin Queen, a monarch married to her people and to her country, not to any man. Discussions within her council and in Parliament about her marriage prospects began before the moment she succeeded her sister in 1558 and continued for the better part of the next twenty years. Several of her speeches before Parliament from the early 1560s to the late 1570s reveal a brilliant rhetorician addressing this thorny issue. In these speeches, Elizabeth promised her councilors a wedding, but included various reasons why the time was not right for such an event to occur.¹²³ Using history, religion, mock indignation, and shrewd diplomatic maneuvering, Elizabeth crafted a persuasive argument against every proposal suggested. Many of these same themes exist in the tracts written against the proposed matches for Prince Henry and Princess Elizabeth nearly forty years later.

Though they have since been published, the tracts by Cornwallis and Raleigh were not printed at the time. It is not known who read or even had access to them, other than Henry. Raleigh addressed his to Henry himself, and the prince requested Cornwallis's tract on the match with Florence.¹²⁴ It would not be unreasonable to assume that Henry also sought Raleigh's advice. There is no evidence to suggest that James read the tracts, and no real way to ascertain the effect, if any, they would have had on his decision. All were eventually published, though most surviving print copies are from the eighteenth century. The significance lays in the tracts themselves, however, and how they illuminated the "foreign policy" of Henry's court.

¹²³ For an example, see "Queen Elizabeth's Speech to a Joint Delegation of Lords and Commons, November 5, 1566," in *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, & Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 93-98.

¹²⁴ Sir Charles Cornwallis, *A Discourse Concerning the Marriage propounded to Prince Henry with a Daughter of Florence*, 1612, BL Add. 41613, ff. 215-216b.

The relationship between Henry and Raleigh is a crucial one in understanding the significance of Raleigh's tracts. Though they never met in person, they maintained contact through letters and intermediaries, and Raleigh became an unofficial tutor to the young Prince. The former Elizabethan war dog embodied the spirit of Henry's court and it is not surprising that the young prince looked up to him. James imprisoned Raleigh shortly after he came to the throne on the grounds that he was suspected of being involved in a plot against the king's life.¹²⁵ Raleigh encouraged Henry's interest in the navy and overseas expeditions and the two shared an obvious hatred of Spain and Catholicism. In addition to the marriage tracts, he wrote several works for the prince, including *Art of War and Sea* and *Discourse on the Invention of Ships*. Perhaps the most famous of his works to be written for and dedicated to Henry was his final project, *The History of the World*.¹²⁶ In this book Raleigh presented history, as one biographer has put it, as "strong, bright, and vital....the guide to existence."¹²⁷ That is how Raleigh used history in his tracts on the Savoyan match, as a guide or teacher.

Raleigh utilized history, specifically the history of the Tudors, to form his arguments against the Savoyan match. He saw no need for the prince to marry at all until a more suitable bride became available, and encouraged calling off the negotiations with the Duke of Savoy. Raleigh reminded the prince that Henry VIII made an alliance with the Duke of Savoy in the early sixteenth century while at war with France—wars that ended in "a great deal of Loss, and more Dishonour."¹²⁸ He proceeded to outline in detail each of Henry VIII's campaigns in

¹²⁵ Stephen Coote, *A Play of Passion: The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh* (London: Macmillan, 1993), 305-317.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 335-339.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 340.

¹²⁸ Raleigh, *A Discourse touching a Match...between the Lady Elizabeth and the Prince of Piedmont*, 253.

France, emphasizing that not only did he have the support of the Duke of Savoy, but also alliances with the Low Countries, Charles V, Ferdinand of Aragon, and the Duke of Bourbon. Effectively, an alliance with Savoy brought nothing to Henry VIII militarily or financially, and would bring nothing to James or Prince Henry a century later.

Raleigh spent much of his treatise relating stories of former marriage alliances in the previous century to point out not only the weakness of the Savoyan match but the problems of all of the proposed matches. These served to warn the prince of the dangers of entering into an alliance with another nation that might in any way weaken England. The two primary examples involved the unloved Mary Tudor. Before his divorce from Katherine of Aragon, Henry VIII considered marrying his daughter to Charles V, who, on the surface, encouraged the union, signing his correspondence to Henry “Your Son and Cousin, Charles.” Raleigh reminded Prince Henry of the failure of that match, and that the mere promise of marriage enabled Charles V to borrow money from the crown and pull Henry VIII into conflicts with France that England could ill-afford at the time.¹²⁹ Mary’s actual marriage to Charles’s son, Philip, nearly forty years later proved disastrous for England. Once again the Habsburgs drew England into an unnecessary conflict with France, which led to the loss “of the good Town of Calais, which had remained in the possession of the Crown of England from year 1347 to the Year 1558.”¹³⁰ Raleigh’s primary point in emphasizing the failure of past royal marriages was to make clear the dangers in hastily entering into a treaty with another country, which often brought more damage to the Crown than good.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 259.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

By invoking the memory of Mary Tudor, Raleigh provided Henry with a quintessential example of a disastrous royal marriage and of the dangers of forming an alliance with Spain. The contrast between Mary and her more popular sister would not have been lost on either Henry or Raleigh. Whereas Elizabeth often boasted her pure English heritage, Mary was intrinsically connected to Spain by virtue of her mother, Katharine of Aragon, and her husband, Philip II.¹³¹ Her union to Philip proved to be a loveless match that led England to near financial and military ruin, while Elizabeth remained forever in the minds of her people the victor at Tilbury against Philip's Armada in 1588. In her own time Mary's marriage to Philip was unpopular with the English people. They fundamentally did not trust Philip or the Spanish, and Philip's retinue of Spanish courtiers that traveled with him caused a stir at court.¹³² By referring to the unfortunate events of Mary's reign against the implied contrast with Elizabeth, Raleigh used the history and memory of the Tudors to illustrate to Henry the dangers of an improper match, particularly one that he believed would weaken England and benefit Spain.

On the surface, the themes of these tracts are entirely familiar; they were anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic. There were however, deeper issues underlying the simple effort to discourage the matches on religious grounds. All of Henry's serious bridal prospects came from Catholic nations. A Catholic marriage was certain. Therefore, discussions ultimately focused on the political, diplomatic, and military advantages of one Catholic princess over another. As Raleigh

¹³¹ Elizabeth often cited her true English heritage to reinforce to Parliament that she above all others would have the concerns of her people at heart, for there was no one more English than her. For an example of this, see "Queen Elizabeth's Speech to a Joint Delegation..." in *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 95.

¹³² H. F. M. Prescott, *Mary Tudor: The Spanish Tudor* (London: Phoenix, 2003), 354-355.

stated, “marriages between foreign Princes, for the most part, are but Politick.”¹³³ Only Cornwallis, in a tract written at Henry’s request, relied heavily on religion to argue against the match with Florence. Calling Catholicism the “serpent of corruption,” he insisted to Henry that a Florentine match would lead to an increase in Catholic plots against the crown from the king’s unreformed subjects.¹³⁴ This was interesting because he did not display the same intolerance of Catholicism in his tract detailing the negotiations with the King of Spain.¹³⁵ One of James’s former ambassadors to Spain, Cornwallis did not spew the same degree of vehement anti-Spanish rhetoric as Raleigh did.

Unlike the rest of Henry’s court, Cornwallis’s prior relationship to the Spanish crown required that he participate in the negotiations for the hand of the Infanta. Nevertheless, while he did not react as negatively towards the Spanish match as the rest of Henry’s circle, Cornwallis recognized the inherent flaws in the proposal. The most important obstacle from his perspective was religion, or specifically, the conversion of either Henry or the Infanta, “if matter of religion be accommodated.”¹³⁶ The abject hostility to Catholicism found in his tract on the Italian match, however, did not appear in his response to a Spanish union. Still, religion proved to be an insurmountable obstacle.

¹³³ Raleigh, *A Discourse touching a Match propounded by the Savoyan between the Lady Elizabeth and the Prince of Piedmont*, 250.

¹³⁴ Cornwallis, *A Discourse Concerning the Marriage propounded to Prince Henry with a Daughter of Florence*, BL Add. 41613, ff. 215-216b.

¹³⁵ Cornwallis, “A Relation of the Carriage of the Marriage that Should have been made between the Prince of England and the Infanta Major,” *Collectanea Curiosa or Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to the History and Antiquities of England and Ireland*, Edited by John Gutch, (Oxford, 1781), 147.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

In spite of James's hopes for an alliance with Spain, the negotiations reached an impasse in 1612. Philip III demanded, after consultation with the Pope, that Henry convert to Roman Catholicism. He believed, according to the Duke of Lerma, that "God might have been pleased to have made this the means for the reducing of the Prince, and England to the Catholic religion."¹³⁷ This demand signaled the death knell of Henry's Spanish match. Though he wanted to strengthen ties to Catholic Europe, James refused to allow the conversion of his eldest son. For the remainder of the prince's lifetime he directed all serious negotiations to the match with Savoy, a match deeply unpopular with Raleigh and, in time, Henry himself, perhaps because of Raleigh's influence.

Raleigh and Cornwallis embraced the fact that, as Raleigh stated, royal marriages were "politick."¹³⁸ Each used politics and diplomacy in their favor when arguing against the Savoyan match. James favored marrying Henry to the Duke's daughter; however, both Cornwallis and Raleigh insisted that Savoy could not escape the clutches of France and Spain. Raleigh warned of the military and financial dependence of Savoy on the two larger nations, stating that "it hath ever depended, and must ever depend, either upon France, or Spain."¹³⁹ If England required military assistance against either of those nations, Savoy would prove useless. Worse still, if France and Spain forged an alliance against England, Savoy could not come to the king's aid due to their economic dependency on the larger nations.¹⁴⁰ Cornwallis believed that no King of England could "recover and retain his rights in those Principalities; All France being interjacent

¹³⁷ Ibid., 154.

¹³⁸ Raleigh, *A Discourse touching a Match propounded by the Savoyan between the Lady Elizabeth and the Prince of Piedmont*, 250.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 251.

¹⁴⁰ Raleigh, *A Discourse touching a marriage between Prince Henry...and a Daughter of Savoy*, 280.

on the one side and the dominions and forces of Spain...about it on the other side.”¹⁴¹

Financially and militarily dependent on France and Spain, Savoy also sat geographically between France and the Spanish controlled lands in Italy, and Raleigh went so far as to label the Duke of Savoy “the Emperor’s Vicar in his own Territory,” meant to emphasize the close relationship between the duke, the Holy Roman Emperor, and the Papacy.¹⁴² Raleigh referred to the Prince of Piedmont as “the Popish Prince of Savoy, that can return no...benefit to this state.”¹⁴³ This was not to suggest that an alliance with Savoy could prove a threat to the Church of England, rather that the duke himself could never aid England fiscally or militarily because of his dependence on the papacy and Spain.

The significance of these passages is what Raleigh, and to a lesser extent Cornwallis, emphasized in the end. The crown would simply not benefit from the match with Savoy favored by the King. Savoy brought little in the way of a dowry and could provide no significant military aid in what they considered the inevitable invasion of Spain under Henry’s rule. In the end, their fear of Spanish aspirations for a Universal Monarchy drove their desire to invade and their concern over James’s persistent political maneuverings to tie the two nations together, either directly or indirectly, through Henry’s marriage. Moreover, the alliance threatened England’s relationship with the Protestant German territories and would “break the Hearts of the People of Geneva, which our late Queen greatly favoured and...which all German Protestant Princes cherish; which the King of France, though of a contrary religion, hath ever protected.”¹⁴⁴

¹⁴¹ Charles Cornwallis, *Tracts on Prince Elizabeth’s Proposed Marriage*, BL Add 39853, f. 25.

¹⁴² Raleigh, *A Discourse touching a marriage between Prince Henry...and a Daughter of Savoy*, 271.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 275.

Raleigh used the memory and moral authority of Elizabeth I to make his point, effectively stating that the Savoyan match went against her beliefs and desires for the kingdom. Elizabeth always served as a powerful motivating factor for members of Henry's court.

Religious, military, and diplomatic matters aside, Raleigh believed that the the king should not enter an alliance that did not benefit him in any way other than providing grandchildren. If Henry married young and had royal heirs, while James lived they would serve only as a further financial burden to an already overwrought treasury.¹⁴⁵ While Henry remained unmarried, "all the Eyes of Christendom [were] upon him" and James's "safety in the mean while will be infinitely more assured."¹⁴⁶ This was not unlike the way in which Elizabeth I conducted her own negotiations in the mid-sixteenth century. By stalling the marriage the king could, in theory, keep Spain and France at bay and not entangle himself by playing one against the other. Raleigh saw the best eventual option as the proposed match to Henri IV's daughter Christine, nine years old at the time. James never favored this French match because he thought the bride too young and the dowry too small.¹⁴⁷ Raleigh hoped to delay Henry's marriage by a few years, waiting until Christine reached a marriageable age, because he saw France as the only useful diplomatic alliance. Not only did France guarantee them a hold over the Low-Countries, according to Raleigh, but the alliance also would protect England from Spain. He encouraged Henry to remember that their hatred of the Pope and Spain was a "hatred more than immortal to our Nation and State."¹⁴⁸ While Savoy bordered and relied on France, their connection to Spain

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 277

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 278

¹⁴⁷ Thrush, 26

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 280.

worried Raleigh more, because of the fear of Universal Monarchy that went back as far as Elizabeth's reign. Raleigh saw a match with France as one way to protect England against that threat.

Henry's own hand suggests that he too favored the French match over the Savoyan one. One of the last known letters Henry wrote to James addressed the matter of his marriage. In the letter, whether because of Raleigh's influence or not is unknown, Henry hoped to delay the seemingly inevitable match with Savoy to discuss, in particular, religious concerns. He freely admitted that his views ran counter to those of James, asking for the king's pardon for offering a differing opinion. He acknowledged his lesser knowledge in matters of the state, and stated that his "part to play" was "to be in love with any of them," but expressed concern that James would choose Savoy for the matter of the dowry alone.¹⁴⁹ In the letter, his chief concern was the "satisfaction to the...body of Protestants abroad," and their acceptance of the Savoyan match.¹⁵⁰ The letter is brief, but it is clear that Henry felt that Protestant opinion both at home and abroad supported a match with France over that of Savoy. Though he did not explicitly state this, it is possible that he felt, as Raleigh did, that Spain held too tight a grip on Savoy. These concerns, masked in religious rhetoric by Henry, Cornwallis, and Raleigh, were not strictly a matter of religion, but about a fear and hatred of Spain and Universal Monarchy that ran deeper than a fear of Catholicism itself.

There is no direct evidence that anyone within Henry's circle addressed these concerns over the matches directly to James himself other than the prince's letter to his father one month before his death. As such, it is difficult to ascertain what, if any effect, the rhetoric that came out

¹⁴⁹ Henry to King James I, from Richmond, 5 Oct 1612, BL Add 39288, f. 7b

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

of Henry's court had on the king's decision. The fact that James never reached a final decision on Henry's marriage before the prince's death further complicated the matter. The historical scholarship on James's reign is silent on this issue. The topic of Henry's marriage is little more than a footnote in most scholarly works on the king, if mentioned at all. Therefore, what conclusions can be drawn from the impact of Henry and his court on the negotiations?

Two weeks after Henry wrote to James expressing concerns over the match with Savoy, Frederick of Palatine arrived for his wedding to the prince's sister. Famous letter writer and one of the early news reporters in England, John Chamberlain, wrote about this event and concluded in a letter to Dudley Carleton that he heard "whispering that the match with Savoy cools...it might in good time be quite quenched."¹⁵¹ James, based on this comment, seemed to be reversing his opinion of the match. Chamberlain, well known for his accurate reporting, heard rumors that the marriage negotiations to the duke's daughter had stalled indefinitely, only seventeen days after Henry wrote to James with his apprehensions about the proposal. It is possible that Henry's concerns led James to reconsider the alliance with Savoy.

What then, is the historical significance of the tracts published by Raleigh and Cornwallis and the letter Henry wrote to his father? Like many issues that formed around the young prince, the importance was not in the "what if?" or "what might have been," but in what actually occurred. The significance is that courtiers, noblemen, and men like Chamberlain talked openly about Henry's potential matches, concerning themselves with Henry's and England's future. All hoped to avoid a treaty with Spain and sought to build alliances against the Spanish in the process. Raleigh and Cornwallis each wrote multiple opinions of the matches for both Henry and

¹⁵¹ Chamberlain to Carleton, 22 October 1612, in Thomson, 69.

Elizabeth. Written largely for Henry, these tracts illustrate the prominence and independence of the satellite court.

The Negotiations in a Larger Context

From the beginning, Henry and the members of his court adopted an opposition policy towards Spain. The rhetoric displayed by key members of that circle, including Raleigh, Cornwallis, and Henry himself, revealed that anti-Spanish sentiments were at the heart of their objections to not only the Spanish match, but also to the union with Savoy. Religious differences certainly played their part, but religion alone did not drive this fear and hatred of Spain that permeated Henry's court and indeed much of England in the early seventeenth century.

Salisbury and Arundel had, after all, encouraged an Italian match, and Raleigh favored a French union, all with Catholic princesses. Henry himself seemed willing to accept a Catholic bride, however much it went against his personal feelings on the matter. None favored the Spanish match, and none favored the Savoyan match because Savoy was effectively a client of Spain.

Historians have debated the origins of England's deep rooted hatred and fear of Spain. Suffice it to say, most scholars look to Elizabeth's reign and the Anglo-Spanish war as the genesis.¹⁵² In those wars, despite the myth perpetuated by the poets and dramatists of the day, Elizabeth did not achieve the victory that many desired. As Thomas Cogswell has written, Elizabeth succeeded only in "holding her own against Philip II of Spain."¹⁵³ As has been previously discussed, certain members of the so-called "war dog" party within her court felt that Elizabeth never adequately addressed the problem of Spain. Raleigh echoed this opinion to

¹⁵² See Cogswell, 12-55, R. B. Wernham, *The Making of Elizabethan Foreign Policy, 1558-1603* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), M. J. Rodriguez-Salgado and Simon Adams (ed), *England, Spain, and the Gran Armada, 1585-1604* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1991) among others.

¹⁵³ Cogswell, 12. He refers of course to the Armada.

Henry in his tract against the Savoyan marriage. Raleigh, unlike most members of Henry's circle, celebrated the memory of Gloriana while still recognizing her failings. He gave her a portion of the blame for the current Anglo-Spanish relations, and for perhaps the only time used Elizabeth as a warning to Henry on how not to conduct himself as king. He stated:

If the late Queen would have believed her Men of War, as she did her Scribes, we had in her Time beaten that great Empire in Pieces, and made their Kings, Kings of Figs and Oranges, as in Old Times. But her majesty did all by Halves, and by petty Invasions taught the Spaniard how to defend himself, and to see his own Weakness, which, till our Attempts taught him, was hardly known to himself.¹⁵⁴

This statement in many ways summed up the “foreign policy” of Henry's court towards Spain. Elizabeth did not go far enough in her actions against the Spanish. For Henry to be a successful Protestant king required that he listen to his military advisors and take the appropriate action. From Raleigh's viewpoint this could only be a full invasion and war, a task that Elizabeth failed to accomplish because of her inability or reluctance (in his mind) to take the necessary measures to ensure England's victory. Henry's known attitudes towards war, discussed in the previous chapter, suggested that he embraced this responsibility, and did not plan to engage the Spanish “by halves.”

Henry's position on war was in complete opposition to that of his father. James abhorred war and valued his reputation as Europe's mediator.¹⁵⁵ In the *Basilicon Doron* James advised Henry to “play the wise Kings part described by Christ; fore-seeing how ye may beare it out with all necessarie provision: especially remember that money is *Niruus belli*.”¹⁵⁶ In advising Henry

¹⁵⁴ Raleigh, *A Discourse touching a marriage between Prince Henry...and a Daughter of Savoy*, 273.

¹⁵⁵ Lockyer, 140.

¹⁵⁶ James I, *Political Writings*, 33. *Neruus belli* means “the sinew of war.”

not to rush into war, James, ironically, advised his son to “look to the Spaniard, whose great succeſſe in all his warres, hath onely come through ſtraitneſſe of Diſcipline and order.”¹⁵⁷ Just as James advised Henry to be ſlow to engage in war, he alſo counſeled him to be ſlow to make peace. In all caſes, he advised moderation, and for Henry to put much thought into each decision. At times, he emphasized, “a juſt warre is more tolerable, then a diſhonourable and diſadvantageous peace.”¹⁵⁸ Whether engaging in war or peace, James encouraged his ſon to be thoughtful and not enter into any agreement or conflict ill advised. As Raleigh’s ſtatement illustrates, neither Henry nor thoſe in his circle embraced this advice, particularly when they conſidered policy towards Spain. Anti-Spaniſh ſentiments in the early ſeventeenth century were by no means limited to Henry and his court, and in many ways joined the popular myth of Gloriana to become part of the national imagination.¹⁵⁹

Henry’s death in November, 1612, did not bring the antagoniſtic attitudes toward Spain to an end. Popular anti-Spaniſh ſentiments continued without him, as did diſcuſſions as to whom the new heir would marry. Indeed, only a month after Henry’s death, James re-opened the negotiations with France for Princeſſe Chriſtine’s hand, with Prince Charles filling his brother’s place as groom. In a letter to Sir Thomas Edmonds written on December 14, 1612, James admitted his actions could be conſidered “very blunt...ſo ſoon after ſuch an irreparable loſſe.”¹⁶⁰

Charles’s marriage negotiations are the focus of many ſtudies, and the negotiations for his Spaniſh Match are far better known than any of the potential matches in Henry’s lifetime.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ Cogſwell, 14.

¹⁶⁰ James I to Sir Thomas Edmondſes, 14 December, 1612, in *Letters of King James VI&I*, 329.

The attitudes towards the Spanish Match in the early 1620s remained very much the same however, as they had in the early 1610s. In November of 1621 Parliament implored James to go to war against the Spanish and to break off the negotiations to marry into the Habsburg family.¹⁶¹ As the saga of the Spanish Match unfolded, the level of tension between James and his subjects rose higher than it had at any point in Henry's lifetime. Thomas Cogswell states that "never before in James's reign had a single political issue so deeply divided the kingdom."¹⁶² Celebrations filled the streets of London when Charles returned from the continent in the fall of 1623 without a bride.¹⁶³ The issues brought forth by Henry's marriage negotiations continued and grew with Charles throughout the remaining years of his father's reign. James's desire to unite with Spain went against public opinion, with Parliament weighing in on the matter, an option not available ten years earlier.

Conclusion

What then can be drawn from this discussion? Certain questions remain. Why did Princess Elizabeth's marriage proceed with relatively little impediment, but one match after another was proposed and rejected for Henry? James proceeded at an almost leisurely pace in regards to his eldest son's marriage. Whether or not the concerns of Henry, Raleigh and others weighed on his mind cannot be known. Perhaps, as Roger Lockyer suggests, the relatively peaceful climate of Europe at the time gave James no reason to rush into an alliance.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ Cogswell, 19.

¹⁶² Ibid, 50.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 12.

¹⁶⁴ Lockyer, 141.

Certainly Raleigh believed that the matter should be postponed until the French match could realistically occur.

James's desire to marry Henry to a Catholic occurred conveniently at a time when most of the eligible princesses in Europe were Catholic. Raleigh, Cornwallis, Salisbury, Arundel, and, most importantly, Henry, found the prospect of a Catholic bride appalling. All realized, however, that it was likely. What then made an Italian Catholic or a French Catholic more favorable than a Spanish Catholic? Financial and political considerations were factors, but in the end what made the Florentine match, and particularly the French match, more desirable was the fear of Spanish control that accompanied the Savoyan and Spanish matches. James sought an alliance with Spain to maintain peace; however, Henry's circle did not believe that possible. The marriage negotiations that surrounded Henry during his two years as Prince of Wales offer perspective on the politics of his court and indicate the extent of anti-Spanish sentiment in early seventeenth-century England, an ideology that continued to play a major role in the Spanish Match of 1623. As such, the negotiations make clear the contrast and the tension between Henry and James. The king pursued alliances which were deeply unpopular. It is not surprising then, that Henry remained in his lifetime the focal point of opposition towards the king, opposition that was often rooted in memory of the Tudors. Henry's connection to Tudor memory, specifically Elizabethan memory, served to define and validate the policies that set his court in opposition to James.

CHAPTER THREE

Our Rising Sun is Set: Tudor Memory, Commemoration, and Henry's Legacy in Early Stuart England

Introduction

Henry's court grew out of a reaction to the policies of James I at the end of his first decade as king. Those who arrived at the court of St. James looked to the prince as the future of England. Henry and the courtiers around him sought to establish a different style of kingship than that of his father. It is easy when studying Henry's court to portray him as unique, because his "policies" differed so greatly from those of James. What is important to understand, however, is that James was unique, not Henry. In the context of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, James offered a type of kingship previously unseen in England. Henry, on the other hand, self-consciously embraced a more familiar Tudor "style" of kingship. He and his courtiers harkened back to the perceived glory days of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, seeking to create in Henry IX the next great Protestant monarch whose reign would rival his Tudor predecessors. The reaction against James's pacifist policies led to a revival of the cult of Elizabeth, which focused on Henry from a very young age. For those who had grown weary of James, Henry represented the true heir to the Tudor monarchy. After his premature death, that dashed hope left a void in the hearts and minds of his supporters both at home and on the continent. This chapter will explore the connections between Henry and the memory of the Tudors, as well as Henry's death and legacy within James's reign.

Henry and the Tudors

The cult of Elizabeth developed during the heyday of her reign in the late 1570s through the early 1590s. The major themes of this cult are familiar. Elizabeth represented the great Protestant defender whose imperial and maritime ambitions would lead England to greatness not only in Europe but throughout the world. As Malcolm Smuts writes, the queen “became the chief symbol of a cultural tradition embodying the aspirations, the religious values, and the patriotism that grew out of the lengthy victorious struggle against domestic and foreign enemies.”¹⁶⁵ Poets and propagandists drew comparisons between Elizabeth and the biblical heroine Judith, hoping that, like her fabled counterpart, Elizabeth would deliver England from the clutches of a foreign enemy, in this case Philip II and Catholic Spain.

Though it existed during her lifetime, the cult of Elizabeth never really fit with her domestic or foreign policies. Elizabeth’s government did not have the resources to carry out the grand plans and dreams of her courtiers and military leaders, and the queen knew it. In spite of the poems, ballads, and plays that suggested otherwise, Elizabeth exercised caution and temperance in her dealings with Spain and in religious matters.¹⁶⁶ Nevertheless, the immediate posterity did not remember Elizabeth as a competent queen who kept the Spanish at bay, but as Gloriana, the great defender of the faith who sought to expand the empire.

Elizabeth’s reticence to go to war with Spain gave rise to criticism by certain factions at court, including one led by the Earl of Essex. The final years of her reign saw the queen’s popularity drop dramatically, and upon her death in 1603 the people of England welcomed James

¹⁶⁵ Smuts, 15.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid, 22.

enthusiastically, even expressing a sense of relief at the end of Elizabeth's long rule.¹⁶⁷ The new king, Protestant with a wife and three children to succeed him, ostensibly gave England the security they did not have under Elizabeth. The succession would not be a concern, and England would return once more to a secure male rule. But James's reign failed to live up to the initial hype and within a few years the cult of Elizabeth was reborn. People associated her not with the failures of her final years, but with the image of Gloriana made popular by the likes of Edmund Spenser and Michael Drayton during the 1580s.¹⁶⁸

The revival of the cult of Elizabeth was seen most often in the literature and dramatic works of the early seventeenth century. One of the earliest instances of the revival occurred in Thomas Dekker's play, *The Whore of Babylon*. Dekker wrote this allegorical work shortly after the Gunpowder Plot incident in 1605. It tells the story of Catholic assassination attempts on Elizabeth I's life. *The Whore of Babylon* was first published and performed in 1607 by an acting troupe known as Prince Henry's Men, or alternately, as the Prince's Servants. This group existed under Elizabeth I but fell under the patronage of Henry in 1603 upon his father's accession to the throne.¹⁶⁹ Blatantly anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish, Dekker's play served as one of the earliest published criticisms of the reign of James I. Dekker depicted Elizabeth as Titania, or the Fairie Queen, and Roman Catholicism itself as the Whore of Babylon. Three kings represented Spain, France, and the Holy Roman Empire.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ Michael Dobson and Nicola J. Watson, *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 43.

¹⁶⁸ Smuts., 23.

¹⁶⁹ Thomas Dekker, *The Whore of Babylon: A Critical Edition*, edited by Marianne Gateson Riley (New York: Garland Publishing, 1980), 94-95.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 97-99.

The Whore of Babylon is frequently studied as one of the earliest and quintessential examples of anti-Catholic literature in early Stuart England. That it was performed by a group under the patronage of Prince Henry is often overlooked by scholars of literature, however, and the play itself is rarely discussed in the histories of Henry. While not represented by a character in the play, the beliefs of Henry and his circle are evident throughout. By 1607 Dekker and others looked to Henry as Elizabeth's true successor, no doubt aided by the militant group that started gathering around him from 1603 onwards. There is little surviving information about Prince Henry's Men during the years he served as their patron. They did not perform at his court often and did not receive the level of patronage under the prince that they had under their original patron, Charles Howard, Lord High Admiral.¹⁷¹ While not officially dedicated to the prince, as many pamphlets and plays were in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot, Dekker did make it clear that in a sense the play was for Henry. On the title page it reads, "*The Whore of Babylon*, As it was acted by the Prince's Servants."¹⁷²

Literary scholar Susan Krantz has argued that James's pacifist policies towards Spain and his desire to wed Henry to a Catholic bride served as the political and social context for the play.¹⁷³ While this is most likely accurate, her assertion that "Henry's adamant refusal to marry a doctrinally committed Roman Catholic" also served as motivation for Dekker is a slight exaggeration.¹⁷⁴ As I discussed in chapter 2, Henry did fight against the Catholic matches proposed by his father, but at a later date. In the immediate aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot,

¹⁷¹ Susan E. Krantz, "Thomas Dekker's Political Commentary in *The Whore of Babylon*," in *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, vol. 35, no. 2, 1995, 271.

¹⁷² Dekker, 93.

¹⁷³ Krantz, 271.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

however, it is more likely that it was certain members of Henry's ever growing circle that spoke out against the idea of a Spanish match rather than Henry himself, who would have only been twelve at the time. Additionally, a letter written by Henry to his father shortly before Henry's death illustrates that, while Henry preferred not to marry a Catholic, he realized that it might be required of him, and sought to find the most suitable candidate.¹⁷⁵

As *The Whore of Babylon* is an allegorical play about Elizabeth, not Henry, the invocations of the prince throughout served to connect him directly to the deceased queen, skipping his father altogether and emphasizing him as Elizabeth's natural successor in terms of religion and foreign policy. Henry's attraction towards naval and military matters was well known by the time of the play's first production, and Dekker reinforced these points on several occasions. At the conclusion of the play, after the victory of the Armada, Titania proclaims, "I like the martial life so well, I could change courts to camps, in fields to dwell. Tis a brave life; methinks it best becomes a prince to march thus, between guns and drums!"¹⁷⁶ Dekker connected Henry to Elizabeth by emphasizing the importance of strong militant beliefs over James's pacifist policies. England needed a warrior, not a diplomat, leading them against the Spanish and Catholic threats. Dekker then further connected Henry to the Tudors by evoking the memory of Henry VIII. Titania states, "Wh' I'm born a soldier by the father's side, the cannon, thunder's zany, plays to us soft music's tunes."¹⁷⁷ Elizabeth herself often accentuated her own similarities with her father, as Titania did in the play. This created a natural progression for the crown; Henry VIII was succeeded by Elizabeth, and Elizabeth by the future Henry IX. This

¹⁷⁵ Prince Henry to King James, from Richmond, October 1612, BL ADD 39288, f. 7b.

¹⁷⁶ Dekker, 268.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 269.

conveniently left out Edward VI and the unpopular Mary and James to connect Henry to his forbears most famous for their respective roles in England's Protestant Reformation and their somewhat exaggerated military might. A popular couplet from time drew a direct connection between Prince Henry and Henry VIII, and their respective roles in the Protestant movement:

Henry the Eighth pull'd down Monks and their cells,
Henry the Ninth should pull down Bishops and their bells.¹⁷⁸

Henry, as king, would continue what his predecessor began. This specific rhyme referred to the hoped for reform by Puritans, who wanted the Church of England freed from some of its more ritualistic practices too reminiscent of Catholicism.¹⁷⁹ While it cannot be said with absolute certainty that Henry's court was a Puritan one, it has long been said that Henry himself, and by extension his court, had strong Puritan inclinations.¹⁸⁰ The above couplet seems to indicate that the Puritans had certainly placed some degree of expectation on Henry, just as other English Protestants did.

The Whore of Babylon is not the only drama in the early seventeenth century that drew connections between the early Stuarts and the Tudors. Princess Elizabeth, like her brother, became the subject of hope for a Tudor revival. William Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* did much the same thing, though today it is the subject of scholarly controversy. Many have challenged its authorship, which is not surprising given the general debate over whether or not Shakespeare wrote any of his plays. Most agree that if not solely authored by a man named John Fletcher, it

¹⁷⁸Quoted in Williamson, 29. This little rhyme is quoted in both Williams and Strong, though I cannot find the original source of the quote.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

¹⁸⁰ Strong, 52.

was at least probably co-authored by him.¹⁸¹ More importantly for this study, the date it was written and first produced is subject to dispute. The first known performance occurred the night the Globe Theatre burned down, on June 29, 1613. Still, scholarship on this last of Shakespeare's histories suggests it was performed earlier, in February 1613, to coincide with the marriage of Princess Elizabeth to Frederick of the Palatinate. The best that can be determined is that the play was written in late 1612 or early 1613.¹⁸²

The significance of the dating lies in one of the final monologues. In it, a prophetic Archbishop Cranmer tells Henry VIII of the glories of Elizabeth's reign, ending with the fate of the crown after her death:

The bird of wonder dies—the maiden phoenix—
Her ashes new create another heir
As great in admiration as herself,
So shall she leave her blessedness to one,
When heaven shall call her from this cloud of darkness,
Who from the sacred ashes of her honour
Shall star-like rise as great in fame as she was.¹⁸³

Some have interpreted this prophecy to be a reference to James, and, as the king served as a patron for Shakespeare, this is a possibility. Although James enjoyed tremendous popular support at the start of his reign, by 1613 that popularity had declined severely. More commonly accepted is that Shakespeare, in fact, meant the Princess Elizabeth, rising from the ashes of her

¹⁸¹ William Shakespeare, *King Henry VIII, or All is True*, edited by Jay L. Halio, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 16-24.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 16, and R. A. Foakes, ed., *King Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), xxviii-xxix.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 215

name-sake to carry on her Protestant cause.¹⁸⁴ If the King's Men did perform *Henry VIII* for the first time on the occasion of her marriage to Frederick of the Palatinate, then this seems the most likely interpretation. The language in the monologue, however, certainly fits with descriptions of Henry, whom the people admired and who, in his short life, experienced a "star-like rise." If the play was written in 1612, it is possible that Queen Elizabeth's heir, equal to her in fame, was meant to be Henry. If the reference was instead to Elizabeth Stuart as Elizabeth I's heir, the significance is still clear. James's popularity did not increase in the aftermath of Henry's death. An opposition party still existed, albeit one that had lost its figurehead. Princess Elizabeth's popularity never exceeded that of her brother, but like Henry, she had always been the focus of those interested in a Tudor revival.¹⁸⁵ The two siblings shared a deep connection that is apparent in both their letters and how others wrote of them. If the prophetic Cranmer was, in fact, referring to Princess Elizabeth it still reveals the level of dissatisfaction with James's reign. In the wake of Henry's death, his sister and her Protestant husband became the inheritors of the Tudor legacy, an inheritance denied to James.

All Our Glory Lies Buried

Henry died on the night of November 6, 1612, at the age of eighteen. The exact cause of his death has never been determined, though it is now widely believed that he died from typhoid fever.¹⁸⁶ James ordered an autopsy performed the day after the prince's death. Six physicians signed the final report, which found that "his lungs were black, and in many places spotted, and full of much corruption...the veins in the hinder part of his head too full of blood, and the

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 16

¹⁸⁵ Strong, 25

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 220.

passages and hollow places of his brain full of much clear water.”¹⁸⁷ During the Overbury affair three years later rumors began to surface that Henry had been poisoned, but there is no evidence to support this claim.¹⁸⁸

Though many found his death surprising, based on all reports the prince’s final illness began over a month before his death. Cornwallis reported that Henry grew pale and gaunt as the summer ended, and throughout early October the prince felt increasingly tired and slept “until nine or after complaining of laziness but not understanding why he felt that way.”¹⁸⁹ He did attend the celebrations surrounding Frederick of Palatine’s arrival in late October, but many commented on his notable lack of energy and ill appearance.¹⁹⁰ Five days later the prince fell so ill that James sent his physician to St. James’s Palace. By October 29, he was bedridden, and though the king sent numerous physicians to treat him, none availed. Chamberlain reported that the royal family, including Frederick, visited the prince on November 1. The king visited again the following day but as Henry’s health declined James prohibited Elizabeth and Charles from returning.¹⁹¹ This upset Elizabeth and she disguised herself in a series of failed attempts to see her dying brother, who continuously requested that she be allowed to visit.¹⁹² By November 5, rumors of Henry’s illness had spread throughout London, and the Bishop of Ely offered prayers

¹⁸⁷ Autopsy Report for Henry, Prince of Wales, BL Egerton MS 2877, f. 160b

¹⁸⁸ Bellany, 183.

¹⁸⁹ Cornwallis, *An Account...*, 29.

¹⁹⁰ Chamberlain to Carlton, October 22, 1612, in *The Chamberlain Letters*, 68.

¹⁹¹ Cornwallis, *An Account...*, 36.

¹⁹² Chamberlain to Carleton, November 12, 1612, in *The Chamberlain Letters*, 70.

for his health at Court and the Archbishop of Canterbury ordered prayers throughout England.¹⁹³ The next morning James and Anne sequestered themselves away from Whitehall; James at Theobalds, Anne at Somerset House, reportedly because neither could cope with their son's approaching death.¹⁹⁴ The prince, delirious by that point, died that night.

Henry's death sent the royal family, the court, and many in the country and on the continent into a state of deep sadness and in some cases, nervous anticipation. Anne's grief at the loss of her son overwhelmed her, and Ambassador Foscari feared for her continued health, as well as that of Elizabeth, who reportedly refused to eat for two days and cried continuously. Charles, only twelve at the time, displayed "a grief beyond his years."¹⁹⁵ Despite their disagreements, James was deeply affected by Henry's death, and though he attempted to occupy his thoughts with matters of state, emotion frequently overcame the king. In the middle of a meeting of the Privy Council in January 1613 he collapsed into tears, saying over and over "Henry is dead, Henry is dead."¹⁹⁶ Raleigh, just as affected by his friend's death, wrote that, "like an eclipse of the sun, we shall find the effects hereafter."¹⁹⁷

The feeling of loss that permeated the court extended to London and throughout the rest of the country. Many who had looked to Henry to be the next great Protestant ruler in Europe expressed their sadness not only at the death of the young heir to the throne, but the death of the future they had hoped for. The Earl of Dorset wrote, "our Rising Sun is set ere scarce he had

¹⁹³ Chamberlain to Carleton, November 12, 1612, in *The Chamberlain Letters*, 69, and G. P. V. Akrigg, *Jacobean Pageant or The Court of King James I* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 134.

¹⁹⁴ Chamberlain to Carleton, November 12, 1612, in *The Chamberlain Letters*, 69.

¹⁹⁵ 'Venice: November 23, 1612,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 449.

¹⁹⁶ 'Venice: January 5, 1613,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 472.

¹⁹⁷ Sir Walter Raleigh, *The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1829), 429.

shone, and that all our glory lies buried.”¹⁹⁸ Accounts from Bristol, Cambridge, and Oxford reported the grief that many felt, and the sermons preached to help comfort them. In Oxford they wept for “the people’s darling...whose spirit was too full of life and splendour to be long shrowded in a cloud of flesh,” while in Bristol rumors persisted that the prince had been poisoned.¹⁹⁹ The rumors of Henry’s poisoning circulated both in England and on the continent. The story grew three years later, even assigning an identity, Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, to the culprit. James’s one-time favorite, Somerset and Henry did not get along, and on occasion quarreled.²⁰⁰ After his implications in the death of Sir Thomas Overbury, the rumors of Henry’s poisoning resurfaced to blame Somerset. Others were also accused of poisoning the prince, including James himself, but no evidence survives that Henry fell victim to foul play by anyone.²⁰¹

Similar rumors, perhaps not surprisingly, circulated on the continent. According to the Venetian ambassador in Paris, the French believed that James poisoned Henry because “he [had] grown jealous of the Prince’s vast designs.”²⁰² Officially, Marie de Medici ordered that the court go into mourning for the prince; however, few in France grieved for his loss because they feared that Henry had been in league with the Huguenots. The Venetian ambassador to France, Giustinian, reported that “the Huguenots are grieved, as they built their hopes on the Prince, and

¹⁹⁸ Earl of Dorset to Sir Thomas Edmonds, November 23, 1612, from Dorset House, in Nichols, *Progresses*, 490.

¹⁹⁹ *General Observation of Prince Henry’s Funeral, 1612* in Nichols, *Progresses*, 503.

²⁰⁰ Barroll, 133.

²⁰¹ Bellany, 183-188, 267-269; both Somerset and Henry allegedly had an affair with Frances Howard, who at the time was married to the Earl of Essex. This affair, along with the already existing tension led some to believe Somerset poisoned Henry out of jealousy. Again, no actual evidence supports the claim that Henry was poisoned by anyone.

²⁰² ‘Venice: December 30, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1610-1613*, 470.

had already chosen him as their chief support and head; others reckon this death among the good fortunes of France.”²⁰³ Whether relieved or saddened, all of Europe responded to Henry’s death with the realization that it would “certainly cause great changes in the course of the world.”²⁰⁴ The French Huguenots and German Protestants mourned the passing of the prince they believed would have fought for the Protestant cause throughout Europe, while the Spanish grew “more haughty” and considered his death to be a miracle.²⁰⁵

The reactions to Henry’s death both in England and in continental Europe indicate that the policies that dominated Henry’s court were not isolated to London. In a sense, these reactions validated his satellite court and reinforced its message. Throughout England and the courts of Europe Henry represented the hope for the Protestant cause, even when his ideas ran counter to those of his father. As I mentioned in chapter 2, rumors persisted in the days following his death that Henry had planned to escort his sister to the Palatinate after she married Prince Frederick in the hopes of furthering his Protestant connections and possibly seeking an alternative bride to any put forth by his father.²⁰⁶ There is no strong evidence to suggest that Henry had, in fact, planned such a trip, but the existence of the rumor itself is significant. Protestants in England, France, and the German states all placed certain expectations on the young prince, thanks in large part to the identity that he, with the help of those in his circle, had constructed for himself. The “haughtier” demeanor of the Spanish, reported after his death,

²⁰³ ‘Venice: November 27, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 452.

²⁰⁴ ‘Venice: November 17, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 448.

²⁰⁵ ‘Venice: November 30, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 453.

²⁰⁶ ‘Venice: November 23, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 450.

suggested that Philip III and his government had previously feared the prospect of Henry as king. Certainly, Salisbury, Southampton, Raleigh, Arundel, and Henry himself wanted that exact reaction from the Spanish, an apprehension that as king, Henry would finish the wars begun by Elizabeth. Henry and his circle energetically constructed an image that portrayed him to be synonymous with the Protestant cause, and in this they proved successful. The reactions to his death in England, France, Spain, and the German states prove that his court succeeded in disseminating its message and placing Henry among the important Protestant figures of his day. This reputation did not begin *post mortem*, but in his lifetime.

Beyond the initial grief and dashed hopes, Henry's premature death caused several practical problems that needed to be resolved. Elizabeth and Frederick's wedding was to occur within the month, but James postponed the marriage until March 1613, as the court went into a period of mourning. Frederick found himself at a loss, having arrived for his wedding less than a month earlier. He and Henry had enjoyed an epistolary friendship since childhood, and Frederick mourned for his friend alongside the royal family.²⁰⁷ Ambassador Foscarini reported rumors that many within the court seemed hesitant for the marriage to go forward, and desired to keep Elizabeth in England given the fact that her twelve-year-old brother, never as robust as Henry, was the new heir to the throne. Despite these fears, James made it clear that he intended the marriage to take place after the period of mourning ended.²⁰⁸

At the same time, James turned to his remaining son and ordered that he stay at court, and that he be "kept as strictly as when he was Duke of York, and [would] not have the reins loose as

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 449.

²⁰⁸ 'Venice: November 30, 1612,' *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 452-53.

early as his brother”.²⁰⁹ Perhaps James feared that the same opposition party that had populated Henry’s court would migrate to Charles if another independent household became established, and in truth many applied to take up their old posts in Charles’s new household when, and if, it was established.²¹⁰ In spite of this, most of the members of Henry’s court faded into obscurity after his death, and few achieved that level of prominence again. Raleigh’s fortunes certainly did not improve with Henry’s death, and in fact some felt that he lost “by [Henry’s] death his greatest hope of release.”²¹¹ In December James reopened the negotiations with France, substituting Charles for Henry in the potential match with Princess Christine. Ambassador Foscarini reported that the prince was “very popular and amiable with everybody,” and “alive to his increased importance.”²¹²

Beyond the wedding and securing the new heir, the matter of Henry’s funeral had to be settled. The king set the date for December 7, 1612. Henry’s funeral rivaled that of Elizabeth I’s nearly a decade before, with over 2,000 in attendance at Westminster Abbey, where he was interred next to his grandmother, Mary Queen of Scots.²¹³ The coffin traveled from St. James’s Palace to the Abbey, draped in a pall of black velvet, with the effigy of the prince resting on top. Charles served as chief mourner for his brother. James, Anne, and Elizabeth did not attend, though Frederick and many of his counts did, and of course, the members of Henry’s household

²⁰⁹ ‘London: December 2, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, James I, 1611-1618*, edited by Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1858), 160.

²¹⁰ ‘Venice: November 30, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1610-1613*, 453.

²¹¹ ‘London: November 12, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1611-1618*, 155.

²¹² ‘Venice: November 30, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1610-1613*, 453.

²¹³ Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, *Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey* (Philadelphia: G.W. Jacobs, 1882), 217.

and several of those within his circle were present.²¹⁴ The Archbishop of Canterbury gave the sermon, discussing in some length Psalm 82, verses six and seven, which read, “I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the most High, But ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes.”²¹⁵ This psalm acknowledged both the divinity and morality of kings and princes, and also their mortal weaknesses.

The eulogy given and the white staffs of office broken over the coffin, the funeral ended. Henry’s effigy remained set up in Westminster to be seen “amongst the Representations of the Kings and Queenes his famous predecessors.”²¹⁶ Today very little of the effigy survives. A face in the Abbey museum once thought to belong to Prince Henry is now believed to belong to another effigy entirely.²¹⁷ Perhaps the best eulogy of the prince was not given by the Archbishop of Canterbury or by a member of his court, despite the enamored writings of Charles Cornwallis in the years that followed. Ambassador Foscarini summed up Henry’s short, yet eventful life in a dispatch written shortly after the prince’s death:

Many predictions centred round his person, and he seemed marked out for great events. His whole talk was of arms and war. His authority was great, and he was obeyed and lauded by the military party. He protected the colony of Virginia, and under his auspices the ships sailed for the north-west passage to the Indies. He had begun to put the navy in order and raised the number of sailors. He was hostile to Spain and had claims in France. He would not suffer the Pope to be ill spoken of, and in his familiar conversation he declared that he admired him as a prince. His designs were vast; his temper was grave, severe, reserved, brief in speech. His household was but little inferior to the King's and kept in excellent order. He had few equals in the handling of arms, be it on horse or on

²¹⁴ *The Funerals of the High and Mighty Prince Henry* (London: Printed by T. S. for John Budge, 1613) in Nichols, *Progresses*, 499.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 502.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 503.

²¹⁷ For an interesting study of Henry’s funeral effigy, see Elizabeth Goldring, “‘So iust a sorrow so well expressed’: Henry, Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration,” in Wilks (ed), *Prince Henry Revived*, 280-295.

foot; in fine all the hopes of these kingdoms were built on his high qualities.²¹⁸

The most interesting observation, that Henry did not speak ill of the Pope and even held some degree of admiration for him “as a prince,” seems contrary to so much of what is known about the beliefs of Henry’s court. However, above all else, the prince carried himself with dignity and princely countenance. He never wanted to debate his father publicly, and perhaps in the same vein he did not want members of his court to attack the Pope, even if he disagreed with the Papacy on principle. Of course, Foscarini, writing shortly after his death, may have been caught up in the emotion of the period as he wrote of the many virtues of the prince to his courts in Italy. Still, the remainder of his description is one of the best accounts of Henry’s person, and it illuminates the potential within the young prince.

Commemoration and Memorialization

A figure as beloved both in his lifetime and after death as Prince Henry would be expected to have a lasting monument to his memory. Surprisingly, no physical commemoration to Henry exists. There are no statues or memorials to him anywhere, including Westminster Abbey, his burial place. He was buried with his grandmother, Mary Stuart, under her large marble sepulcher, with only his name and the year of his death inscribed in a stone at the base marking it as his final resting place. Ambassador Foscarini wrote that a large marble tomb was being prepared for Henry at a great cost, in addition to “many statues.”²¹⁹ These never came to pass, perhaps because of the cost or a lack of interest on the part of James and later Charles.

²¹⁸ ‘Venice: November 23, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 450.

²¹⁹ ‘Venice: December 29, 1612,’ *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1610-1613, 469.

Regardless, no permanent monument to Henry was ever placed in Westminster Abbey, something that upset his supporters at the time.²²⁰

Shortly before Henry's death, James had completed a project he first envisioned shortly after taking the throne. He exhumed and transported his mother's body from her original resting place in Peterborough Cathedral to the south aisle of Henry VII's Lady Chapel in Westminster Abbey. She was buried parallel to her cousin and rival, Elizabeth I. Historians have studied the monuments James built for Elizabeth and Mary as the king's way of addressing the problem of honoring his mother's memory while at the same time honoring that of the woman who executed her, but left him the crown of England. He then used the relocations in the Abbey to link the memory of his dynasty to that of the Tudors.²²¹ Ironically, in death James connected himself to the dynasty with which his eldest son had so often been associated in life. The sculptors completed Elizabeth's tomb before that of Mary, and in 1606 James ordered that Elizabeth's coffin be exhumed and reburied it in the north aisle of the Lady Chapel, on top of the coffin of her older sister, Mary I. James requested that he be buried in Elizabeth's original location, next to her grandfather, Henry VII.²²² This connected the founder of the Tudor dynasty with the founder of the Stuarts, in a sense legitimizing his dynasty. It further served, as Peter Sherlock suggests, to link the two kingdoms of England and Scotland together, an aspiration for which James fought his entire reign.²²³

²²⁰ Stanley, 217.

²²¹ Peter Sherlock, "The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory," in *Journal of British Studies* 46 (April 2007): 263-289.

²²² Ibid., 284.

²²³ Ibid., 263-64

Mary Stuart's tomb, larger and more expensive than that of Elizabeth, was completed in 1612. Her body was transported from Peterborough to Westminster and laid to rest on October 8, 1612, two months to the day before Henry's interment next to her.²²⁴ Ironically, though he was identified with the memory of the Tudors in life, in death he lay next to his grandmother, the great Catholic queen and rival of Tudor Protestantism. Instead, it was James's final resting place that marked his position, and that of his dynasty, as the true heirs of Henry VII. Though there is no memorial to the first Stuart king, the message he was trying to convey is clear. Henry, on the other hand, lay in an even more forgotten place in an increasingly crowded tomb. Sherlock asserts that his burial upset "the geography of interment, separating barren and fertile," from Elizabeth's tomb (the barren Tudors) and that of Mary (the fertile Stuarts). Sherlock seems to argue that Henry's premature death called into question Stuart fertility over that of the Tudors.²²⁵ By the end of the Stuart era, however, Henry's sister, cousin, several nieces and nephews, and a large number of Queen Anne's stillborn infants had joined him under his grandmother's monument. By the eighteenth century twenty-two of her descendants rested in Mary's tomb, with coffins stacked on top of each other in a rather macabre fashion.²²⁶ The fact that many within the tomb died young does not take away from the fact that Mary's vault serves to emphasize to this day the fertility of the Stuarts over the two barren Tudor women buried opposite her. Unfortunately, amidst the crowded tomb Henry lay largely forgotten by posterity; he is simply one of twenty-three others buried in the vault, with his nephew Henry of

²²⁴ Ibid., 285.

²²⁵ Ibid, 287.

²²⁶ Aidan Dodson, *The Royal Tombs of Great Britain* (London: Duckworth, 2004), 193.

Gloucester's coffin resting on top of his.²²⁷ In the seventeenth century, at least, he was memorialized not in marble or stone, but in elegies, poems, sermons, and paintings.

In the months that followed Henry's death, dozens of elegies were printed in honor of the prince's memory. Others appeared as the century progressed. The sheer volume is impressive, and they have been the subject of their own scholarly studies, particularly in the field of literature.²²⁸ They naturally celebrate his many virtues and lament the fact that he died so young. One compared him to Hector and Achilles, and nearly all mourn the loss of what might have been. They stressed the hope that was placed on him in not only England, but in Europe as a whole. Thomas Heywood referred to him as "the Hope of three Kingdoms (nay the World)...to generall Europe, the great Losse of Losses."²²⁹ Another called the prince the "World's richest jewell," the "miracle of youth," the "conqueror of hearts," the "terroure of the pope," and the "atlas of our hope."²³⁰ These elegies, lamenting the loss of the great Protestant prince that would have led England and Protestant Europe to victory against Catholicism and Spain, created in the English imagination the so-called myth of the conqueror. It is this near-mythical figure that is best remembered today, and most often studied. In the seventeenth century and later, Henry came to represent the endless possibilities of what might have been had he ascended the throne.

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ See Elkin Calhoun Wilson, *Prince Henry and English Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1946), pp. 128-176.

²²⁹ Thomas Heywood, "A Funerall Elegie upon the death of the most hopefull and illustrious Prince Henry Prince of Wales," *Renascence Editions*, transcribed by Richard Bear from the 1613 edition (Eugene: University of Oregon, 1999), 3.

²³⁰ Anonymous, reprinted in *Elegies and Epitaphs: A Comprehensive Review*, edited by Charles Box (Gloucester: H. Osbourne, 1892), 23.

Overlooked was the fact that Henry was young and inexperienced, and never proven on the field of battle. Still, these elegies were the only real memorial to Henry; they served their purpose, to present him as a figure as legendary as his godmother, Elizabeth I. Henry, and what he actually represented while alive, was largely ignored.

Conclusion

Henry was consciously tied to the memory of the Tudors in his lifetime. People looked to him to continue what Elizabeth I began, and to go farther than she had in the fight against Catholicism and Spain. That hope helped to create the myth of Henry in the years after his death, but the importance of it during his brief reign as Prince of Wales should not be overlooked. The expectations placed on Henry were very real, and as far reaching as the elegies later suggested. The dispatches from foreign ambassadors prove that European Protestants saw him as the quintessential Protestant leader just as much as Protestants in England did. This view was not limited to the disgruntled Elizabethan war dogs that inhabited his court and encouraged his arch-Protestantism. The ideology of his court spread throughout England, France, Spain, and the Low Countries, and in that sense his court succeeded in part in what it set out to do. The promise of Henry as king went unfulfilled, but he succeeded in spreading the message of his court throughout Europe, as is evidenced by the outcry in November and December of 1612.

Conclusion

Henry's rise to prominence and his abrupt end occurred during the decade leading up to the Thirty Years War and at a time when dissatisfaction with James had reached new heights. Financial problems only aggravated the larger issue, the king's foreign policy initiatives. English Protestants feared Spain and their desires for a Universal Monarchy. They saw Henry as their best hope for defeat of the Spanish. James, on the other hand, sought to make alliances with Spain, terrified by the thoughts of another religious war. He resisted again in the early 1620s with the outbreak of the Thirty Years War, as many, including Parliament, called for a direct war against Spain. It seems that as early as 1610 the English had lost faith in James and what he would accomplish. He represented a new style of kingship for which England was not ready. His goals were more practical, as England could ill afford to involve herself in a large European conflict at the time.

James became Henry's other, with Henry becoming defined in complete opposition to his father. This response suggests the level of discontentment with James. The members of his court looked back on the cult of Elizabeth and the exaggerated memory of her victory against the Spanish and endowed Henry with the Tudor characteristics necessary for him to be Elizabeth's true heir. The triumphant era of the 1580s would be reborn in Henry, and to a lesser extent, his sister. This hope reached a climax in the fall of 1612 as Elizabeth prepared to marry one of the premiere Protestant princes in Europe, and her brother began to make his opinions heard louder than ever before. The possibility that Henry would marry a Catholic princess with ties to Spain or the Pope was intolerable in the minds of many English Protestants, particularly those who had gravitated to Henry's court. James's marital plans for his son ran counter to the plans Henry and his court had for his future. Henry's sudden death robbed his supporters of the hope they had

placed on him. Whether unintentionally, by design, or due to a simple lack of funds, no permanent memorial to Henry was constructed. He existed only in the dramatic interpretations of him in literature, and in the exaggerated memory in the English imagination. This created the “myth of the conqueror,” and over the centuries Henry is frequently lost in that myth.

A study of Henry and his court can move beyond the mythical and the counterfactual to look at the real significance of his reign as Prince of Wales. What it reveals about James is as illuminating as what it reveals about Henry, and in a sense the son can never be separated from the father. Henry owed his popularity in part to his father’s unpopularity. Those dissatisfied with James looked to him, and the prince happily accepted the role. He modeled himself in opposition to his father, embracing those qualities which James lacked. It is worth noting that Charles, both as Prince of Wales and later as king, never constructed his own identity to serve as a contrast to that of his father, and it was not constructed for him. James did keep a tighter rein on Charles, no doubt because he had been aware of Henry’s increased popularity and did not wish to repeat the experience of the satellite court with Charles. In fact, Charles initially embraced his Spanish Match, and traveled to Spain in disguise to assure its success, while Henry and those in his circle had fought against not only the Spanish match, but those marriage alliances that they feared were too closely tied to Spain. In that sense the phenomenon of Henry’s court is a unique one, emblematic of the times and the personality of the young man at the center of it. Again, not before or after in early modern British history did the heir to the throne establish an opposition court that illuminated the weaknesses of the monarch that way that Henry’s did. Henry became a symbol of everything that James was not: he operated a virtuous court, embraced Protestantism fervently, maintained ties with the continent, and represented to many the hope for England’s future military glory against Spain. We can never know what kind

of king Henry would have become, and it is immaterial. What is important is that for two years he represented an opposition party to his own father and helped develop a court that actively promoted those differences. This time period represented a crisis for James, and the response by his son and the courtiers around him was indicative of how seriously they saw England's predicament under James. Henry, through his perceived strengths, became a symbol of his father's weaknesses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Manuscript

British Library

Autopsy Report for Henry, Prince of Wales. Egerton MS 2877, Folio 160b.

Cornwallis, Sir Charles. Tract against the Proposed Marriage of Prince Henry with the Sister of the Duke of Florence. 1612. Add. 41613, Folios 215-216b.

_____. Tracts on Proposed Marriage of Princess Elizabeth to the Prince of Piedmont. Add. 39853, Folio 25.

Letter from Robert Tindall to Prince Henry, June 22, 1607. Harleian 7007. Folio 139, p. 86

Letter from William Cecil to Prince Henry. Harleian 7007. Folio 295.

Letter from Robert Cecil to Prince Henry, 1609. Harleian 7007. Folio 324.

Letter from Robert Cecil to Prince Henry, 1611. Harleian 7008. Folio 119.

Letter from Robert Devereaux to Prince Henry, 1611. Harleian 7008. Folio 197.

Letter from Frances Howard to Prince Henry, 1611. Harleian 7008. Folio 278.

Letter from Robert Devereaux to Prince Henry, 1612. Harleian 7008. Folio 295-297.

Letter from Prince Henry to King James, October 5, 1612. Add. 39288, Folio 7b.

Stuart, Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales. *Certaine orders and instruccons set downe by ... Henry Prince of Wales ... 1612 ... & delivered unto ... Captaine T. Button....* A facsimile of the original document produced by P.A. Hanrott . London: c. 1840. G7218.

Printed

- Brown, Horatio F., ed. *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice*. Volumes XI-XII. London: Kraus Reprint, 1904-1905.
- Carey, Robert. *The Memoirs of Robert Carey*. Edited by F. H. Mares. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Chamberlain, John. *The Chamberlain Letters*. Edited by Elizabeth McClure Thomson. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1965.
- Croft, Pauline, ed. "A Collection of Several Speeches and Treatises of the late Lord Treasurer Cecil." *Camden Miscellany XXXIX*. Camden Fourth Series. London: Royal Historical Society, 1987.
- Cornwallis, Sir Charles. *An Account of the Baptism, Life, Death, and Funeral of the most Incomparable Prince Frederick Henry, Prince of Wales*. London, Printed for J. Freeman in Fleet Street, 1751.
- _____. "A Relation of the Carriage of the Marriage that Should have been made between the Prince of England and the Infanta Major." *Collectanea Curiosa or Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to the History and Antiquities of England and Ireland*. Edited by John Gutch. Oxford, 1781.
- Dekker, Thomas. *The Whore of Babylon: A Critical Edition*. Edited by Marianne Gateson Riely. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1980.
- Elizabeth I. "Queen Elizabeth's Speech to a Joint Delegation of Lords and Commons, November 5, 1566." *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, & Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Green, Mary Anne Everett, ed. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series, James I, 1611-1618*. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1858.
- Heywood, Thomas. *A Funerall Elegie upon the death of the most hopefull and illustrious Prince Henry, Prince of Wales*. Renaissance Editions. Transcribed by Richard Bear from the 1613 edition. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1999.
- James VI and I. *Letters of King James VI and I*. Edited by G. P. V. Akrigg. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

- _____. *Political Writings*. Edited by Johann P. Sommerville. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Jonson, Ben. *The Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers. The Works of Ben Jonson, VII*. Edited by W. Glifford. London: Bickers and Son, 1875.
- Nichols, John, ed. *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, II*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1828.
- Raleigh, Sir Walter. *The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1829.
- _____. The works of Sir Walter Raleigh, Kt. political, commercial, and philosophical; together with his letters and poems. London, 1751.
- _____. *The Letters of Sir Walter Raleigh*. Edited by Agnes Latham & Joyce Youings. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1999.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Henry VIII, or All is True*. Edited by Jay L. Halio. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- _____. *King Henry VIII*. Edited by R. A. Foakes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Secondary Sources

- Akrigg, G. P. V. *Jacobean Pageant; Or, The Court of King James I*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Barroll, Leeds. *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Bellany, Alastair. *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern Britain: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Bergeron, David M. *Royal Family, Royal Lovers: King James of England and Scotland*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991.
- Birch, Thomas. *The Life of Henry, Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I*. London: Printed for A. Millar, 1760.
- Bowen, Lloyd. *The Politics of the Principality: Wales, c1603-1642*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2007.

- Box, Charles, ed. *Elegies and Epitaphs: A Comprehensive Review*. Gloucester: H. Osbourne, 1892.
- Chrimes, S. B. *Henry VII*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Cogswell, Thomas. *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Colley, Linda. "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument." *The Journal of British Studies* 31, no. 4 (1992): 309-329.
- Coote, Stephen. *A Play of Passion: The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh*. London: Macmillan, 1993.
- Croft, Pauline. "The Parliamentary Installation of Henry, Prince of Wales." *Historical Research* 65, no. 157 (1992): 177-193.
- Cruikshanks, Eveline, ed. *The Stuart Courts*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000.
- Dobson, Michael & Watson, Nicola J. *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Dodson, Aidan. *The Royal Tombs of Great Britain*. London: Duckworth, 2004.
- Games, Alison. *The Web of Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Haynes, Alan. *Robert Cecil: Earl of Salisbury, 1563-1612*. London: Peter Owen Publishers, 1989.
- Hirst, Derek. *England in Conflict, 1603-1660: Kingdom, Community, Commonwealth*. London: Arnold, 1999.
- Howarth, David. *Lord Arundel and His Circle*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Krantz, Susan E. "Thomas Dekker's Political Commentary in *The Whore of Babylon*," *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 35, no. 2 (1995): 271-292.
- Lindquist, Eric N. "The Last Years of the First Earl of Salisbury, 1610-1612." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 18, no. 1 (1986): 23-41
- Lockyer, Roger. *James VI and I*. London: Longman, 1998.
- Norris, Herbert. *Tudor Costume and Fashion*. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 1997.
- Peck, Linda Levy. *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

- _____, ed. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Prescott, H. F. M. *Mary Tudor: The Spanish Tudor*. London: Phoenix, 2003.
- Rodriguez-Salgado, M. J. & Adams, Simon, ed. *England, Spain, and the Gran Armada, 1585-1604*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1991.
- Sherlock, Peter. "The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory." *Journal of British Studies* 46 (April 2007): 263-289.
- Smuts, R. Malcolm. *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.
- Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn. *Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey*. Philadelphia: G.W. Jacobs, 1882.
- Stewart, Alan. *The Cradle King: The Life of James VI and I, the First Monarch of a United Great Britain*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003.
- Strong, Roy. *Henry, Prince of Wales, and England's Lost Renaissance*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1986.
- Thomas, Keith. *The Ends of Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Thrush, Andrew. "The French Marriage and the Origins of the 1614 Parliament." *The Crisis of 1614 and the Addled Parliament*. Edited by Stephen Clucas and Rosalind Davies. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Wernham, R. B. *The Making of Elizabethan Foreign Policy, 1558-1603*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Wilks, Timothy, ed. *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England*. London: Southampton Solent University in association with Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007.
- Williamson, J. W. *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart, A Study of Seventeenth Century Personation*. New York: AMS Press, 1978.
- Wilson, Elkin Calhoun. *Prince Henry and English Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1946.