

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of Warwick

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/157011>

Copyright and reuse:

This thesis is made available online and is protected by original copyright.

Please scroll down to view the document itself.

Please refer to the repository record for this item for information to help you to cite it.

Our policy information is available from the repository home page.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

**‘Our English Deborah’
Elizabeth Analogies in Early- and
Mid-Seventeenth-Century England (1603–1659)**

Aidan Mikhael Norrie
BA, BA (Hons), MA (Res), MRSNZ, AFHEA

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Renaissance Studies

Centre for the Study of the Renaissance,
University of Warwick

May 2021

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
Thesis Abstract	vii
List of Abbreviations	viii
Textual Notes	ix
<u>Introduction</u> Elizabeth Analogies: Typology, History, and Monarchy	1
<u>Chapter 1</u> Elizabeth Analogies and the 1603 Succession	45
<u>Chapter 2</u> Elizabeth I and James VI & I: Providence and Protestantism	73
<u>Chapter 3</u> Charles I, Elizabeth Analogies, and the English Israel	121
<u>Chapter 4</u> Elizabeth Analogies and the Lords Protector: Counsel and Commemoration in the Commonwealth	181
<u>Conclusion</u> Elizabeth Analogies in Seventeenth-Century England and Beyond	221
Appendix 1 Frontispiece of George Carleton's <i>A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercie</i>	231
Appendix 2 Pamphlets Containing Elizabeth Analogies, 1603–1659	232
Bibliography	245

Acknowledgements

This thesis is the culmination of a decade-long academic career. I have no doubt that thirteen-year-old Aidan, who grew up in regional Queensland, and became the first person in their family to attend university, would be very proud of this achievement, even if they didn't fully grasp the hard work and sacrifice it would take to get here.

This achievement, however, would not be possible without the support of a large number of individuals and groups. First and foremost, I thank my supervisors, Peter Marshall and Tess Grant. They were model supervisors, tolerating, with good humour, my various foibles, they always provided excellent feedback and advice, and were constantly supportive of whatever it was I discussed with them. Peter and Tess, please accept my heartfelt gratitude.

I gratefully acknowledge the Chancellor's International Scholarship awarded to me by the University of Warwick. The staff and students (both past and present) of the Centre for the Study of the Renaissance at Warwick provided me with a welcoming academic home, and I am grateful to the CSR for the various grants and bursaries awarded to me over the last three years. I am also grateful for the successive Directors of Graduate Studies, Marco Nievergelt and Caroline Petit, for their support during my studies. I would like to especially thank the Centre's administrator, the wonderful and indefatigable Jayne Sweet, who was always on hand to answer any number of queries I had, and whose cheerfulness never failed to improve my day. Finally, I thank the staff of the Warwick library, who often went above and beyond the normal call of duty to ensure that I could get my hands on the material I needed—especially during the upheaval caused by the Covid-19 pandemic.

I have to acknowledge that one of the reasons I was able to undertake my PhD was the excellent foundation provided by two very different groups of people. The first is a very dedicated group of high school teachers, without whom I would not be here to have written this thesis. I thank Liz McKewin, John Humphreys, Keith Hutcheon, Melanie Currie, Damon Giles, Megan Hindmarch, and especially Janine Clearwater and Rebecca Boyle, for not only supporting and believing in me, but also for going above and beyond the call of duty to ensure that I was able to pursue my goals on my own terms. The other is the excellent introduction to postgraduate life provided to me by the University of Otago. I want to take this opportunity to once again reiterate my heartfelt thanks to the English & Linguistics and History staff and postgraduates at Otago for everything they provided me. I thank Lyn Tribble and Takashi Shogimen for their continued help and support, as well as my whānau in Aotearoa—especially Nicola Cummins, Jo Oranje, Jocelyn Harris, Liam and Val McIlvanney, Craig Scott, Iain and Tamsyn Sutherland, and Michael Templeton.

During my PhD, I was lucky enough to secure a fellowship to the Newberry Library, Chicago. I thank the Humanities Research Centre at Warwick and the Center for Renaissance Studies at the Newberry for this opportunity to get my hands on some truly spectacular material. I want to especially thank Lia Markey and Suzanne Karr Schmidt at the Newberry, who helped make my visit such a productive pleasure.

Throughout the researching and writing of this thesis, I have accumulated many debts. There are a number of people without whom this thesis would not exist in its completed form. It thus gives me great pleasure to thank and acknowledge: Jo Adamson, Nadine Akkerman, Sara Barker, Nikki Clark, Susan Doran, Joseph Dowsett, Alan Ford, Marina Gerzic, Mitchell Gould, Natalie Hanley-Smith, Chris Hay, Tracey Hill, Kerry Jackson, Marika Keblusek, Paulina Kewes, Katarzyna Kosior, David McInnis, Danna Messer, Naomi Pullin, Mike Rose, Peter Sherlock, Rachel Willie, and Ellie Woodacre. Whether you shared a source, your expertise, or an encouraging word (or all of the above!), please accept this as my sincere thanks.

In addition to the wonderful people mentioned above, I have to single out a few individuals for special thanks. Zoe Stansell at the British Library went above and beyond to help me get access to manuscript sources during the Covid-19 pandemic; Esther van Raamsdonk was, in the horror year that was 2020, a constant ray of sunshine, and she enthusiastically supported my crusade to broaden the geographic emphasis of the CSR; Liam Sims provided me photos of many manuscripts, collated several early modern pamphlets for me, and never failed to cheer me up when things were tough; Sophie Shorland read (what seems like) endless drafts of documents, abstracts, and applications, provided me a place to stay in London, and I am very lucky to call her a dear friend; Kat Waters was the best subject librarian a PhD student could ask for, and always answered my questions with patience and good humour; and last, but not least, the team at Coffee#1 Stafford—especially Jodie, Sarah, and Aaron—provided a warm and welcoming environment when I needed a change of workplace (especially when I needed to do some serious editing), and ensured that this Antipodean coffee snob had one fewer thing to complain about when living in the Midlands.

On a more personal note, there are four people without whom I would not be here to submit this thesis. Nathaniel, my best friend and harshest critic, helped to keep everything in perspective. John and Nurhaida provided much needed love, support, and encouragement from afar, and helped to keep me grounded. And finally, Joseph: thank-you for always being there, for listening to me, talking through ideas with me, supporting me no matter what, feeding me, and sharing your life with me. I couldn't have done this without you. I love you.

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own work. It does not contain work either published elsewhere or submitted for a degree at another university.

Thesis Abstract

This thesis analyses how analogies using Elizabeth I of England were employed by a variety of writers and commentators in a range of ways to counsel, critique, warn, rebuke, and reprove her Stuart successors, as well as the two Lords Protector, during the turmoil and upheaval of the period 1603 to 1659. In this period, Elizabeth was paralleled with, compared to, or conflated with a litany of biblical figures, including Daniel, David, Deborah, Esther, Jacob, Josiah, Judith, Moses, Samuel, Solomon, and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Elizabeth had been compared and conflated with many of these figures during her reign for various religio-political purposes, and had in fact compared *herself* to Deborah, Judith, Esther, David, Daniel, and Solomon. The existing scholarship on Elizabeth analogies, however, almost exclusively deals with how they were invoked during Elizabeth's lifetime. A central argument of this thesis is that such analogies remained extremely potent devices of counsel and rebuke, and took on new meanings and purposes, in the decades after Elizabeth's death.

Scriptural analogies—those drawn between Elizabeth and a biblical figure—were a central part of the legacy of the last Tudor monarch in early- and mid-seventeenth-century England. This thesis argues that they provided (retroactive) religio-political validation of Elizabeth's reign, as both a female king and as a resolute Protestant; they depicted Elizabeth as a providential monarch whom the incumbent Stuart monarch or Lord Protector should be emulating; and by offering such counsel to her successors they sought to effect meaningful change. Elizabeth analogies allowed the dead queen to be depicted by different groups of people—with a range of agendas—as the embodiment of a providential ruler from the Old Testament whom her successors should emulate.

List of Abbreviations

Add.	Additional
BL	British Library, London
<i>Collected Works</i>	<i>Elizabeth I: Collected Works</i> , ed. by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).
CP	The Cecil Papers, Hatfield House Archives
<i>CSP</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers</i>
HMSO	His / Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
MS	manuscript
<i>OCD</i>	<i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> , ed. by Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, rev. 3rd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
<i>ODNB</i>	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> , online edition.
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i> , online edition.
<i>Selected Works</i>	<i>Queen Elizabeth I: Selected Works</i> , ed. by Steven W. May (New York: Washington Square Press, 2004).
<i>STC</i>	<i>A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640</i> , ed. by A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave, rev. by W.A. Jackson, F.S. Ferguson, and K.F. Pantzer (London: Bibliographic Society, 1976–1991).
SP	State Papers
TNA	The National Archives, Kew
Wing	<i>Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641–1700</i> , ed. by Donald Wing (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1972–1988).

Textual Notes

All Biblical references are from the King James Version.

All quotes from Shakespeare's plays (and their dates of composition) are from *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Modern Critical Edition*, ed. by Gary Taylor, John Jowett, Terri Bourus, and Gabriel Egan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Unless otherwise stated, all translations are my own. Wherever possible, the original language source is given in full in the footnotes.

All early modern documents have been transcribed as originally printed, except for the substitution of modern orthography (u/v, v/u, f/s), and the standardisation of capitalisation. Contractions and abbreviations have been silently expanded, and italicisation has not been retained. Manuscripts have been transcribed in a semi-diplomatic fashion. Where a folio reference does not contain a recto or verso symbol, the manuscript is foliated on every page.

Dates are given as they appear, but the year has been taken to commence on 1 January.

Oh my God, oh my Father, whose goodness is infinite and
 whose power is immense ... give me strength so that I,
 like another Deborah, like another Judith, like another Esther,
 may free your people of Israel from the hands of your enemies.

Elizabeth I, *Christian Prayers and Meditations* (1569)

Queen Elizabeth:
 A Deborah, a Judith, a Susanna,
 A Virgin, a Virago, a Dyana:
 Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise, and Chaste,
 With Heavenly, Earthly gifts, adorn'd & grac'd,
 Victorious, glorious, bounteous, gracious, good,
 And one whose vertues dignifi'd her bloud,
 ... Amongst all Queens, proclaim'd her Queen of harts.

John Taylor, *A Memoriall of All the English Monarchs* (1622)

Introduction

Elizabeth Analogies: Typology, History, and Monarchy

On 24 October 2018, UK Prime Minister and Leader of the Conservative Party, Theresa May, attended a meeting of the 1922 Committee in order to face down backbench criticisms of her Brexit policies. Despite concerns from her supporters that the meeting would be disastrous, and would set in motion a challenge to her leadership, May ‘emerged unscathed’ from the meeting after having delivered ‘an “emotional and personal” speech [that] reportedly won over MPs’.¹ One of the first MPs to talk to the media about the meeting was Michael Fabricant. After loudly telling the assembled journalists that the questioning of May had been fairly tame, he described the meeting’s outcome in striking terms: ‘It wasn’t Daniella and the lion’s den, it was a petting zoo.’

What is striking about this use of the biblical story of Daniel in the lion’s den is that such an analogy would not have been out of place—and was actually a widespread trope—in early modern England. Indeed, at the commencement of her coronation procession in January 1559, Elizabeth I of England offered a prayer of thanksgiving in which she thanked God for preserving her just as He had Daniel from the lions. The use of biblical stories to explain or describe contemporary situations has a long history, but it was an especially important part of early modern England’s religio-political discourse. This thesis analyses the way that Elizabeth analogies were used by a variety of writers in a range of ways to counsel, critique, warn, rebuke, and reprove Elizabeth’s Stuart successors, as well as the two Lords Protector, during the turmoil and upheaval of the period 1603 to 1659. In this period, which spanned the death of Elizabeth and the accession of James VI & I on 24 March 1603, to the resignation of Richard Cromwell as Lord Protector in May 1659, Elizabeth was paralleled with, compared to, or conflated with a litany of biblical figures, including Daniel the Prophet, King David, Deborah the Judge, Queen Esther, Jacob, King Josiah, the widow Judith, Moses, Samuel the Prophet, King Solomon, and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Elizabeth had been compared to and conflated with many of these figures during her reign for various religio-political purposes, and had in fact compared *herself* to David, Daniel, Deborah, Esther, Judith, and Solomon. The existing scholarship on Elizabeth analogies, however, almost exclusively

¹ Dan Sabbagh, ‘PM deploys “emotional” speech to see off threat from Brexit critics’, *The Guardian*, 24 October 2018, <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2018/oct/24/pm-deploys-emotional-speech-to-see-off-threat-from-brexit-critics>.

deals with how they were invoked during Elizabeth's lifetime.² A central argument of this thesis is that such analogies remained extremely potent as devices of counsel and rebuke, and took on new meanings and purposes, in the decades after Elizabeth's death.

According to Victoria Brownlee, 'the belief that the Bible's narratives were prefigurative of the present was a compelling one in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.'³ This view, coupled with the fact that the Bible was indisputably viewed as the preeminent text in the early modern period, accounts for the potency of biblical analogy as a tool of counsel and rebuke. Elizabeth analogies—those drawn between Elizabeth and a biblical figure—were a central part of the legacy of the last Tudor monarch in early- and mid-seventeenth-century England. This thesis argues that they provided (retroactive) religio-political validation of Elizabeth's reign, as both a female king and as a reliable Protestant; they depicted Elizabeth as a providential monarch whom the incumbent Stuart monarch or Lord Protector should be emulating; and by offering such counsel to her successors they sought to influence or shape regime policy. Elizabeth analogies allowed the dead queen to be depicted by different groups of people—with a range of agendas—as the embodiment of a providential ruler from the Old Testament: a model her successors should emulate.

It is important to note that this thesis is *not* about Elizabeth I. Instead, it is about the use of biblical analogy, with Elizabeth serving as the lens through which the device is analysed. Even though popular culture today retains a great deal of interest in Elizabeth, there is limited understanding as to why an unmarried and childless monarch whose death brought to the throne a new royal house from Scotland was remembered so positively, and was able to secure such a powerful and enduring place, in seventeenth-century English religio-political discourse. As this thesis suggests, Elizabeth analogies were a central component of the way that Elizabeth was remembered in the decades after her death—when enduring myths were being

² For Elizabeth as Deborah, see: Carol Blessing, 'Elizabeth I as Deborah the Judge: Exceptional Women of Power', in *Goddesses and Queens: The Iconography of Elizabeth I*, ed. by Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 19–33; and Alexandra Walsham, "'A Very Deborah?'" The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 143–168. For Judith, see: Aidan Norrie, 'Elizabeth I as Judith: Reassessing the Apocryphal Widow's Appearance in Elizabethan Royal Iconography', *Renaissance Studies*, 31.5 (2017), pp. 707–722. For Esther, see: Michele Osherow, 'Crafting Queens: Early Modern Readings of Esther', in *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. by Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), pp. 141–157; and Saralyn Ellen Summer, "'Like Another Esther': Literary Representations of Queen Esther in Early Modern England' (PhD thesis, Georgia State University, 2005). For Solomon and David, see: Linda S. Shenk, 'Queen Solomon: An International Elizabeth I in 1569', in *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. by Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), pp. 98–125; Susan Doran, 'Elizabeth I: An Old Testament King', in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, ed. by Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 95–110; and Michele Osherow, *Biblical Women's Voices in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

³ Victoria Brownlee, *Biblical Readings and Literary Writings in Early Modern England, 1558–1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 2.

constructed and consolidated. Although scholarly analysis of this has to date been largely cursory, it seems clear that Elizabeth analogies are in fact a significant reason for the longevity of the last Tudor monarch's posthumous fame.

Analogy and Typology

That biblical analogies were an important part of Elizabethan royal iconography is well established in the scholarship; their appearance after Elizabeth's death, however, has received virtually no attention: only one article considers their appearance as its subject.⁴ Scholars who analyse Elizabeth analogies invariably end in March 1603; most conclude, as Susan Doran does, that the biblical analogies were drawn 'until the queen's death'.⁵ References to posthumous Elizabeth analogies do appear, but they are mentioned fleetingly and with limited analysis; in his discussion of *A Thankful Remembrance of God's Mercy*, John Watkins merely notes that the depiction of Elizabeth as Deborah and James as Solomon allowed them to 'continue their biblical predecessors' work of protecting the godly against their murderous and idolatrous enemies'.⁶ Kevin Sharpe notes that Charles I's depiction 'as a David who followed Solomon' was similar to the way Elizabeth presented herself as the heir of the 'godly patriarchs' including Deborah and Judith, but he does not acknowledge that Elizabeth continued to be conflated with Deborah and Judith throughout the Caroline period.⁷ Likewise, while Michelle Osherow has noted that Elizabeth 'was hailed as an English Deborah from the start of her reign until after her death', she does not offer any posthumous examples of the phenomenon.⁸ In so far as scholars have considered the issue, they tend to treat it as an implicit element of what Alexandra Walsham has described as the 'powerfully enduring' image of 'Elizabeth as an instrument of divine intervention and a reincarnation of the godly rulers of Israel and Judah'.⁹ This thesis, therefore, provides the first in-depth examination of a crucial tool of counsel and critique that the scholarship has largely treated as an incidental component of the period's royal iconography.

Typology and (biblical) analogy, while interconnected, are not the same. Typologies drew on a figure's type: in early modern England, people of the past (especially the biblical

⁴ See: Aidan Norrie, "'Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise, and Chaste'" – Queen Elizabeth I's Biblical Analogies After Her Death', *Royal Studies Journal*, 2.2 (2015), pp. 25–44.

⁵ Doran, 'Elizabeth I: An Old Testament King', p. 95.

⁶ John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 28.

⁷ Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), pp. 395–396.

⁸ Michele Osherow, "'Give ear, O princes": Deborah, Elizabeth, and the Right Word', in *Elizabeth I and the 'Sovereign Arts': Essays in Literature, History, Culture*, ed. by Donald Stump, Linda Shenk, and Carole Levin (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2011), p. 251.

⁹ Walsham, "'A Very Deborah?'" p. 162.

and classical past) were often closely associated with an attribute, talent, skill, or event. Using this association, a figure's type was the generally agreed upon connotation that a figure evoked in the present—for instance, the links between Solomon and wisdom. Typologies, according to Kevin Chovanec, were part of 'the early modern intellectual habit of interpreting the present by finding similar events and figures in the Bible's recorded history'.¹⁰ As Victoria Brownlee and Laura Gallagher observe, 'Biblical typology was among the most influential, and common, reading practices of the early modern period and ... was fundamental to the application of Scripture to the secular present.' Brownlee and Gallagher also note that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this 'methodology was expanded outwards to include secular history within a continuing process of typological fulfilment. ... A typological reading of the Bible marked Scripture's contents with living relevance'.¹¹ This worked in practice, according to Kevin Killeen, because typology was 'a mode of reading the present', which meant that early modern writers believed 'A type ... perforated through historically separate events, marking them as inherently linked. Typology purported to discover the conjoined nature of historically disparate events or figures'.¹² Drawing on these various discussions and definitions, this thesis understands (biblical) typology as the practice of taking a biblical figure's attribute and/or association, and applying it to a person or event in the present.¹³

A biblical analogy, on the other hand, is a literary device in which a figure (or the actions of a figure) from the present is compared to a scriptural figure (or the actions of that figure). An analogy thus compared two (or more) figures with the aim of making a didactic point, usually with the intention of providing counsel or to provide precedent for a decision (or indeed lack thereof) in the present. Elizabeth analogies generally combine typology and biblical analogy: in conflating Elizabeth with Solomon, writers were drawing an analogy between the two monarchical figures, while also almost always invoking the wise Solomon *typos* to suggest that because of their inherent links, Elizabeth could (or did) display the same wisdom as Solomon, meaning that her actions should be emulated in the present. One of the

¹⁰ Kevin Chovanec, 'The British Pharaoh?: James I and VI and Internationalist Religious Writing at the Wedding of Friedrich V and Elizabeth Stuart', *The Seventeenth Century*, 30.4 (2015), p. 391.

¹¹ Victoria Brownlee and Laura Gallagher, 'Introduction: Discovering Biblical Women in Early Modern Literary Culture, 1550–1700', in *Biblical Women in Early Modern Literary Culture, 1550–1700*, ed. by Victoria Brownlee and Laura Gallagher (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), pp. 8, 9.

¹² Kevin Killeen, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 35.

¹³ This understanding draws on definitions offered by Helen Hackett, who describes typology as 'the identification of parallels between ... two figures which suggest some kind of mystical patter and divinely-ordained plan underlying the course of Christian history', and Donald Stump, who defines the practice of typology as finding 'characters in one age whose actions resemble and, seen in hindsight, foreshadow persons in a later age who are more religiously or historically important'. Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995), p. 10; Donald Stump, *Spenser's Heavenly Elizabeth: Providential History in 'The Faerie Queene'* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), p. 27.

underlying strengths of biblical analogy is the ambiguously understood connotation of the type/s it drew on: most analogies do not explain their intended typological meaning. Instead, writers expected their readers to understand the reason for invoking a particular figure, but they could also use the ambiguity of a figure's type to suggest multiple meanings, some of which were more critical than others. As I show below, biblical analogies in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were a unique device that formed part of a larger discourse of connecting the present to events and people of the past, demonstrating Daniel Woolf's observation that 'the appeal of the past saturates early modern discourse, public and private.'¹⁴

Biblical analogies and typologies were an important part of premodern royal iconography. John N. King has acknowledged the various ways that the Bible was used to demonstrate Elizabeth's legitimacy, arguing that 'biblical typology supported Elizabeth's reign as another exception to the norm of government by an adult male.'¹⁵ For King, these typologies included 'Old Testament types for monarchy and prophecy (e.g., Moses, David, and Solomon)', 'the traditional regal types of Moses, David, and Solomon,' and 'Deborah and Judith [who] furnish models for a godly kingdom ruled over by a queen'.¹⁶ These various typologies, then, were fused together to demonstrate Elizabeth's providential accession to the English throne, with biblical analogies used to perpetuate Elizabeth's right to reign as a female king.¹⁷

While post-1603 Elizabeth analogies have received limited attention in the scholarship, there is a plethora of work on the use of typology.¹⁸ These discussions of typology, however,

¹⁴ Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500–1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 45. Woolf adds: 'It was sufficient, through much of the [early modern] period, to argue on behalf of something by pointing out its antiquity' (p. 45).

¹⁵ John N. King, 'The Godly Woman in Elizabethan Iconography', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 38.1 (1985), p. 43.

¹⁶ King, 'The Godly Woman in Elizabethan Iconography', pp. 42, 56. Why Judith, who is not royal, is considered a model of 'a godly kingdom ruled over by a queen' is unclear.

¹⁷ King, 'The Godly Woman in Elizabethan Iconography', p. 58.

¹⁸ See, for instance: Russell Newton, 'Wielding the Brazen Serpent: The Variety and Power of Biblical Typology in Early Modern Scotland', *The Seventeenth Century* (2019), pp. 1–16; Russell Newton, 'Godliness Unveiled: William Guild, Biblical Types, and Reformed Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland' (PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2018); Reuben Sánchez, *Typology and Iconography in Donne, Herbert, and Milton: Fashioning the Self After Jeremiah* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); Rhoda F. Cairns, 'The Exegesis of Experience: Typology and Women's Rhetorics in Early Modern England and New England' (PhD thesis, Miami University, 2008); Charles Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), esp. pp. 228–229; André Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans. by Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Richard A. Muller and John L. Thompson, eds., *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: Essays Presented to David C. Steinmetz in Honor of His Sixtieth Birthday* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996); Julia Reinhard Lupton, *Afterlives of the Saints: Hagiography, Typology, and Renaissance Literature* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996); Victoria Kahn, 'The Metaphorical Contract in Milton's *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*', in *Milton and Republicanism*, ed. by David Armitage, Armand Himy, and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Francis Young, 'Typology', in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*, ed. by Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce and David E. Orton (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 29–49; Hugh T. Keenan, ed., *Typology and English Medieval Literature* (New York: AMS Press, 1992); Gerard Reedy, *The Bible and Reason: Anglicans and Scripture in Late Seventeenth-Century England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press,

often descend into what Donald Dickson calls a straightforward ‘game’ of equivalences, which perpetuates the inaccurate and anachronistic idea that ‘all one had to do was simply match types with their corresponding antitypes’.¹⁹ While many works use the phrase, and even the concept, much of the scholarship neither engages with the purpose or function of the typology, nor goes beyond discussion of transferrable attributes. For instance, while Helen Hackett’s study of Elizabeth as the Virgin Queen has proved highly influential, her discussion of typology is largely concerned with transferrable attributes, focusing on ‘the use of Old Testament typology to endorse the new Protestant Queen’.²⁰ Likewise, while Donald Stump suggests that the appearance of Moses and Elijah in Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* are types for Elizabeth, he does not offer any explanation as to what this typology would have meant to its contemporary audience, or the purpose for invoking the type.²¹ Finally, despite titling an essay ‘Elizabeth I as Deborah: Biblical Typology, Prophecy and Political Power’, Anne McLaren used the word ‘typology’ only twice in the essay, neither time explaining how the typology was intended to work, nor suggesting how Elizabeth *was* a contemporary Deborah. While she is right in pointing out that the ‘recourse to this biblical typology obviously enhanced Elizabeth’s monarchical authority’, like Stump, she neither explains what this typology would have meant for contemporary audiences, nor does she explain how the recourse to Deborah ‘enhanced’ Elizabeth’s authority.²² These imprecise uses of typology, coupled with their non-specific applications, are indicative of the way that Elizabeth’s comparisons with figures from the Old Testament have been treated in the scholarship.

As this thesis shows, biblical figures had multiple, intersecting typological purposes, with different purposes emphasised in different texts. For instance, Deborah was a woman, who wielded political and religious authority, was favoured by God, devised military strategies, and was ‘superior’ to men. Not all of the analogies drawn between Elizabeth and Deborah invoked all of these similarities or types: some focused on Deborah as a woman wielding

1985); Paul J. Korshin, *Typologies in England, 1650–1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982); Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); Earl Miner, ed., *Literary Uses of Typology from the Late Middle Ages to the Present* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977); Joseph A. Galdon, *Typology and Seventeenth Century Literature* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975); Steven N. Zwicker, *Dryden’s Political Poetry: The Typology of King and Nation* (Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 1972); John W. Blench, *Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Study of English Sermons, 1450–c.1600* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964); Jean Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, trans. by Wulstan Hibberd (London: Burns and Oates, 1960); and G.W.H. Lampe and K.J. Woollcombe, *Essays in Typology* (London: SCM Press, 1957).

¹⁹ Donald R. Dickson, ‘The Complexities of Biblical Typology in the Seventeenth Century’, *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, 11.3 (1987), p. 253.

²⁰ Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, p. 50.

²¹ Stump, *Spenser’s Heavenly Elizabeth*, pp. 27, 81–89.

²² Anne McLaren, ‘Elizabeth I as Deborah: Biblical Typology, Prophecy and Political Power’, in *Gender, Power, and Privilege in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Jessica Munns and Penny Richards (London: Pearson Longman, 2003), p. 93.

political authority, and others on her military victory. Likewise, to mention David was not always to invoke divine kingship and, as this thesis shows, the slippery and contestable nature of biblical typologies allowed them to be used by a range of writers in a variety of (sometimes contradictory) contexts. To say that a figure—biblical, classical, or mythological—had a single typological purpose fails to take into consideration the multiplicity of reasons for which a biblical analogy could be drawn in early modern England.

The greatest strengths of biblical analogies, which accounts for their widespread use in various contexts, were their inherent universality and flexibility. Biblical analogy was likely the only literary device of counsel, critique, or praise that could be employed irrespective of the time or place: biblical analogy could be employed in print, appear on stage, be used in parliament, or come out of the mouth of a minister in a sermon. This universality explains the vast array of people, from a variety of social, cultural, and confessional backgrounds, who employed the device in a range of mediums and contexts throughout the premodern period. Some uses of biblical analogy are immediately obvious. They were used in prayers, such as the one Richard Vennard composed in 1601 called ‘A prayer for the prosperous successe of her Majesties forces in Ireland’, which implored:

Sweet Jesus, God of mercie, ... suffer thy servants [to] passe through that Irish red Sea of Sanguin and blodie pretence, and let those rebbels be overwhelmed with the Egiptian Pharo. Circumvent that rebellious Sissira, that thy judgment (like a naile) may peirce into the braine of his malicious practises: That our Sovereaigne may sing with Debora after the victorie, having with Hester preserved hir people, and with chast Judith cut off the head of harne pretending Holofernes. And as to thy servant Moyses, under-prop the arme of hir Generall with thine owne powre ... Stand still O Sonne of God, and give thy people victorie, as the Sunne stooode still when Josua got the victory.²³

Analogies appear in a myriad of sermons, from those preached in a small parish church on a Sunday, to those intended for a national audience, including the sermon preached by John Williams, the Bishop of Lincoln and the Lord Keeper, at the funeral of James VI & I, in which he called the King ‘Great Britaines Salomon’, reminded his listeners of ‘the peaceable Raigne of our late Salomon’ and that ‘our Deare Master ... raigned better, [and] raigned also longer then King Salomon’, before concluding that God ‘hath made a lively Repraesentation of the Vertues of Salomon, in the Person of King James’.²⁴ They were used in a variety of contexts in parliament, such as when Elizabeth sought to delay agreeing to the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, by claiming that she had not determined it was the right course of action, telling

²³ Richard Vennard, *The Right Way to Heaven: And the true testimonie of a faithfull and loyal subject* (London, 1601; BL shelfmark C.53.c.12.), sig. φ 1r.

²⁴ John Williams, *Great Britains Salomon: A Sermon Preached at the Magnificent Funerall, of the most high and mighty King, James, the late King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, defender of the Faith* (London, 1625; STC 25723), pp. 1, 55, 66, 76.

parliament 'as Salomon, so I above all thynges have desyred wysdome at the handes of God'.²⁵ Or, when the Lords used biblical history in February 1563 to exhort Elizabeth to marry, and thereby produce an heir, by claiming:

the Scriptures hath declared succession and having of children to be one of His principal benedictions in this life; and of the contrary He hath pronounced otherwise. And therefore Abraham prayed to God for issue, ... Anna, the mother of Samuel, prayed to God with tears for issue; and Elizabeth (whose name your majesty beareth), mother to John [the] Baptist, was joyful when God blessed her with fruit.²⁶

Biblical analogies were not, however, restricted to only 'official' or 'political' uses like those detailed above. They also appear in a range of popular and literary texts. These include plays like Shakespeare's *Henry VI, Part 1* where the Dauphin, after being bested in a fight by Joan la Pucelle (Joan of Arc), claims that 'thou ... fightest with the sword of Deborah'.²⁷ They are also to be found in broadside ballads, such as Thomas Deloney's *Garland of Good Will*, which celebrated Elizabeth's Judith-like victory over the Armada:

Lo here behold how God provides
for them that in him trust:
... How often hath our Judith sav'd,
and kept us from decay:
Gainst Holofernes, Devill and Pope,
as may be seen this day.²⁸

They were used in poetry, such as when Hester Pulter hoped that Charles I, 'our Job-like saint', would 'rise from the ground' of his imprisonment in Carisbrooke Castle.²⁹ That biblical analogies were a useful literary frame of reference is made clear by their use in letters. When Elizabeth wrote to Henri IV of France after learning of his conversion to Catholicism she claimed, 'I will not cease to place you in the forefront of my devotions, that the hands of Esau may not spoil the blessing of Jacob'.³⁰ Finally, although more rarely, biblical analogies were also made visually, such as in the frontispiece of George Carleton's *A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercie*, which depicted Elizabeth as Deborah, and James VI & I as Solomon (see

²⁵ Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.III.34, fol. 314.

²⁶ *Collected Works*, pp. 84–85.

²⁷ Shakespeare, *Henry VI, Part 1*, 1.3.84.

²⁸ Thomas Deloney, *The Garland of Good Will. Divided into three parts: Containing many pleasant Songs, and pretty Poems, to sundry new Notes* (London, 1628; STC 6553.5), sig. G2r. This is the earliest, extant copy of the ballad; the ballad, however, was entered into the Stationers' Register on 23 March 1588, and it is likely the same ballad as an entry in the Register from 1566/1567. See: Ananya Dutta Gupta, 'Gender, Genre and the City in Early Modern English Writing: A Reading of Thomas Deloney's Ballad "The ouerthrow of proud Holofernes, and the triumph of vertuous Queene Iudith" (1587–8)', *The Literary London Journal*, 14.1 (2017), pp. 27–45; and Elkin Calhoun Wilson, *England's Eliza* (1939; New York: Octagon Books, 1966), pp. 43–44.

²⁹ Hester Pulter, 'Upon the Imprisonment of his Sacred Majesty, That Unparalleled Prince, King Charles the First', Leeds University Library, Brotherton Collection, MS Lt q 32, fol. 33r.

³⁰ *Collected Works*, p. 371. Elizabeth is expanding on the notion that Protestantism is Jacob, who took away the birthright of his elder brother, Esau (and thus Catholicism).

Appendix 1).³¹

Certainly, some of these genres could, and did, also employ classical analogies—images, plays, poetry, and broadside ballads in particular. Nevertheless, there was no other literary device of counsel and critique that could be used in all those circumstances, no matter the audience or author, in early modern England. This universality is central to the power of biblical analogy: and it is this universality that makes the study of the device central to understanding the genre(s) of counsel and critique in early modern England, and that makes its absence from the existing scholarship an unfortunate oversight.

This universality was facilitated by biblical analogy's other strength: its flexibility. The typology, and thus antitype, of a biblical figure or event was debatable and contestable, with the same person or event able to be used in support of what might seem to be completely contradictory standpoints. An example of this flexibility is the various uses of David as a typological device to comment upon the political situation between 1649 and 1653. As Mary Ann Radzinowicz has argued, writers were able to use the typology of David in support of their contrasting political views.³² Royalists, like Abraham Cowley and Thomas Hobbes, used David as an example of a king who lost his kingdom, but eventually regained it through God's intervention; Republicans, like John Milton, instead used the typology to suggest that Charles had been overthrown like Saul, with the favoured peace-bringer David/Cromwell taking his place. Given the various premodern readings of the biblical story of David, both views could seem equally plausible: that they could both be made without any cognitive dissonance or contradiction underlines the malleability of biblical analogy.

Elizabeth analogies, like biblical analogies more generally, were part of a long history of comparing a contemporary monarch with biblical predecessors for the purpose of making a didactic point. Both before and after the Reformation, one of the most popular typologies for rulers across Europe was Solomon. As Laura Fábíán has shown, as far back as the Merovingian kings of France (mid-fifth century to 751), monarchs were regularly compared to Solomon, with successive popes even endorsing the comparison.³³ For instance, in 816, Pope

³¹ That contemporaries were in no doubt that 'Deborah' was actually Elizabeth is made clear by a comment made in a sermon preached by Malachi Harris. Preached before Sir Thomas Roe, the British ambassador for peace talks between the non-Habsburg belligerents of the Thirty Years' War, Harris referred to the 'Frontispice of ... A Thankfull Remembrance', which contained 'the Portraictures, of Q. Elizabeth (of renowned memory,) with a Flag in her hand, in which is described, the, Spanish-Armado in 88'. Malachi Harris, *Brittaines Hallehujah Or A Sermon of Thanksgiving For the happy Pacification in Brittain* ([Hamburg], 1639; STC 12807), p. 12.

³² Mary Ann Radzinowicz, 'Forced Allusions: Avatars of King David in the Seventeenth Century', in *Literary Milton: Text, Pretext, Context*, ed. by Diana Treviño and Michael Lieb (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1994), p. 47.

³³ Laura Fábíán, 'The Biblical King Solomon in Representations of Western European Medieval Royalty', in *The Routledge History of Monarchy*, ed. by Elena Woodacre, Lucinda H.S. Dean, Chris Jones, Zita Rohr, and Russell Martin (New York: Routledge, 2019), pp. 55–56. See also: Daniel H. Weiss, *Art and Crusade in the Age of Saint*

Stephen IV visited Louis the Pious, King of the Franks (r. 814–840). He compared the visit to that of the Queen of Sheba to the court of Solomon, claiming ‘What once brought the Queen of Sheba—the love of wisdom—through various lands [and] across seas ... is what has brought me to you’, before concluding, ‘But you are more capable, [and] you are stronger at heart, than Solomon’.³⁴

Saint Louis IX of France (r. 1226–1270) was associated with Solomon both in life and during the period leading up to his canonisation in 1297.³⁵ Jean de Joinville’s *Life of Saint Louis* asserts that the King’s royal justice was as great as Solomon’s, and Gauthier Cornut, Archbishop of Sens, is recorded as describing Louis as ‘the True Solomon, the peaceful’.³⁶ In his sermon at Louis’s canonisation, Pope Boniface VIII used 1 Kings 10:23 as his text—‘And King Solomon exceeded all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom’—in order to claim that while both kings were deservedly called *rex pacificus*, Louis far exceeded his Hebrew antecedent because he dignified not only his country, but also the whole of Christendom.³⁷ This analogy also, however, served as an implicit criticism of Louis’s grandson, Philip IV the Fair, who Boniface believed lacked his saintly grandfather’s virtues.³⁸

Solomon was, of course, not the only Old Testament kingly *typos*. For many European monarchs, Solomon’s father David was a key typological paradigm. While there are references to Charlemagne being called a Solomon, his many wars and depiction as a conqueror meant he was more frequently compared to David.³⁹ The analogy is made explicit in a letter from

Louis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 53–74.

³⁴ Ermoldus Nigellus, *In Honor of Louis*, in *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: The Lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Thégan, and the Astronomer*, ed. and trans. by Thomas F.X. Noble (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), p. 148.

³⁵ It is also worth noting that Geoffrey of Beaulieu’s *Life of Saint Louis* compared Louis to the Old Testament king Josiah, with Geoffrey claiming that ‘many things are said in praise of this King Josias ... that seem most properly to pertain to the praise of our king’. *The Sanctity of Louis IX: Early Lives of Saint Louis by Geoffrey of Beaulieu and William of Chartres*, trans. by Larry F. Field, ed. by M. Cecilia Gaposchkin and Sean L. Field (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014), p. 71.

³⁶ *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae, Volume I: Documenta hagiographica*, ed. by Paul Riant (Geneva, 1876), p. 47. Original Latin: ‘verus Salomon, id est pacificus, secundum originem carnis processit.’ See also: Weiss, *Art and Crusade in the Age of Saint Louis*, p. 56.

³⁷ M. Cecilia Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), pp. 1, 53–54; Fábíán ‘The Biblical King Solomon’, p. 59.

³⁸ Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis*, pp. 57–60. Boniface was critiquing Philip’s unilateral decision to tax the previously exempt French clergy half of their annual income the year before—a decision that had caused Boniface to issue the papal bull *Clericis laicos* (1296). On this dispute, see: Jeffrey H. Denton, ‘Taxation and the Conflict between Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII’, *French History*, 11.3 (1997), pp. 241–264.

³⁹ Fábíán, ‘King Solomon in Representations of Royalty’, p. 56. As part of his ‘revival’ of a more classical court, Charlemagne’s main attendants were given classical, biblical, or literary nicknames—for instance, Charlemagne’s poet and secretary Angilbert/Engelbert was Homer, and Charlemagne himself was David. In many of his letters to the King, Alcuin simply addresses Charlemagne as ‘my most excellent lord David’. ‘Alcuin to Gisela and Rotrud: early 801’, in *Charlemagne: Translated Sources*, ed. and trans. by P.D. King (Lambrigg: P.D. King, 1987), p. 325. On the ‘nicknaming’ practice, see: Mary Garrison, ‘The Social World of Alcuin: Nicknames at York and at the Carolingian Court’, in *Alcuin of York: Scholar at the Carolingian Court*, ed. by L.A.J.R. Houwen and A.A. MacDonald (Groningen: Forsten, 1998), pp. 59–79.

Alcuin, written in late 799:

I pray ... that your piety's coming may be a comfort to all and abundant blessing may accrue to your nobility's most illustrious sons through your good deeds, just as we read that it was through the holiness of one man, him of the same name as yourself, David, a king most beloved of God, that the power of the royal throne was preserved for all his descendants.⁴⁰

As would be the case in early modern England, the succession between David and Solomon was used to bolster the reign of Charlemagne's son and successor, with the peaceful reign of Louis the Pious compared to Solomon's.⁴¹

Most medieval English monarchs were compared to a biblical figure at some point during their reign—generally David and/or Solomon. Edward the Confessor was paralleled with both David and Solomon at his coronation when Eadsige, Archbishop of Canterbury, preached: 'May God make you victorious and a conqueror over your enemies, both visible and invisible; may he grant you peace in your days ... May God bless this our chosen king that he may rule like David ... govern with the mildness of Solomon, and enjoy a peaceable kingdom'.⁴² William of Newburgh, in his *Historia rerum Anglicarum* (*History of English Affairs*, c.1198), compared Henry II to Solomon in order to contrast Henry's reign with that of his son, Richard I, whom William depicted as a Rehoboam.⁴³ In his *Mirour de l'Omme* (*The Mirror of Mankind*, c.1370), John Gower (negatively) compared Edward III to David, depicting the King's mistress, Alice Perrers, as a contemporary Bathsheba, and claiming that like David, Edward had been led astray by his carnal lust.⁴⁴ In 1392, after the City of London had incurred Richard II's rage by refusing to grant him a loan, the reconciliation pageants compared the King to Solomon, claiming Richard 'knows how, just like Salomon, to rule his realm', with the Queen, Anne of Bohemia, recognised as 'a Hesther for the realm' for intervening and sparing the English from Richard's vengeful wrath.⁴⁵ In 1415, Henry V was depicted as a Solomon succeeding the Davidic Henry IV. During the founding of Syon Abbey, a monk from

⁴⁰ 'Alcuin to Charles: 799, after 10 July', in *Charlemagne: Translated Sources*, pp. 322–323. See also: Thomas F.X. Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), p. 234.

⁴¹ Paul Kershaw, *Peaceful Kings: Peace, Power, and the Early Medieval Political Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 174–177, 181–182; Fábíán, 'King Solomon in Representations of Royalty', p. 56.

⁴² Frank Barlow, *Edward the Confessor* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), p. 64.

⁴³ *The History of William of Newburgh*, in *The Church Historians of England, Volume IV, Part II*, ed. and trans. by Joseph Stevenson (London, 1856), p. 553. See also: Nicholas Vincent, 'William of Newburgh, Josephus and the New Titus', in *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: The York Massacre of 1190; Narratives and Contexts*, ed. by Sarah Rees Jones and Sethina Watson (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press and The Boydell Press, 2013), pp. 86–87.

⁴⁴ John Gower, *Mirour de l'Omme* (*The Mirror of Mankind*), trans. by William Burton Wilson, rev. by Nancy Wilson Van Baak (East Lansing, MI: Colleagues Press, 1992), pp. 298–299. See also: Gardiner Stillwell, 'John Gower and the Last Years of Edward III', *Studies in Philology*, 45.3 (1948), pp. 464–465.

⁴⁵ Richard Maidstone, *Concordia* (*The Reconciliation of Richard II with London*), ed. by David R. Carlson, trans. by A.G. Rigg (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2003), pp. 53, 73. On Richard's 'quarrel', see: Caroline M. Barron, 'The Quarrel of Richard II with London, 1392–7', in *The Reign of Richard II: Essays in Honour of May McKisack*, ed. by F.R.H. Du Boulay and Caroline M. Barron (London: Althone Press, 1971), pp. 173–201.

Vadstena, Sweden (who was to be brought over to establish the Abbey for the Bridgettine Order), wrote to Henry V, claiming:

Even as Solomon magnificently consummated the temple which David his father planned to build, so also may the merciful integrity of your majesty bring to due fulfillment [sic] a monastery of this kind, which the devout intention of your generous father, hindered by death, could not achieve.⁴⁶

Finally, at his entry into London in 1432, Henry VI was greeted with pageants that compared him to Euclid and Pythagoras, as well as Enoch, Elijah, David, and Solomon.⁴⁷

The upheaval of the Wars of the Roses temporarily paused the use of biblical analogy (the main mediums for analogies in this period—pageants and courtly writings—were largely abandoned), but its re-emergence under Henry VII suggests that its religio-political purpose was widely understood. For instance, the City of Worcester used the figure of David, alongside several other biblical figures, in pageants they planned to present to Henry VII in May 1486 as the King travelled to York in the aftermath of the Stafford and Lovell rebellion.⁴⁸ The City officials, aware of Worcester's role in the uprising, wished to reassure Henry of their loyalty, and to demonstrate that he was the embodiment of great leaders from the Old Testament, with the implication being that he should be merciful to his subjects.⁴⁹ The pageant, which was eventually not performed, was to consist of a figure—'Janitor'—who compared Henry to various famous rulers from history, including six biblical figures. In the written account of the pageant's speeches, Janitor began by asking 'Quis est ille qui venit,' ['What man is this that comes'] so great of Price? / I thought Noe [Noah], whiche came late from the Flodde.⁵⁰ Janitor then invoked several of the great figures from the Old Testament:

Welcome Abraham, which went from his Kynndrede,
Of al this Lande to take Possession.
Welcome Ysaac, that sumtyme shulde have be dedde,
And now is Heire to his Fader by Succession.
Welcome Jacob, opteynyng the Beneson,
Which many Yeres dwelled with his Ungle ture,
Fleyng his Countrey from Drede of Esau.

Welcome Joseph, that was to Egipte sold.
Frely welcome oute of depe Cesterne.
Welcome David, the myghty Lion bolde,

⁴⁶ Nancy Bradley Warren, 'Kings, Saints, and Nuns: Gender, Religion, and Authority in the Reign of Henry V', *Viator*, 30 (1999), p. 318.

⁴⁷ John Lydgate, 'Henry VI's Triumphal Entry into London', in *Mummings and Entertainments*, ed. by Claire Sponsler (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2010), pp. 29, 35, 38; Richard H. Osberg, 'The Lambeth Palace Library Manuscript Account of Henry VI's 1432 London Entry', *Mediaeval Studies*, 52 (1990), pp. 255–267.

⁴⁸ Doran, 'Elizabeth I: An Old Testament King', p. 95.

⁴⁹ Sydney Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992), p. 40.

⁵⁰ Joannis Lelandi, *Antiquarii De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea, Volume 4*, ed. by Thomas Hearne (London, 1770), p. 195.

Chosen of God, this Realme to rule and governe.⁵¹

Henry was thus like Abraham, because he led his people—the Lancastrians—to take England, and by marrying Elizabeth of York, had untied his ‘Kynndrede’; like Isaac, who should have been killed, he was preserved; like Jacob, who had lived with his uncle, he had been forced to flee—to Brittany to avoid the Yorkists—so that he would not be killed; like Joseph, he was betrayed by members of his family, and was eventually restored; and like David, he was chosen by God to rule England. The overt flattery in the verses is clear, and their conclusion—‘Henry the VII chosen by Grace and Chaunce /... Now to be King of England and of Fraunce’—reinforces the belief that Henry had claimed the crown with providence’s intervention.⁵² The City of Worcester, desperate to ingratiate itself with the King, highlighted the providential favour that had allowed Henry to win the crown. But, at the same time, the city officials reminded Henry that God’s favour did not necessarily do away with every struggle: all of the figures mentioned faced difficulties in the exercise of their part in God’s plan, and so Henry was implicitly reminded that in dealing mercifully with those involved in the uprising, he would be emulating those famed biblical figures.

Henry VIII was most commonly associated with David. As Pamela Tudor-Craig and John N. King, among others, have shown, the typology of David, who overthrew an oppressive ruler and had to bring together a divided kingdom, was a key component of Henry’s new, post-Reformation royal iconography.⁵³ Comparisons with David not only bolstered Henry’s claims to religio-political supremacy over the pope, but also allowed Henry’s actions to be depicted as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies. For instance, Leonard Cox’s translation of Erasmus’s commentary on the Epistle of St Paul to Titus, published in 1534, used the example of David in support of the royal supremacy.⁵⁴ According to Cox, God

made kynge David keper of his herd of Israell ... even so he hath by the voice of his people chosen our most noble and vertuous kynge Henry to be hed of his Englishe flocke, as well in spirituall governaunce as in erthly domynyon. Let here no man murmur as some do ... For why sholde not by goddes lawe our kynge and soverayne

⁵¹ Lelandi, *Antiquarii De Rebus Britannicis*, p. 195.

⁵² Lelandi, *Antiquarii De Rebus Britannicis*, p. 196.

⁵³ See: Pamela Tudor-Craig, ‘Henry VIII and King David’, in *Early Tudor England: Proceedings of the 1987 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Daniel Williams (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1989), pp. 183–205; John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), esp. pp. 54–90; John N. King, ‘Henry VIII as David: The King’s Image and Reformation Politics’, in *Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contents*, ed. by Peter C. Herman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), pp. 78–92; and John N. King, ‘Henry VIII as David: The King’s Image and Reformation Politics’, in *Henry VIII and His Afterlives: Literature, Politics, and Art*, ed. by Mark Rankin, Christopher Highley, and John N. King (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 34–52.

⁵⁴ Aysa Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 130–131; and Martin Murphy, ‘Thame, Tübingen, Kraków and Reading: The Itinerary of Leonard Cox, Humanist and Schoolmaster (c.1495–1550)’, *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 64 (2015), p. 87.

lord be our hed herdes man as well as David beynge a lay prynce was hed shephered to his flocke of Israell? Now wher can ony [sic] of them fynde one iote in scripture that proveth theyr most holy father to be above kynges or temporall rulers?⁵⁵

Using David to legitimise the royal supremacy emphasises the way that the Reformation increased reliance on biblical typology as a tool of religio-political power. David had been an important royal type for centuries, but the typology was used more deliberately and urgently for Henry after England's split from Rome.

There can be little doubt that the Reformation fuelled the device's religio-political significance, and its subsequent use. A pertinent example is the appearance of biblical analogies in Sweden during the reign of Gustav I (r. 1523–1560). Gustav Vasa was elected as the first hereditary monarch of Sweden in 1523. The demise of the Kalmar Union—which had seen Denmark, Sweden, and Norway ruled by the monarch of Denmark since 1397—began in 1521 with the Swedish War of Liberation; Gustav's election and coronation in 1523 formally ended the Union.⁵⁶ While there were several reasons for the Union's demise—not least was the Swedish nobility's resentment of their Danish overlord—the northward expansion of the German states into Denmark and the Baltic not only brought conflict to Denmark's northern and southern borders, but it also spread the ideas of both Luther and Calvin, which at once conflicted with the Catholic churches of each country, and provided new avenues for expanding and asserting royal power.

One of Gustav's most significant legacies was his overseeing of the Swedish Reformation. Gustav's implementation of the Reformation was similar to Henry VIII's split from Rome: the assets of the Catholic Church in Sweden were transferred to the crown in 1527, and the Lutheran Church of Sweden was established under Gustav's personal control in 1536 with the formal abolition of Canon Law.⁵⁷ Gustav also facilitated the imposition of his evangelical theological views on the Church by installing his own trusted supporters as bishops—a strategy on which Elizabeth would also rely two decades later.⁵⁸

Gustav, as both the 'liberator' of Sweden and overseer of Sweden's Reformation, turned to the Bible to bolster his position. Gustav was compared to Joseph and to Joshua, the Hebrew prophet who led the Israelites into the Promised Land, and he was also often

⁵⁵ Erasmus of Rotterdam, *The Paraphrase of Erasm[us] Roterdame upon [the] epistle of sai[n]t Paule unto his discypyle Titus, lately translated into englysshe and fyrste a goodly prologue*, trans. by Leonard Cox (London, 1534; STC 10503), sigs. A6v–A7r.

⁵⁶ Michael Roberts, *The Early Vasas: A History of Sweden, 1523–1611* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), pp. 1–2.

⁵⁷ Roberts, *The Early Vasas*, pp. 114–116.

⁵⁸ E.I. Kouri, 'The Early Reformation in Sweden and Finland, c.1520–1560', in *The Scandinavian Reformation: From Evangelical Movement to Institutionalisation of Reform*, ed. by Ole Peter Grell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 46.

paralleled with Moses, the prophet who had led the Israelites out of captivity in Egypt.⁵⁹ For instance, in a sermon that was delivered in Uppsala in 1540, Gustav was compared to Moses's successor Joshua:

Who was it that freed the land from Christian [II of Denmark]? Who drove away that devil? Who returned peace to the kingdom again? Indeed it was King Gustav, our dear gracious lord. This King Gustav has done great things with the help of God in heaven, and is given as another Joshua—their greatness completed.⁶⁰

Similarly, in January 1544, when the *riksdag* met at Västerås, proceedings commenced with a speech from the throne. It was a long and sometimes incoherent piece—the audience required a printed summary of the speech's contents—that recapped many of the standard tropes of Gustav's kingship. The speech reiterated the biblical parallel of Sweden's liberation from Denmark and the Kalmar Union: King Christian—a contemporary Pharaoh—oppressed the godly Swedish, and God delivered his people by raising up Gustav, a new Moses:

In this case, we can see that because of the king's law, expressed and proven so that the kingdom, land, and people all exist in peace and security, he [the king] would rule, guard and protect, as God has confirmed and accomplished, because of his [the king's] gratitude and honour of God, ... he is like the examples of the pious and holy kings and princes of the Old Testament, namely, Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Gideon, David, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Cyrus, and other holy godly rulers and chiefs.⁶¹

Gustav and his apologists thus employed biblical analogies to demonstrate the providential favour the Swedes had received. Certainly, the Bible had been used for political purposes before the Reformation, but the Reformation caused a new (or perhaps renewed) focus on the

⁵⁹ The link between Gustav and Moses (and to Joseph) is still evident today. Gustav commissioned a ceremonial sword from Augsburg, Germany in 1541. The Sword of the Realm, as it is known, is the paramount royal ornament (taking precedence above the crown), and was used in every coronation from Erik XIV's in 1561 to their cessation during the reign of Gustav V (r. 1907–1950). On one side, the sword depicts episodes from the life of Moses, from the burning bush to the crossing of the Red Sea. The other side depicts scenes from the life of Joseph, from his dream that makes his brothers jealous, to Jacob's arrival in Egypt and his death. Even today, it is understood that these 'motifs [were] alluding to Gustavus Vasa's own career'. *Christina, Queen of Sweden: A Personality of European Civilisation*, ed. by Per Bjurström, trans. by Patrick Hort and Roger Tanner (Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1966), p. 172; 'Rikssvärdet från 1542' ['The Sword of State of 1542'], *Livruskammaren, Skattkammaren nr 13*; Ulla Landergen, ed., *The Treasury: The Regalia and Treasures of the Realm, The Royal Palace, Stockholm* (Stockholm: The Royal Collections, The Treasury, 2009), p. 39; and Edward Twining, *A History of the Crown Jewels of Europe* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1960), p. 650.

⁶⁰ Joseph Gonzalez, 'Rewriting History: Humanist Oration at the Funeral of Gustav Vasa, 1560', *Scandinavian Studies*, 78.1 (2006), p. 27. Original Swedish: 'Vem var det som befriat landet från Kristian? ... Ho haver denne djävulen bortdrivit? ... Ho, säger jag, kom riket i rolighet igen? Sannerligen det gjorde konung Gustav, vår käre nådige herre. ... Det haver konung Gustav till att så stor ting bedriva av Gud i himmelen given såsom annor Josua med stort väldighet fullbordat.'

⁶¹ *Svenska Riksdagsakter Jämte andra handlingar som böra till statsförfattningens historia under tidehvarfet, 1521–1718*, ed. by Emil Hildebrand and Oscar Alin (Stockholm, 1887), pp. 343–344. The speech was written in German, and then translated into Swedish. It is almost impenetrable, with a single sentence stretching over several pages. Original Swedish: 'Så kunne i och här uthaf förnimma, att uthi vår svenske lagh i konungs balken är sådant uppenbarat, uttryckt och bevisat, ... så att the theres rike, landh och folk alleniste uthvartes uti frid och rolghet skulle regere, beskyddas och beskärma, utaf Gudh stadfäst och uthvaldt är, ... såsom alle exemple af the fromme och helife konungar och furster uti thet gamble testament, nämbiligen Abrahams, Josephs, Moises, Gedeons, Davidz, Josaphatz, Ezechias, Cyrus, och många andre helige gudfrucktige regenter och hufvudh [sic].'

device as a part of royal iconography.

While biblical analogy had, by the seventeenth century, become associated with Protestantism, it was nevertheless employed by Catholic writers too.⁶² For example, the associations between Spanish kings and the kings of the Old Testament were made overt at various points throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In particular, writers described the Solomonic Philip II succeeding the Davidic Charles V—a link that was also made between Henry VIII/Edward VI and Elizabeth/James VI & I.⁶³ In his first speech to the assembled MPs since his return from exile, and delivered on 27 November 1554, Cardinal Reginald Pole spoke about the reformation he hoped his tenure as papal legate would precipitate in England.⁶⁴ Pole was especially interested in the role Mary's new husband, the future Philip II of Spain, would play in England's return to the Catholic fold:

I can wel compare hym [Charles V] to David, whiche thoughe he were a manne electe of God: yet for that he was contaminate with bloode and war, coulde not builde the temple of Jerusalem, but lefte the finishynge therof to Salomon whiche was *Rex pacificus*, So may it be thoughte, that the appeasing of controversies of religion in Christianity, is not appoynted to this Emperour but rather to his sonne, who shal perfourme the buildyng that his father hath begun.⁶⁵

This comparison was also drawn posthumously. In 1619, during the Counter-Reformation, the Benedictine monk Juan de Salazar described the 'almost complete similarity' between the Hebrews and the Spanish. Building on a tradition perpetuated by Aquinas and Erasmus, De Salazar sought to explain the continued success of Spain and its empire as being the result of the godly kings who sat on the Spanish throne. For De Salazar, Charles V had been a new David, and Philip II a new Solomon. Like David, Charles was involved in various military exploits, both defensive and offensive, which was their key point of similarity:

In Hebrew [times] prospered King David, so singular a captain, that by his great courage he was respected and feared, and all the princes wished to emulate him. Likewise, in Spain, Emperor Charles V the Great, whose courage in battle was so well known and notable, that almost the whole world surrendered to him, and all his new territories obeyed him.⁶⁶

⁶² Norrie, "Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise, and Chaste", p. 26; Peter Marshall, *Heretics and Believers: A History of the English Reformation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), p. 390.

⁶³ For Henry VIII/Edward VI, see: King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp. 93, 160; and Marshall, *Heretics and Believers*, p. 304. For Elizabeth/James VI & I, see Chapter 1.

⁶⁴ Marshall, *Heretics and Believers*, pp. 389–390.

⁶⁵ John Elder, *The Copie of a letter sent in to Scotlande, of the arrivall and landyng, and moste noble marryage of the moste Illustre Prynce Philippe, Prynce of Spaine, to the most excellent Prince Marye Quene of England* (London, 1555; STC 7552), D7v–D8r.

⁶⁶ Juan de Salazar, *Politica Española* (Logroño, 1619), p. 95. Original Spanish: 'En el Hebreo florecion un Rey David, tan singular Capitán, que por su mucho valor fue respectado y temido de todos los Principes confinantes sus emulos. En el Español un Emperado Carlos V Maximo, cuyo valor en armas fue tan conocido y señalado, que se le rindiō casi el mundo vijo, y se le sugetó, y le obedecion todo el nuevo.'

On the other hand, Philip, like Solomon, was ‘sedentary’, and engaged in a building program.⁶⁷ De Salazar focused on Philip’s work on El Escorial, which was both a royal residence and a monastic church, and was designed as a copy of the First Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem:

In Hebrew times, Solomon understood all things, par excellence, and his intelligence and character was widely known, and he is commonly called the Sage. And in Spain there was Philip II, so advised, rational, and informed in all ways, that is rightly said that he has a prudent reputation; imitating him [Solomon] even in the distinguished and prodigious building of San Lorenzo el Real, which he had made at El Escorial: an imitation of the famous temple, which Solomon had built in Jerusalem.⁶⁸

According to De Salazar, Spain’s godly kings were thus responsible for the country’s providential favour.

History and Memory

As already noted, biblical analogies were part of a larger discourse in premodern Europe that applied the people and events of the past to the present, with the intention of using the past as evidence of how things in the present should be handled. An illustrative example of this larger discourse is Plutarch’s *Parallel Lives*. Thomas North’s English translation of Plutarch’s *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes* was published in 1579. In his dedication to Elizabeth, North rhetorically asked ‘who is fitter to revive the dead memorie of their fame, than she that beareth the lively image of their virtues?’⁶⁹

North’s translation of Plutarch is full of exhortations to look to the example of worthy ancestors. In the *Life of Aratus*, readers are told to ‘conform ... thy life unto the examples and maners of thy vertuous auncesters’, with North’s gloss reminding readers of ‘The example of our auncesters, wherein profitable to their posteritie’.⁷⁰ Likewise, Scipio Africanus is described as ‘a myrror and example of all vertue’, and Publius Valerius Publicola, the first co-consul of the Roman Republic, is hailed as ‘a good example for magistrates’.⁷¹ For Plutarch, and North, the example of these men was relevant to contemporaries, and in publishing their biographies, North was hoping to encourage people to emulate the example of these ‘vertuous auncesters’.

⁶⁷ D.A. Brading, *Mexican Phoenix: Our Lady of Guadalupe; Image and Tradition Across Five Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 35.

⁶⁸ De Salazar, *Política Española*, p. 96. Original Spanish: ‘En Huvo en el Hebreo un Salomon tan entendido en todas las cosas, que por excelencia, y por lo mucho que alanzò de sus effencias y naturalezas, es llamado comunmente el Sabio. Y en el Español huvo Phelipe segundo, tan advertido, cuerdo, y avisado en todo genero de ellas, que con razon es dicho, y tiene por renombre el prudente, imitandole aun, hasta en el insigne y protentoso edificio, de san Lorenzo el Real, que hizo fabricar en el Escorial: â imitacion del famosso templo, que en Jersualem edificio Salomon.’

⁶⁹ Plutarch, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*, trans. by Thomas North (London, 1579; STC 20066), sig.

*2r. North relied on a French translation by Jacques Amyot, rather than the surviving Greek.

⁷⁰ Plutarch, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*, p. 1084.

⁷¹ Plutarch, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*, pp. 1158, 112.

The publication of a second, expanded edition in 1595 emphasises the public interest in learning about important historical figures.⁷²

Indeed, it was understood, and even expected, that monarchs would be compared with appropriate predecessors. These comparisons both exhorted the current monarch to emulate the example of their predecessor, and exalted the current monarch as being just as worthy, if not more so, than their predecessors. On 28 April 1615, Oliver St John was tried for sedition in the Star Chamber. He had written a letter to the Mayor of Marlborough refusing to contribute to the Benevolence that James VI & I was attempting to levy, claiming that the tax violated the Magna Carta and constituted the ‘grievous sin of perjury’ against the King’s coronation oath, with St John pointing out that it was for such acts that Richard II had lost his crown.⁷³ St John was (unsurprisingly) found guilty, imprisoned, and fined £5,000. In delivering the court’s judgement, Francis Bacon, the Attorney General, rebuked St John for his ‘negative’ analogies, and emphasised how careful choice should be made when using a historical analogy in reference to the reigning monarch:

And for your comparison with Richard II. I see you follow the example of them that brought him upon the stage and into print in Queen Elizabeth’s time; a most prudent and admirable Queen. But let me intreat you, that when you will speak of Queen Elizabeth or King James, you would compare them to King Henry VII. or King Edward I. or some other parallels to which they are like.⁷⁴

For Bacon, there was much to be gained in using the examples of past monarchs to counsel, and indeed describe, contemporary monarchs. However, Bacon not only asserted the danger that ‘unlike’ parallels wrought on those who invoked them, but also acknowledged that James’s predecessors were not all ‘equal’, and that some were worthy of emulation, and others—like Richard II—were not to be recalled.⁷⁵ As Phil Robinson-Self has observed, ‘The

⁷² Plutarch is also important because his biographies were not merely examples of ‘good’ characters. For instance, in the prologue to the lives of Antony and Demetrius, he made clear his belief that ‘we shall be the forwarder in reading and following the good, if we know the lives, and see the deformity of the wicked’ (p. 941).

⁷³ Francis Bacon, *The Works of Francis Bacon, Volume 12: The Letters and The Life 5*, ed. by James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath (Cambridge, 1869), pp. 132–135.

⁷⁴ Bacon, *The Works of Francis Bacon*, p. 145.

⁷⁵ Elizabeth herself seems to have been aware of the use of these ‘unlike’ parallels. In August 1601, after Essex had been executed for his rebellion, Elizabeth met with antiquarian William Lambarde to discuss historical records in the Tower. After coming across records from Richard II’s reign, Elizabeth is recorded to have remarked ‘I am Richard II know ye not that?’ As a prelude to his rebellion, Essex had paid the Chamberlain’s Men to perform a play about Richard II—most likely Shakespeare’s *Richard II*—in order to plant in people’s minds the idea that a monarch could be deposed for listening to ‘wicked’ counsellors. After Elizabeth’s remark, Lambarde is supposed to have replied ‘Such a wicked imagination was determined and attempted by a most unkind Gent.’ Both Elizabeth and Lambarde showed a keen awareness that Essex’s ‘wicked imagination’ was relying on an ‘unlike’ parallel between the Queen and her deposed predecessor. *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. by John Nichols, 3 vols (London, 1823), I, p. 552. See also: Stephen Orgel, ‘Prologue: I am Richard II’, in *Representations of Elizabeth I in Early Modern Culture*, ed. by Alessandra Petrini and Laura Tosi (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 11–43.

past is usefully malleable for present purposes'.⁷⁶ It served as a veritable catalogue of examples that could be applied to the present. The types of the dead monarchs may have been commonly understood, but as Bacon's judgement shows, these types were not equal. As Bacon reminded St John, there was both danger and profit in employing the past to comment on the present.

Bacon's judgement shows that there are important links between memory, history, and biblical analogies.⁷⁷ Elizabeth analogies were a central part of Elizabeth's memory and commemoration in the century after her death, even though they are largely absent from the existing studies of that theme. In a recent collection that focused on religion and memory in the English Civil Wars, the editors emphasised 'the interconnections between religion, memory, politics, and identity in seventeenth-century England'.⁷⁸ Scholars have long discussed the political currency of 'Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory' throughout the seventeenth century, but the absence of discussion of posthumous Elizabeth analogies means that the interconnectedness between religion, memory, and politics embodied in an Elizabeth analogy is poorly understood.⁷⁹ As David Cressy has argued, "'Queen Elizabeth of famous memory" became a rival with whom no living kings could compete. At best they might associate her image with their own; at worst, Elizabeth's memory loomed as a reproach to her less illustrious successors.⁸⁰ For example, during a debate in the House of Commons on 3 June 1628—delivered in the aftermath of the failed second La Rochelle expedition—Sir John Eliot described what he saw as England's decline, a decline that a return to the example of Elizabeth would arrest:

You know the wisdoms of our ancestors, the practice of their times; how they preserved their safeties. ... Against this greatness and ambition we likewise know the proceeding of

⁷⁶ Phil Robinson-Self, *Early Modern Britain's Relationship to Its Past: The Historiographical Fortunes of the Legends of Brute, Albina, and Scota* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2018), p. 4.

⁷⁷ On the scholarly use of historical memory, see: Kate Chedgzoy, Elspeth Graham, Katharine Hodgkin, and Ramona Wray, 'Researching Memory in Early Modern Studies', *Memory Studies*, 11.1 (2018), pp. 5–20; and Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Mueller, and Jasper van der Steen, eds., *Memory Before Modernity: Practices of Memory in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

⁷⁸ Dolly MacKinnon, Alexandra Walsham, and Amanda Whiting, 'Religion, Memory and Civil War in the British Isles', *Parergon*, 32.3 (2015), p. 5.

⁷⁹ As Christopher Hill observed, 'A favourite method of political denigration with acceptable limits was to praise Queen Elizabeth—often excessively—in order by implication to criticize her successors.' Christopher Hill, 'Censorship and English Literature', in *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill, Volume I: Writing and Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England* (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1985), p. 57. See also: Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England*; Carole Levin, 'Elizabeth's Ghost: The Afterlife of the Queen in Stuart England', *Royal Studies Journal*, 1 (2014), pp. 1–16; Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway, eds., *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* (Madison, WI: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007); Mihoko Suzuki, 'Elizabeth, Gender, and the Political Imaginary of Seventeenth-Century England', in *Debating Gender in Early Modern England, 1500–1700*, ed. by Cristina Malcolmson and Mihoko Suzuki (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 231–253; and Conyers Read, 'Good Queen Bess', *The American Historical Review*, 31.4 (1926), pp. 647–661.

⁸⁰ David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989), p. 130.

that princess, that never to be forgotten excellent Queen Elizabeth, whose name without admiration falls not into mention with her enemies. You know how she advanced herself, ... how she advanced this nation in glory and state; how she depressed her enemies, how she upheld her friends, how she enjoyed a full security, and made them then our scorn who now are made our terror.⁸¹

For Eliot, and those he was addressing, the past provided legitimacy and example. Biblical analogies thus allowed the dead queen to be imbued with political relevance, no matter the situation, because—as one of the pioneers of memory studies, Maurice Halbwachs, observed almost a century ago—collective cultural memory is both a spontaneous and a deliberate recollection that is created, contested, preserved, and passed on within a social context.⁸² The legacy of Elizabeth's reign was, however, a constantly shifting concept. As Judith Pollmann has remarked, 'the past served as a main frame of moral, political, legal, religious, and social reference', and monarchs in particular combined these various frames of reference, which in turn allowed a dead monarch to be used *as* a frame of reference.⁸³ As the examples analysed in this thesis suggest, the use of an Elizabeth analogy took the Queen's legacy a step further. Invoking 'Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory' offered Elizabeth's reign as an example to be emulated. Wrapping up such an invocation with a biblical analogy, however, affirmed the providential support Elizabeth had received, and portrayed the Queen as part of a chain of typologically infused governance that stretched back to the ancient past of the Old Testament. Elizabeth analogies, therefore, combined the example of the biblical past with the recent (and known) past in order to offer a range of counsel, critique, rebuke, and warning.

The belief in the paramountcy of the Bible, and its pre-figurative nature, had far-reaching political implications, and is well attested in the existing scholarship.⁸⁴ Brownlee notes that 'biblical interpretation was wedded to the realities of everyday life'; Beatrice Groves argues that 'The currency and status of the Bible made it a uniquely powerful source, and

⁸¹ *Commons Debates 1628, Volume IV: 28 May–26 June 1628*, ed. by Mary Frear Keeler, Maija Jansson Cole, and William B. Bidwell (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), pp. 60–62.

⁸² Maurice Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1925). My summary of Halbwachs's argument is synthesised from the English translation: *On Collective Memory*, ed. and trans. by Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

⁸³ Judith Pollmann, *Memory in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 1.

⁸⁴ See, for example: Thomas Fulton, *The Book of Books: Biblical Interpretations, Literary Culture, and the Political Imagination from Erasmus to Milton* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2021); Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith, and Rachel Willie, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England, 1530–1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Nevada Levi DeLapp, *The Reformed David(s) and the Question of Resistance to Tyranny: Reading the Bible in the 16th and 17th Centuries* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014); Hannibal Hamlin, *The Bible in Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Naomi Tadmor, *The Social Universe of the English Bible: Scripture, Society, and Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Osherow, *Biblical Women's Voices in Early Modern England*; Michelle Ephraim, *Reading the Jewish Woman on the Elizabethan Stage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); David S. Katz, *God's Last Words: Reading the English Bible from the Reformation to Fundamentalism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004); and Deborah K. Shuger, *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

[even] a brief allusion to a biblical story could open up a fund of associations, ambiguities, and analogues'; and Kevin Killeen perhaps best summarised the real-world impact of this belief when he noted that 'the scriptures provided both a scalpel and a sledgehammer for political analysis, amenable to subtle as well as crude deployment'.⁸⁵ This is because, in the now famous words of Christopher Hill, the Bible was 'a huge bran-tub from which anything might be drawn', because 'there were few ideas in whose support a Biblical text cannot be found'.⁸⁶ Nevertheless, while analogies drew on the Bible to make their political point, analogies that also included Elizabeth 'of famous memory' provided an extra layer of political analysis, another scalpel or sledgehammer with which to either praise, counsel, cudgel, or eviscerate the current ruler.

The centrality of the Bible to early modern politics means that providentialism is an important lens through which Elizabeth analogies must be read. This thesis engages with, and expands on, Alexandra Walsham's groundbreaking work, *Providence in Early Modern England*.⁸⁷ Most of the Elizabeth analogies drawn throughout the seventeenth century openly invoked providence, or broadcast Elizabeth's providential favour. For instance, Robert Fletcher concluded his *Briefe and Familiar Epistle* with a prayer that thanked God, who 'didst first in great mercie send unto this realme a Deborah to defend us from Sissera: a most blessed woman to redeeme us from Roome and Romish religion'.⁸⁸ Fletcher's example both highlights the pervasiveness of the doctrine of providence in early modern England, and shows that providentialism is key to understanding the religious significance of invoking figures from the Old Testament.

One of the most sustained early modern discussions of the doctrine of providence was written by Robert Purnell, and published in 1657. Purnell explained to his readers that 'God takes notice and knoweth all things' and therefore, even 'the smallest things are governed and upheld by him'. He added that 'God in his ordinary providence maketh use of means, and yet he is free to work without, above, and against them as he pleaseth', before concluding that 'God hath a continuall care over all his creatures once made, sustaining and directing them, with all that belongeth to them, and effectually disposeth of them all to good ends'.⁸⁹

⁸⁵ Brownlee, *Biblical Readings and Literary Writings*, p. 8; Beatrice Groves, *Texts and Traditions: Religion in Shakespeare, 1592–1604* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), p. 25; Killeen, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England*, p. 4.

⁸⁶ Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (London: Allen Lane, 1993), p. 5.

⁸⁷ Providentialism, according to Walsham, was 'the belief that God was no idle, inactive spectator upon the mechanical workings of the created world, but an assiduous, energetic deity who constantly intervened in human affairs'. Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 2.

⁸⁸ Robert Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle, shewing his Majesties Most Lawfull, Honourable and Just Title to All His Kingdoms* (London, 1603; STC 11086), sig. B3v. This example is analysed in Chapter 1.

⁸⁹ Robert Purnell, *A Little Cabinet Richly Stored with all sorts of Heavenly Varieties, and Soul-Reviving Influences* (London, 1657; Wing P4237), pp. 14–15.

In analysing the trend of comparing contemporary events and people to the past, this thesis also suggests that the Reformation shifted the focus from the more general historical past to the events and people of the Bible. There are important caveats to this observation, of course. For instance, John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* can certainly be read as a book of Protestant saints for contemporary people to emulate. Indeed, Elizabeth's Privy Council praised the new edition of the *Acts and Monuments* in November 1570 for allowing the English to keep in their 'memorye' the example of these martyrs, who in their 'tymes past' had behaved in such a way that their lives and deeds should 'come to the handes and knowledge of all hir majesties good subjectes'.⁹⁰ The *Acts and Monuments*, like saintly *vitae*, were thus relevant to people and their lives outside of the church building.

As the reception and afterlife of the *Acts and Monuments* shows, the writing of history, and the way it was consumed by readers both lay and academic, changed dramatically during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁹¹ As Daniel Woolf has noted, 'Before 1500, history was a minor genre written principally by clergy and circulated principally in manuscript form, within a society still largely dependent on oral communication'. By the late seventeenth century, however, 'steadily rising literacy, together with immense social and demographic change, had made history the most widely read of literary forms and the chosen subject of hundreds of writers'.⁹² While this thesis is not about the writing of history in the seventeenth

⁹⁰ Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, 'Print, Profit and Propaganda: The Elizabethan Privy Council and the 1570 Edition of Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', *The English Historical Review*, 119.484 (2004), p. 1292.

⁹¹ For some of the scholarship that has influenced my own thinking, see: Paul Cavill and Alexandra Gajda, eds., *Writing the History of Parliament in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018); Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (London: Routledge, 2017); Nicholas Popper, *Walter Raleigh's 'History of the World' and the Historical Culture of the Late Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012); Anthony Grafton, *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Sandra Logan, *Text/Events in Early Modern England: Poetics of History* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); Paulina Kewes, ed., *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006); Markku Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past*; Alzada Tipton, 'Caught between "Virtue" and "Memorie": Providential and Political Historiography in Samuel Daniel's *The Civil Wars*', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61.3-4 (1998), pp. 325-341; Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks, eds., *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Linda Levy Peck, 'Peers, Patronage and the Politics of History', in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. by John Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 87-108; Malcolm Smuts, 'Court-centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians, c.1590-1630', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), pp. 21-43; D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990); Joseph H. Preston, 'Was There a Historical Revolution?', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38.2 (1977), pp. 353-364; Arthur B. Ferguson, *Clio Unbound: Perception of the Social and Cultural Past in Renaissance England* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1979); Kevin Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979); F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1967); and F. Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962).

⁹² Daniel Woolf, 'Historical Writing in Britain from the Late Middle Ages to the Eve of Enlightenment', in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Volume 3, 1400-1800*, ed. by José Rabasa, Masayuki Sato, Edoardo Tortarolo, and Daniel Woolf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 473. See also: D.R. Woolf, 'Genre into Artifact:

century, it is important to consider that the people invoking Elizabeth analogies believed that the Bible was a historical document that also contained a 'blueprint' of God's will. The Bible, therefore, in addition to being a sacred text, included a range of examples that could be learned from, and was pre-figurative of the present. As Timothy Hampton has argued, 'The application of past to present aims at the maintenance of social relations, at the production of practical knowledge and communicative action'.⁹³ In the early modern period, history was primarily prized for its didactic and educative qualities, with Woolf observing that 'the past was seen predominantly as a source of examples'.⁹⁴ Indeed, as Edward Chamberlayne claimed in 1647, 'The most probable way to know what will be, is to observe what hath beene'.⁹⁵ While Woolf goes on to acknowledge that 'how those examples were to be construed would vary', he does highlight a key contextual point of continuity throughout the early modern period: people turned to the past in order to find examples of how the present should be managed. I therefore consider Elizabeth analogies to be part of what Noah Millstone has described as the widespread 'participation and collaboration' of people in England's 'monarchical government'.⁹⁶ Elizabeth analogies, which combine history with religion, politics, memory, and temporality, were thus a key example of the widely understood link between the ancient past of the Bible, and the more recent past of Elizabeth's reign.

Biblical analogies thus drew on the dual potency that came from privileging the historical past, and the acknowledgement that the biblical past represented God's will, allowing serious theological understandings of the Bible to be offered in service of practical politics.⁹⁷ This duality meant that biblical analogies were, in effect, a protected discursive space: by claiming to be using God's prefigurative blueprint, polemicists and commentators were able to avoid charges of sedition and treason. For instance, while the Jezebel typology

The Decline of the English Chronicle in the Sixteenth Century', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 19.3 (1988), pp. 321–354.

⁹³ Timothy Hampton, *Writing From History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), p. 17.

⁹⁴ Woolf, 'Historical Writing in Britain', p. 473.

⁹⁵ Edward Chamberlayne, *The Present Warre Parallel'd. Or, A briefe Relation of the five yeares Civil Warres of Henry the Third* (London, 1647; Wing C1846), sig. A1r. See also: Jason Peacey, "'That memorable parliament': Medieval History in Parliamentary Polemic, 1641–42", in *Writing the History of Parliament in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, ed. by Paul Cavill and Alexandra Gajda (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp. 194–210.

⁹⁶ Noah Millstone, *Manuscript Circulation and the Invention of Politics in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), p. 8.

⁹⁷ Although Protestantism had a problematic, and sometimes antagonistic, relationship with sacred history, various writers looked to the past to suggest that England's Protestantism derived from Apostolic conversion, supplanting a Catholic view of the conversion of the English with one that came straight from the pages of the New Testament. Elizabeth herself gave credence to the idea that Joseph of Arimathea had been responsible for the first Christianising mission to Britain. See: Rosamund Oates, 'Elizabethan Histories of English Christian Origins', in *Sacred History Uses of the Christian Past in the Renaissance World*, ed. by Katherine Van Liere, Simon Ditchfield, and Howard Louthan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 165–185; and Jack Cunningham, "'A young man's brow and an old man's beard": The Rise and Fall of Joseph of Arimathea in English Reformation Thought', *Theology*, 112.868 (2009), pp. 251–259.

appears in several indictments for sedition or treason during Elizabeth's reign, these same indictments also included other treasonous pronouncements or activities, meaning that no one was indicted for *only* describing Elizabeth as a Jezebel.⁹⁸ The indictment against Irishman Patrick Dones, an 'obstinate' and 'odious' papist, not only accused him of 'calling hir Majestie (whom god long preserve) Jesabel,' but also recounted that he often hoped 'to see hir draged as a horses taile'.⁹⁹ The general absence of 'negative' analogies in court records, therefore, suggests a level of protection, meaning that it is interesting to consider how Oliver St John (discussed above) would have been treated if he had compared James to Rehoboam, who increased the already heavy tax burden demanded by his father Solomon, rather than Richard II.¹⁰⁰

In addition to the nature of history in the early modern period, biblical analogies also interact with early modern conceptions of time and temporalities.¹⁰¹ That time was a real and contested concern in the period is perhaps demonstrated by the appearance of 'Time' in the fourth pageant of Elizabeth's coronation procession; indeed Elizabeth's response to the pageant, 'Tyme, and Tyme hath brought me hether', invites consideration that Elizabeth meant more than merely horological time.¹⁰²

⁹⁸ Rosemary O'Day records in July 1583 the 'exec[ution]. of three separatists at Bury St Edmunds for vilifying Queen as "Jezebel"'. Rosemary O'Day, *The Routledge Companion to the Tudor Age* (New York: Routledge, 2010), p. 29. This is incorrect: Congregationalists Elias Thacker and John Copping (who had already been in prison for five years) were executed for circulating the prohibited works of radical Protestant Robert Browne. They may have called the Queen a Jezebel, but this was not the reason for their execution. A third, Thomas Gibson, submitted, and was released. BL Lansdowne MS 38, fols. 162r–163r; Frederic A. Youngs, Jr., *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 214–215; John Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558–1689* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), p. 97. Of that many examples of the Jezebel analogy that Cressy and Killeen cite, none resulted in a prosecution. David Cressy, *Dangerous Talk: Scandalous, Seditious, and Treasonable Speech in Pre-Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 75–76; Killeen, *The Political Bible*, pp. 208–210.

⁹⁹ It is unclear if Dones was ever tried and/or punished for this 'seditious & traytrous behaviore'. 'Letter of William Willaston to Sir Robert Cecil', TNA SP 12/283a, fol. 32r.

¹⁰⁰ 1 Kings 12:14.

¹⁰¹ As Merry Wiesner-Hanks has shown, in the early modern period, 'women and men lived in a number of times at once—planetary, botanical, biblical, seasonal, liturgical, multigenerational, life-course, daily, horological—which overlapped and conflicted.' Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks, 'Introduction', in *Gendered Temporalities in the Early Modern World*, ed. by Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018), p. 15.

¹⁰² [Richard Mulcaster], *The Quenes Majesties Passage through the Citie of London to Westminster the Day before her Coronacion* (London, 1559; STC 7589.5), sig. C2v. The pageant consisted of two 'hills ... of convenient height'. One of the hills was 'cragged, barren and stony', and it was topped with a tree, 'all withered and dead'. Under the tree sat a person in 'rude apparel'. Above his head was a sign claiming he depicted 'A Decayed Commonweal'. Attached to the tree was a sign that listed the 'Causes of a ruinous commonweal'—namely, want of the fear of God, blindness of guides, disobedience to rulers, bribery in magistrates, rebellion in subjects, unmercifulness in rulers, civil disagreement, unthankfulness in subjects, and flattering of princes. This hill was set in contrast to the second, which is described as being 'fair, fresh, green and beautiful'. Under the healthy tree atop this hill stood a person 'well apparelled and appointed'. The sign above his head named him as 'A flourishing Commonweal'. The tree on this hill described the causes of a flourishing Commonwealth; namely, fear of God, obedient subjects, a wise prince, lovers of the commonwealth, learned rulers, virtue rewarded, obedience to officers, and vice chastened. In between these two hills was a small cave, out of which came a personage depicting Time. Time was leading a person 'finely and well apparelled, all clad in white silk'. The person, 'Temporis filia' (the daughter of Time), was named as 'Veritas'—Truth. Truth was clutching a book that was clearly labelled 'verbum veritas'—the

Biblical analogies were not only intertwined with God's plan, but they were also linked to secular, temporal concerns. For instance, during her progress to the University of Oxford in 1566, Elizabeth was entertained by scholars who gave disputations. One such scholar was William Lane, whose proposition was 'that a woman can rule'. His response—which argued in the affirmative—drew together biblical analogies with early modern conceptions of time, and indeed overlapping temporalities:

It was a debatable question for a long time but now there is no question,
Whether a woman can justly rule over men.
... Those things that the examples of our ancestors always prove
Must be dutifully maintained in our own times.
... Now witness the testimonies of this case.
Judith, a most outstanding woman, defeated Holophernes,
And Deborah was a holy judge of the people.
... What more needs to be said? Why should I go on saying more?
Let Elizabeth be an example to us.
... The examples teach that a woman rules justly.¹⁰³

In addition to returning to the female figures of the Old Testament to demonstrate the 'justness' of female rule, Lane also showed the various temporalities at play. The rule of women was a 'debateable question for a long time', but the example of history must be 'maintained in our own times'. Lane not only reinforced the value that early modern people placed on the past, and on past precedent, but also on the way that the concept of time applied differently in different places: surely, if the past was as relevant as Lane claimed, there was no need to debate female rule, given the historical precedent of the Bible. Biblical analogies were therefore part of both the way that human and divine time intersected, and the way that the past was frequently referred to in the present, offering precedent and example of how things should be done.

Early modern conceptions of time, and the relationship between divine time and human time were largely influenced by the writings of Aristotle and St Augustine. In discussing time in Book IV of his *Physics*, Aristotle treated it as a measure of change. His definition of time, however, is deceptively simple: 'when we perceive a distinct before and after, then we speak of time; for this is just what time is, the calculable measure or dimension of motion with respect to before-and-afterness.'¹⁰⁴ As Tony Roark observes, Aristotle took the

word of truth—which signalled the book was a copy of the Bible in English.

¹⁰³ 'Queen Elizabeth's Visit to the University of Oxford, 31 August–6 September 1566', ed. and trans. by Sarah Knight, in *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources, Volume 1: 1533 to 1571*, ed. by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 595–596.

¹⁰⁴ Aristotle, *Physics*, ed. and trans. by P.H. Wicksteed and F.M. Cornford, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), I, p. 387.

prevailing idea of time, and turned it ‘on its head: according to Aristotle, times owes its existence immediately to motion and perception, and ultimately to material objects’.¹⁰⁵ For Aristotle, then, time is a number. According to Ursula Coope, this means that time is ‘a “number of change”, a single order within which all changes are related to one another.’¹⁰⁶ This definition, however, requires ‘the existence of beings, like us, who can count. It depends on the fact that we count *nows* in a certain way.’¹⁰⁷ The need for humans complicates time, but it is in the counting of the *nows* that God could be inserted. Indeed, Aristotle provided some of the groundwork for later Christian authors and their conceptions of divine time, because God held in His mind all the *nows* that ever had been and that ever would be all at once. For Aristotle, ‘though changes are various and separate from one another, time is everywhere the same’—the only difficulty being human inability to comprehend the *nows* simultaneously.¹⁰⁸

St Augustine also had a profound effect on early modern conceptions of time. Time is discussed in Book XI of his *Confessions*, as part of his discussion of creation and God’s word. He first addressed the conception of divine time:

Yourself [addressing God], on the other hand, are always the same,¹⁰⁹ and your years will not fail. Your years do not come and go. Ours do come and go, so that all of them come in succession; whereas because your years continue unchanging, they all continue in the same moment in time: ... You have made all times, and you are antecedent to all times: and there was never a kind of “time” when time did not exist.¹¹⁰

Divine time, then, is not comparable to human time, but explains why events from the human ‘past’ are relevant to the human ‘present’. This is because, as Walsham has noted, God had ‘foreknowledge of every temporal event’.¹¹¹ Thus, God sent Deborah not only for the Israelites, but also for God’s people until the end of days.

Augustine then went on to consider the past and the future, explaining their relevance to, and impact on, the present:

For if future and past exist, I want to know where they are. ... Wherever they are, whatever they are, they cannot be anything else but present. ... In fact my childhood, which no longer exists, is part of past time, which no longer exists: but when I call to mind the impression of that childhood, and describe it, I am contemplating it in the present moment, because it is still in my memory.¹¹²

Because of their cultural relevance, the examples of biblical figures like Deborah and Solomon

¹⁰⁵ Tony Roark, *Aristotle on Time: A Study of the ‘Physics’* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 3.

¹⁰⁶ Ursula Coope, *Time for Aristotle: ‘Physics’ IV.10-14* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), p. 5.

¹⁰⁷ Coope, *Time for Aristotle*, p. 5.

¹⁰⁸ Aristotle, *Physics*, I, p. 423.

¹⁰⁹ Alluding here to Psalm 102:27: ‘But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.’

¹¹⁰ Augustine, *Confessions*, ed. and trans. by Carolyn J.B. Hammond, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), II, pp. 215–217.

¹¹¹ Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, p. 152.

¹¹² Augustine, *Confessions*, II, pp. 225–227.

are similar to Augustine's example of his childhood memories. In calling 'to mind the impression' of Deborah and Solomon, people who invoked Elizabeth analogies can be considered to be 'contemplating it in the present moment'. At the same time, however, because God held all time in His mind simultaneously, what was human past was concurrently past, present, and future for God, meaning that these biblical examples had intense spiritual relevance in contemporary religio-political debates.¹¹³

Typology and Literature

Typologies were not only reserved for biblical figures. In premodern England, various characters—classical, historical, and/or religious (especially saints)—served diverse typological purposes. These other typologies were regularly employed in literary works, and are thus important contextually for understanding biblical analogies. While scholars are aware of Elizabeth's biblical analogies, more work has been undertaken on her association with classical figures.¹¹⁴ Particularly in the latter half of Elizabeth's reign, biblical analogies co-existed and interacted with classical analogies—such as comparisons of Elizabeth with the Roman goddess Diana (the Greek equivalent of Artemis, also known as Cynthia), the Greek goddess Astraea, and the Roman goddess Minerva (the Greek equivalent of Athena). Indeed, some scholars (particularly Roy Strong, Helen Hackett, and Donald Stump) have inaccurately claimed that biblical references were only used in the first part of Elizabeth's reign, and were

¹¹³ It is also likely that Elizabeth analogies engage with the emergence of new understandings of time after the Reformation. The abolition of purgatory caused a substantial rethinking of time (particularly in regards to a human's life-cycle), and it created a more lineal understanding of time that made linking the present to the past more straightforward, as there was no longer a need to consider a person's time in purgatory after their death. See: Peter Sherlock, 'The Reformation of Memory in Early Modern Europe', in *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates*, ed. by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010), pp. 30–40; Cathy Shrank, 'Disputing Purgatory in Henrician England: Dialogue and Religious Reform', in *Representing Religious Pluralization in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Andreas Höfele, Stephan Laqué, and Enno Ruge (Berlin: Lit, 2007), pp. 45–61; and Peter Marshall, 'After Purgatory: Death and Remembrance in the Reformation World', in *Preparing for Death, Remembering the Dead*, ed. by Tarald Rasmussen and Jon Øygarden Flåten (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2015), pp. 25–44.

¹¹⁴ The scholarship is vast, but see, for instance: David Scott Wilson-Okamura, 'Belphoebe and Gloriana', *English Literary Renaissance* 39.1 (2009), pp. 47–73; Deanne Williams, 'Elizabeth I: Size Matters', in *Goddesses and Queens: The Iconography of Elizabeth I*, ed. by Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 69–82; Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth*; Jean Wilson, 'Queen Elizabeth I as Urania', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 69 (2006), pp. 151–173; Dieter Mehl, 'Edmund Spenser's Gloriana: Elizabeth as "Faerie Queene"', in *Elizabeth I: Past and Present*, ed. by Christa Jansohn (Münster: Lit, 2004), pp. 89–100; Susan Doran, 'Virginity, Divinity and Power: The Portraits of Elizabeth I', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 171–199; Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Random House, 1999); Peter McClure and Robin Headlam Wells, 'Elizabeth I as a second Virgin Mary', *Renaissance Studies*, 4.1 (1990), pp. 38–70; John N. King, 'Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 43.1 (1990), pp. 30–74; Robin Headlam Wells, *Spenser's 'Faerie Queene' and the Cult of Elizabeth* (London: Croom Helm, 1983); Winfried Schleiner, "'Divina Virago': Queen Elizabeth as an Amazon", *Studies in Philology*, 75.2 (1978), pp. 163–180; Francis A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1975); and Wilson, *England's Eliza*.

replaced by classical references in the latter part.¹¹⁵ Instead, while the use of biblical analogies certainly fluctuated during Elizabeth's reign, they did appear throughout its entirety, with examples extant from virtually every year of her reign.¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, classical analogies are important contextually, especially because of their association with the development of the Virgin Queen iconography. However, they function differently from biblical analogies. Generally, classical analogies were far more focused on attributes, rather than actual parallels. Elizabeth was never intended to *be* a Cynthia, or even to be *like* the goddess Cynthia—instead, it was her virginity that was likened to Cynthia's. An extension of this is the issue of history: while the Bible was considered a historical document of events, stories from which classical analogies were drawn were generally recognised as being fictional. Thus, while Elizabeth might be *like* Cynthia or Astraea, she could not *be* them; she could, however, be a contemporary Deborah or Solomon.

The difference between the way that biblical and classical analogies were used is evident in the first known comparison between Elizabeth and Astraea, which dates from 1569.¹¹⁷ According to Jan van der Noot, a Dutch poet, Elizabeth had been sent to England to usher in a new 'Golden Age': 'it may truly be sayd, that ... the Virgin Astrea is descended from heaven to builde hir a seate in this your moste happie countrey of England.' It is seldom noted, however, that this analogy to Astraea is invoked immediately *after* ones to several biblical figures:

good kings and princes which feare the Lord, shal have peace and comfort bothe in this worlde, and in the worlde to come: Like as had Jos[h]ua, Juda, Gedeon, David and divers other in those days, and is also to be seene at this day most evidently in the realmes and countreyes under youre Majesties dominion.¹¹⁸

Thus, Elizabeth's virginity means she rules like a returned Astraea but, more importantly, God had blessed her to rule in England as a second Joshua, Judah, Gideon, and David.

Biblical and classical figures were also included in depictions of the nine worthies—both male and female.¹¹⁹ The worthies were a long-standing trope of exemplary counsel in

¹¹⁵ See: Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*; Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, p. 87; and Donald Stump, 'Abandoning the Old Testament: Protestant Dissent and the Shift in Court Paradigms for Elizabeth', in *Elizabeth I and the 'Sovereign Arts': Essays in Literature, History, Culture*, ed. by Donald Stump, Linda Shenk, and Carole Levin (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2011), pp. 283, 284.

¹¹⁶ Doran, 'Elizabeth I: An Old Testament King', p. 114; Norrie, 'Elizabeth I as Judith', pp. 707–722.

¹¹⁷ King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, p. 241. It is also worth considering that classical analogies required some level of education, whereas biblical figures were known from weekly church services.

¹¹⁸ Jan van der Noot, *A Theatre wherein be represented as wel the miseries and calamities that follow the voluptuous Worldlings, As also the greates joyes and plesures which the faithfull do enjoy* (London, 1569; STC 18602), sig. A6v.

¹¹⁹ See, for instance: Celeste Turner Wright, 'The Elizabethan Female Worthies', *Studies in Philology*, 43.4 (1946), pp. 628–643; Horst Schroeder, *Der Topos der Nine Worthies in Literatur und bildender Kunst* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1971); and Sue Hedge, 'Nine Worthies and Nine Worthy Women: Image, Text and Performance in North-Western Europe 1311–1650' (PhD thesis, University of East Anglia, 2012).

premodern Europe, and were generally presented together in a kind of ‘manual’ for contemporaries in a similar way to the various editions of *The Mirror for Magistrates*.¹²⁰ The texts listed nine people to be emulated, and ideally, exceeded—generally in a tripartite structure of three Old Testament figures, three pagans, and three Christians.¹²¹ These manuals had existed since the early fourteenth century, with the first likely to have been Jacques de Longuyon’s poem *Les Voeux du paon* (*The Vows of the Peacock*) from around 1310.¹²² His nine male worthies—the pagans Hector, Alexander the Great, and Julius Caesar; the Old Testament figures Joshua, King David, and Judas Maccabeus; and the Christians King Arthur, Charlemagne, and Godfrey of Bouillon—were copied and reused over the next three centuries. As Ann McMillan notes, changes to this list were rare, ‘except for the occasional substitution of a local favorite’.¹²³

The reproductions and adaptations of the male worthies eventually lead to the emergence of the female worthies.¹²⁴ Eustace Deschamps’s ballade 403, written between 1389 and 1396, is generally considered the first written account of the nine female worthies. Notable women had been grouped together before, such as in Boccaccio’s *De claris mulieribus* (1361–1362), but Deschamps was obviously responding to the nine male worthies in his ballad.¹²⁵ Deschamps does not group the women according to religion, and there is a much larger emphasis on mythological examples. His female worthies are Deipyle, Teuta, Semiramis,

¹²⁰ The idea of the books was to hold up a mirror to (in)famous people so that contemporary rulers could learn from them, especially from their mistakes (hence the inclusion of figures including Caligula, Richard II, and Cardinal Wolsey). The *Mirror* was considered a continuation of John Lydgate’s *Fall of Princes*, which itself drew on both Chaucer’s ‘The Monk’s Tale’ and Boccaccio’s *De Casibus Virorum Illustrium* (*On the Fates of Illustrious Men*). Throughout the Tudor and early Stuart period, the collection went through seven iterations (including the first, lost edition from 1555). Elizabeth I was included in the final iteration by Richard Niccols, which was published in 1610 (STC 13446). On the *Mirror for Magistrates*, see: Harriet Archer, *Unperfect Histories: The Mirror for Magistrates, 1559–1610* (Oxford University Press, 2017); Harriet Archer and Andrew Hadfield, eds., ‘*A Mirror for Magistrates*’ in *Context: Literature, History and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); and Lily B. Campbell, ‘Introduction’, in *The Mirror for Magistrates: Edited from Original Texts in the Huntington Library*, ed. by Lily B. Campbell (1938; New York: Barnes and Noble, 1960), pp. 3–60.

¹²¹ Such manuals were often given as gifts to monarchs (see: Schroeder, *Der Topos der Nine Worthies*, pp. 84–88, for a bibliography of manuscripts of the Nine Worthies in royal libraries). For instance, Petruccio Ubaldini’s New Year’s gift for Elizabeth in 1577 was ‘Le vite e i Fatti di sei Donne Illustri’ (literally, ‘The Lives and Facts of Six Illustrious Women’). The six women were Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra, St Clotilde of Burgundy, Suanvita of Sweden, ‘Jutba’, daughter of Emperor Otho II (Ubaldini actually retells the story of Judith of Schweinfurt, who, in the premodern period, was mistakenly believed to be the daughter of Otto II), Zarina, Queen of the Sacae, and Wanda, virgin Queen of the Poles. BL Royal MS 14 A XIX.

¹²² Ann McMillan, ‘Men’s Weapons, Women’s War: The Nine Female Worthies, 1400–1640’, *Medievalia*, 5 (1979), p. 113.

¹²³ McMillan, ‘Men’s Weapons, Women’s War’, p. 113. Godfrey of Bouillon was the figure most likely to be substituted.

¹²⁴ See, for instance, Chaucer’s *The Legend of Good Women* (c.1380).

¹²⁵ Simone Celine Marshall, ‘Wonder Woman and the *Nine Ladies Worthy*: The Male Gaze and What It Takes to Be a “Worthy Woman”’, in *From Medievalism to Early-Modernism: Adapting the English Past*, ed. by Marina Gerzic and Aidan Norrie (New York: Routledge, 2019), pp. 22–24.

Penthesilea, Hippolyta, Thamyris, Lampedo/Marpesia, Menalippe, and Sinope.¹²⁶ Deschamps actually includes ten women, as Lampedo and Marpesia, co-ruling Amazon queens, are considered together—a quirk that was repeated in further versions.¹²⁷

Lists of female worthies were also presented in the tripartite structure, however. One of the most famous was put forward in Thomas Heywood's *The Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine the most Worthy Women of the World* (1640). His Jewish women were Deborah, Judith, and Esther; the Pagan women were Boudica, the Queen of the Iceni, Penthesilea, and Artemisia; and the Christian women were Æthelflæd, Lady of the Mercians, Margaret of Anjou, wife of Henry VI, and Elizabeth I.¹²⁸ Heywood's interest in Elizabeth was not new—his two-part play, *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* 'was a run-away success'—but *The Exemplary Lives* was not merely intended as a popular history.¹²⁹ Heywood concluded his section on Elizabeth by declaring:

Thus have I described unto you a Vestall for virginities, a Mirrour of Majestie, no lesse celebrated for religious pietie, then regall dignitie; with no afflictions afrighted, no disasters daunted: to her friends a mother, her foes a terrour, maliciously pursued, miraculously preserved, of women the wonder, of Princesse, the Paravant [pre-eminent], Elizabeth.¹³⁰

Elizabeth, the providential, Protestant monarch whom all should emulate, is brought to the fore here. Elizabeth was 'miraculously preserved'; she is a 'mirrour' to be imitated, and a pre-eminent ruler. While not an analogy, Heywood's *Exemplary Lives* certainly demonstrates the utility of turning to the past to find example for the present.

It is unlikely to be a coincidence that the figures most commonly used for Elizabeth

¹²⁶ Sinope, Hippolyta, Deipyle, Penthesilea, and Menalippe are mythological; Lampedo and Marpesia were Amazon queens whose lives are mentioned in Roman histories, but are unlikely to have existed; only Teuta, Semiramis, and Thamyris have historical backgrounds. According to Marshall: 'Teuta was the queen regent of the Ardiaei tribe in Illyria, who reigned from 231 BCE to 227 BCE; Semiramis (Shammuramat) was the Assyrian wife of Shamshi-Adad V (r. 824 BCE-811 BCE); Thamyris (Tomyris) was a Massagetean ruler, an Iranian people from the Scythian pastoral-nomadic confederation of Central Asia, east of the Caspian Sea, c.520 BCE'. Marshall, 'Wonder Woman and the *Nine Ladies Worthy*', p. 32n20.

¹²⁷ Marshall, 'Wonder Woman and the *Nine Ladies Worthy*', pp. 22, 33n1.

¹²⁸ Thomas Heywood, *The Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine the most Worthy Women of the World: Three Jewes, Three Gentiles, Three Christians* (London, 1640; STC 13316), sigs. A3r–A4r. The story of Boudica was 'rediscovered' during the early sixteenth century (and was printed in Polydore Vergil's *Anglia Historia*), and was made popular by John Fletcher's *Bonduca* (first performed c.1613, and published in the first Beaumont and Fletcher folio in 1647). For more on Boudica's 'rediscovery', see: Samantha Frénée-Hutchins, *Boudica's Odyssey in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014). Artemisia was queen of the ancient Greek city-state of Halicarnassus around 480 BCE. She fought alongside Xerxes I during the second Persian invasion of Greece. Æthelflæd (daughter of Alfred the Great) ruled Mercia as Lady of the Mercians from 911 until her death in 918. She was the first woman to rule in England in her own right (she was chosen as her husband's successor by the witan), and she successfully repelled several attempted Danish invasions.

¹²⁹ Teresa Grant, 'Drama Queen: Staging Elizabeth in *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 120.

¹³⁰ Heywood, *The Exemplary Lives*, p. 212.

analogies—Deborah, Judith, Esther, and David—were all traditional worthies.¹³¹ These congruencies suggest that the concept of the worthies sat beside, and interacted with, biblical analogies as a trope of counsel and exemplarity. They also show that linking the people of the biblical past with those of the recent past to make contemporary, presentist, points was a widely accepted, and utilised, didactic tool in both theological and political texts, and those intended for more popular and cultural consumption.

Many of the worthies, both male and female, were prominent features of early modern English drama. For instance, in addition to the thwarted pageant of the nine male worthies in *Love's Labour's Lost*, Doll Tearsheet teases Falstaff in *Henry IV, Part 2* by claiming 'Thou art as valorous as Hector of Troy, worth five of Agamemnon, and ten times better than the Nine Worthies.'¹³² Plays, with their various, typological uses of the past—biblical, historical, or imagined—are part of the wider literary culture with which biblical analogies interacted. In early modern England, turning to the past for example in the present was a cultural reflex. Biblical analogy was one example of such a reflex, even if the Bible, which combined both history and the word of God, was in another league to secular histories. Nevertheless, this reflex of emulating (or learning from) the past in the present manifested in a variety of ways, including in plays.

Given their shared interest in using the past to comment on the present, biblical analogies and plays undoubtedly informed each other.¹³³ Indeed, many of the key typological figures used in biblical analogies were depicted on the early modern stage.¹³⁴ Biblical figures

¹³¹ In fact, I have not found a list of female Worthies in the tripartite form that do not include Deborah and/or Judith. For instance, a collection of heraldry from c.1600 lists 'The Nine worthy women' as: Minerva, Semiramis, Queen of Assyria, Tomyris, Queen of Scythia, Deborah, Jael, Judith, Empress Matilda, Isabella I of Castile, and Joanna I of Naples. BL Lansdowne MS 865, fol. 12v. These same nine are included in BL Harley MS 6090, fols. 3v–4v; and BL Add MS 37507, fol. 352r. In addition to these nine, antiquarian and architect John Thomas Micklethwaite reproduced a list of worthy women, compiled in 1657 in Nuremberg (and based on Hans Burgkmair's early-sixteenth-century woodcuts), which included Esther, Judith, Jael, Lucretia (a virtuous Roman woman whose rape by the last Roman king, Sextus Tarquinius, led to the downfall of the monarchy), Veturia (mother of Coriolanus), Virginia (a virtuous Roman woman Livy's *History of Rome* who was killed by her father rather than be enslaved by the decemviri), St Helena (the mother of Emperor Constantine), St Bridget of Sweden, and St Elizabeth of Hungary. BL Add MS 37507, fols. 352r, 353r.

¹³² Shakespeare, *Henry IV, Part 2*, 2.4.187–189.

¹³³ Both Annaliese Connolly and Paul White have recently shown that claims about the lack of biblical drama post-Reformation are inaccurate. See: Annaliese Connolly, 'Biblical Tragedy: George Peele's *David and Bethsabe*', in *The Genres of Renaissance Tragedy*, ed. by Daniel Cadman, Andrew Duxfield, and Lisa Hopkins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019), pp. 29–50; and Paul Whitfield White, "'Histories out of the scriptures': Biblical Drama in the Repertory of the Admiral's Men, 1594–1603', in *Loss and the Literary Culture of Shakespeare's Time*, ed. by Roslyn L. Knutson, David McInnis, and Matthew Steggle (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), pp. 191–213. On the use of typology in drama, see: Groves, *Texts and Traditions*; Jane H. Jack, 'Macbeth, King James, and the Bible', *English Literary History*, 22.3 (1955), pp. 173–193; and Adrian Streete, "'What bloody man is that?': Questioning Biblical Typology in *Macbeth*", *Shakespeare*, 5.1 (2009), pp. 18–35.

¹³⁴ According to Murray Roston, Joseph, Adam, David, Esther, Susannah, Daniel, Deborah, and Judith were figures that appeared most frequently on the premodern English stage. Murray Roston, *Biblical Drama in England from the Middle Ages to the Present Day* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), pp. 55–57.

appeared in a variety of plays, including the anonymous *Godly Queene Hester* (c.1525–1529) and *Sapientia Solomonis* (1566), Thomas Watson's *Absalom* (c.1540), and George Peele's *The Love of King David and Fair Bathsheba* (1599), and would almost certainly have appeared in the lost plays 'The Two Synnes of Kynge Davyd' (c.1562), a 'Play of Holofernes' (1572), 'Saul and David' (1588), a 'Play of the Prophet Daniel' (1589), 'Hester and Ahasuerus' (c.1594), and a 'Play of Judith' (before 1597).¹³⁵ There can be little doubt that the depiction of biblical stories on the stage would have improved cultural awareness of these biblical stories.¹³⁶ After all, like those who invoked biblical analogies, playwrights relied on common tropes, allusions, and coded references to make clear their intended meaning.¹³⁷ Elizabeth analogies that employed David or Esther, for instance, drew primarily on biblical and the accepted extra-biblical accounts (usually Josephus), but writers also seem to have drawn on these stage depictions, with the analogy and the typology coloured by these stage depictions.¹³⁸

Many playwrights also used history to couch the counsel and critique contained within their plays. A biblical analogy was certainly more potent than an example from non-scriptural history, but their echoes in drama underscore the reflexive turn to the past for example. For instance, Barnabe Barnes's *The Devil's Charter* (1607) used an exaggerated and debauched retelling of the reign of Pope Alexander VI (r. 1492–1503) to emphasise the wickedness of Catholicism in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot, in a way that recalls the use of Deborah's providentially granted victory over the Canaanites to offer an example of how the contemporary Catholic threat should be handled.¹³⁹ Likewise, Thomas Middleton's *Hengist, King of Kent* (c.1616–1620) presented a variety of historical monarchs and their ruling styles in

¹³⁵ On these plays, see, respectively: Michelle Ephraim, *Reading the Jewish Woman on the Elizabethan Stage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 28–47; Ruth H. Blackburn, *Biblical Drama Under the Tudors* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971), pp. 81–88; Elizabeth Rogers Payne, 'Introduction', in *Sapientia Solomonis*, ed. by Elizabeth Rogers Payne (New Have: Yale University Press, 1938), pp. 1–45; Mathew R. Martin, 'Introduction', in *David and Bathsheba*, by George Peele, ed. by Mathew R. Martin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp. 1–47; Martin Wiggins, ed., *British Drama 1533-1642: A Catalogue*, 10 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012–), I, pp. 358–359 (no. 358); I, p. 382 (no. 359); II, p. 78 (no. 520); II, pp. 438–439 (no. 815); II, p. 478 (no. 834); II, pp. 406–408 (no. 801); II, p. 402 (no. 798). For the lost plays, also see their entries in the *Lost Plays Database*: https://lostplays.folger.edu/Main_Page.

¹³⁶ As Charlotte Steenbrugge has argued, medieval drama grew out of the sermon tradition, with 'repeated assertions of drama's role in instructing the laity in religious matters and virtuous living' supporting the view that 'plays were seen to have a devotional function similar to sermons'. The performance of biblical characters on the early modern stage, even if it was to a lesser extent, certainly drew on this 'devotional function'. Charlotte Steenbrugge, *Drama and Sermon in Late Medieval England: Performance, Authority, Devotion* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2017), p. 5.

¹³⁷ Adrian Streete, 'Antipapal Aesthetics and the Gunpowder Plot: Staging Barnabe Barnes's *The Devil's Charter*', in *Protestant Aesthetics and the Arts*, ed. by Sarah Covington and Kathryn Reklis (New York: Routledge, 2020), p. 100; Groves, *Text and Traditions*, p. 25.

¹³⁸ A good example of this is a little-known poem and interlude, *Hadassah: Or, The History of Queene Hester*, written for Henrietta Maria by one of her poets, Francis Lenton, in 1638. The story of a consort preventing the genocide of her people was one that many writers used to hint that the Queen might secure toleration for her fellow Catholics. A beautiful presentation copy, complete with Esther's coat of arms, survives: BL Add. MS 34805.

¹³⁹ See: Streete, 'Antipapal Aesthetics and the Gunpowder Plot', pp. 103–110.

order to provide an example of good, kingly government from which James VI & I should learn, in a similar way to how Solomon analogies were intended to counsel the King.¹⁴⁰ Finally, Nathanael Richards's *The Tragedy of Messalina, Empress of Rome* (1640) used the downfall of the titular Roman Empress to criticise Henrietta Maria, and the 'wickedness' of the Caroline court more generally, in a way that recalls polemicists who linked the Queen to Jezebel.¹⁴¹ This is of course only a very small selection of examples, but their differing political contexts emphasises the variety of ways that the past was offered as counsel for the present across early modern England.

Monarchy

On Sunday, 19 June 1625, William Laud, Bishop of St David's, preached a sermon before Charles I and MPs to mark the opening of the new King's first English parliament. His text was Psalm 75, and Laud focused on the various uses of 'I' in the psalm. With this focus, he argued that 'David sometime[s] speaks in his owne person, and sometimes in Gods'.¹⁴² This observation concerning a voice's duality draws on the concept of the king's two bodies, and is equally applicable to biblical analogies. Laud's explication, delivered in the 1620s, suggests an important—and overlooked—way that biblical analogies were interpreted and understood by both those who used them, and those who consumed them. Just as David was able to switch between his two distinct roles as a mouthpiece for God and as a human, so could Elizabeth, meaning that polemicists could claim that the dead Queen's actions and pronouncements were not merely her own, but were actually God's. Certainly, what was Elizabeth's voice and what was God's was debateable, but this ambiguity imbued a monarch's action(s) with divine authority: after all, who could definitively prove whether or not an action was God's? This ambiguity also allowed Elizabeth analogies to be remarkably flexible and adaptable, with an action or pronouncement able to be linked to God if it served the author's purpose, or glossed over if not. This flexibility likely explains, for instance, why Elizabeth's actions against puritans were increasingly overlooked or forgotten as more time elapsed, with these actions thought of as stemming from Elizabeth's 'owne person', rather than from God. At the same time, writers could also claim that Elizabeth's repudiation of Catholicism, and her returning of the Church of England to Protestantism, were God's doing through Elizabeth. Thus, Elizabeth's actions

¹⁴⁰ See: A.L. Kistner and M.K. Kistner, 'What Is *Hengist, King Of Kent*?', *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 7.2 (1982), pp. 147–159.

¹⁴¹ See: Lisa Hopkins, *The Cultural Uses of the Caesars on the English Renaissance Stage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 136–138. On Henrietta Maria's conflation with Jezebel, see: Dunn-Hensley, *Anna of Denmark and Henrietta Maria*, pp. 142, 201.

¹⁴² William Laud, *The Works*, ed. by William Scott (Oxford, 1847), p. 93.

were actually God's actions, meaning that it was paramount that Charles I defend England from the 'evils' of popery, because God Himself had re-instigated England's Protestantism.

As Laud's sermon shows, early modern people recognised that monarchs possessed both a body natural and a body politic—a concept made famous by Ernst Kantorowicz's *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*.¹⁴³ This duality helps account for the potency of biblical analogy. After all, the eternal nature of the body politic meant that it already possessed the qualities of all a monarch's predecessors, both more recent, and those from biblical times. This means that biblical analogies sought to connect a monarch's body natural with, and draw on, the experiences contained within the eternal and inherited body politic.¹⁴⁴

Elizabeth analogies, it can be argued, demonstrate a certain disregard for the 'person' of Elizabeth, and instead indicate a focus on the 'character'—or idea—of Elizabeth, in ways congruent with the concept of the king's two bodies. In the same way that Laud attempted to distinguish between utterances of David that were his own, and those that came from God, Stuart puritans were able to disregard the person of Elizabeth, who actively sought to suppress their predecessors, and instead focus on the *idea* of Elizabeth, a Queen who defended England's Protestantism and would have supported their attempts to remove the vestiges of popery from England. Like the oft-repeated epithet 'Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory', the Elizabeth analogies of the early and mid seventeenth century primarily deal with the 'character' of Elizabeth, rather than 'the person of flesh and blood'.¹⁴⁵ This is an important distinction, and is evident in the way that various writers depicted the last Tudor monarch as the defender of puritanism, or as the great parliamentary monarch. The separation of Elizabeth the woman from Elizabeth the Queen is also central to the posthumous Elizabeth analogies analysed in this thesis; any contradictions are dismissed as stemming from Elizabeth the woman, rather than Elizabeth the Queen.

Various scholars have shown how the concept of the king's two bodies was adapted, theorised, and appropriated by a range of people in early modern England. Marie Axton's *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* focuses on the manifestations of the

¹⁴³ Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (1957; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 394: the body politic 'never dies, is never under age, never senile, never sick, and is without sex'.

¹⁴⁴ Indeed, at the first meeting of her Privy Council on 20 November 1558, Elizabeth is recorded as stating, 'I am but one body naturallye considered though by his permission a bodye politique to governe'. TNA SP 12/1, fol. 12r.

¹⁴⁵ I draw here on Elisabeth Wåghäll Nivre's excellent study of Queen Christina of Sweden, particularly her observation that 'it is as if "Queen Christina of Sweden" had already become a fictional character during her lifetime, a figure that appeared in print and had little to do with the person of flesh and blood'. Elisabeth Wåghäll Nivre, 'Writing Life—Writing News: Representations of Queen Christina in Early Modern Literature', *Renaissance Studies*, 23.2 (2009), p. 222.

concept of the king's two bodies in drama—an outlet that allowed playwrights to provide pointed counsel and commentary, often with religious and political undertones.¹⁴⁶ Axton observes that the concept appeared first in royal masques and productions at the Inns of Court, before spreading to playwrights, in plays such as Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville's *Gorboduc* (1561), which sought to present the case for the Suffolk line of succession, rather than the Scottish claim.¹⁴⁷ Axton's focus on dramatic uses of the king's two bodies demonstrates the concept's use beyond the 'elite', and shows that the concept was pervasive enough in early modern England to be implicit—if not explicit—in the drawing of Elizabeth analogies.

David Norbrook has focused on Kantorowicz's use of the king's two bodies for reading Shakespeare's *Richard II*.¹⁴⁸ Norbrook pays great attention to Kantorowicz's application of the concept in the English Civil War, noting that Kantorowicz argued both that the Regicide only did away with the body natural, and that parliament was in fact fighting to defend the body politic from Charles's body natural. This has the effect, according to Norbrook, of claiming 'that on a higher metaphysical plane the English Revolution never actually happened'.¹⁴⁹ Norbrook thus exposes here the danger in applying the concept too rigidly in premodern England: belief in the king's two bodies was clearly not the central reason for the Regicide and the Commonwealth. Nonetheless, for Norbrook, the concept can undo some of the Whiggish views of history—and few monarchs have suffered more at the hands of that particular school of thought than Elizabeth. It creates a space in which monarchs can make mistakes (which is how Stuart puritans viewed Elizabeth's actions against Elizabethan puritans), or to make decisions that in hindsight were a failure (such as Elizabeth's controversial issuing of monopolies in the 1590s).

One of the most important re-workings of Kantorowicz is Cynthia Herrup's focus on the role gender played in the exercise of monarchical power. Despite mentioning the relevance of his concept to the rule of women—the body politic, 'being immortal, was *sanctus*, regardless of the personal character, or even the sex, of its constituent'—Kantorowicz broadly avoided engaging with the gendered aspect of monarchy, and the exercise of female kingship.¹⁵⁰ Herrup is intrigued by this omission, noting that in the second half of the sixteenth century in

¹⁴⁶ Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977), p. 17.

¹⁴⁷ Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, p. 46.

¹⁴⁸ David Norbrook, 'The Emperor's New Body? *Richard II*, Ernst Kantorowicz, and the Politics of Shakespeare Criticism', *Textual Practice*, 10.2 (1996), p. 331.

¹⁴⁹ Norbrook, 'The Emperor's New Body?', p. 340.

¹⁵⁰ Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, p. 80.

England ‘the real persons behind this fiction were mostly female’.¹⁵¹ Since medieval times, Herrup argues, the English believed a monarch who wished to rule well needed to possess a measure of both ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ qualities. Kings—both male and female—existed outside the norms of humanity; in one person, a king defied ‘the set boundaries of mortal and immortal, lay and secular, and single and the corporate’.¹⁵² This need to embody both genders is at the core of Herrup’s conception of the king’s two bodies. A monarch not only needed to be just, economical, and courageous—all considered masculine qualities—but also needed to temper these qualities with their feminine counterparts and be merciful, bountiful, and peace loving.¹⁵³ This balance not only prevented the Senecan descent into ‘womanly rage’, but also ensured that the state was not overrun by the masculinity that caused tyranny and cruelty—as exemplified by the reign of Richard III.¹⁵⁴ The general acceptance of this balance can be seen in the way that both male and female kings were described as ‘nurses’ of their people.¹⁵⁵

Herrup’s discussion of the links between gender and the concept of the king’s two bodies is particularly relevant to my analysis of posthumous Elizabeth analogies, with the concept largely resolving the ‘tension’ created by Elizabeth the female king, while also showing that neither sex nor gender were structurally determinative for Elizabeth analogies. Thanks to revisionist and feminist scholars of the last three decades, Elizabeth’s life and reign have been thoroughly reassessed through the lens of gender studies, and this thesis is indebted to these pioneering analyses of the intersection between Elizabeth’s gender and monarchical power.¹⁵⁶ The mediation of Elizabeth’s gender through the idea of the king’s two bodies

¹⁵¹ Cynthia Herrup, ‘The King’s Two Genders’, *Journal of British Studies*, 45.3 (2006), p. 495.

¹⁵² Herrup, ‘The King’s Two Genders’, p. 499.

¹⁵³ Herrup, ‘The King’s Two Genders’, p. 498. See also: Susan Doran, ‘Did Elizabeth’s Gender Really Matter?’, in *Queens Matter in Early Modern Studies*, ed. by Anna Riehl Bertolet (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), p. 41.

¹⁵⁴ This view of Richard III is of course a Shakespearean construction, but the conflation of unchecked masculinity causing bad blood (in the literal, early modern biological sense) surfaces several times in *Richard III*. For example, the Duchess of York attempts to counsel Richard, who ignores her advice, leaving her to tell him, ‘Bloody thou art; bloody will be thy end’ (4.4.195). Then, in his oration to the soldiers before the Battle of Bosworth, the Earl of Richmond—the eventual Henry VII—asks his soldiers: ‘For, what is he they follow? Truly, gentlemen, / A bloody tyrant and homicide; / One raised in blood, and one in blood established; One that made means to come by what he hath, / And slaughtered those that were the means to help him’ (5.3.245–249).

¹⁵⁵ This view, which was widely accepted in early modern England, was based on Isaiah 49:23, which claimed ‘kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers’. For instance, in an anonymous pamphlet commemorating Elizabeth’s death and James’s accession, the author declared: ‘And so, though God hath taken away Queene Elizabeth our late and loving Nurce-mother, yet the succeeding of that mightie and godly Prince, King James, our new and renowned Nurce-father’. *Weepe with Joy: A Lamentation, for the losse of our late Sovereigne Lady Queene Elizabeth, with joy and exultation for our High and Mightie Prince, King James, her lineall and lawfull Successor* (London, 1603; STC 76053), p. 1.

¹⁵⁶ See, for instance: Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*; Doran, ‘Did Elizabeth’s Gender Really Matter?’, pp. 31–52; Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Carole Levin, Debra Barrett-Graves and Jo Eldridge Carney, eds., *Elizabeth I: Always Her Own Free Woman* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003); Donatella Montini and Iolanda Plescia, eds., *Elizabeth I in Writing: Language, Power and Representation in Early Modern England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018); Linda Shenk, *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); and Ilona Bell, *Elizabeth I: Voice of a*

shows that gender was not fundamental to an Elizabeth analogy—after all, unlike Michael Fabricant, no drawer of an Elizabeth analogy felt the need to render Daniel as Daniella, nor explain why they thought it was appropriate that Elizabeth was a contemporary Solomon, despite the difference in gender. This is because, as Mary Beth Rose has argued, Elizabeth created her monarchical ‘persona by monopolizing all gendered positions, taking rhetorical advantage of the special prestige of both female and male subject positions ... without consistently privileging either’, and Herrup has convincingly argued that because of the concept of the king’s two bodies, ‘The iconography of kingship seems to have transcended gender’.¹⁵⁷

At first glance, there appears to be an inherent conflict that resulted from offering an Elizabeth analogy to the kings and lords protector who succeeded her. Indeed, while the rhetoric of the English being ‘weary’ of government by an old woman at the Queen’s death can be found in a selection of tracts, the continued appearance of Elizabeth analogies demonstrates either that the ‘relief’ at James’s accession very quickly dissipated, or that the English were not as ‘weary’ as has been assumed (or, as is more likely, a combination of both).¹⁵⁸ Elizabeth analogies, therefore, sometimes contained an implicit criticism that a woman had been a better ruler. Nonetheless, by drawing on the idea of the king’s two bodies, writers were able to suggest that the current ruler had inherited Elizabeth’s body politic, meaning they had no reason to not emulate her example.

Typologies were also not constrained by a need to match genders. There were, after all, no biblical types for female kingship: Deborah was not a monarch, Esther was a queen consort, and Judith, despite some suggestions to the contrary, was not royal.¹⁵⁹ While a male king could draw on a plethora of types from the Old Testament, female kings did not enjoy the same recourse. This imbalance emphasises the prevailing, gendered view of the premodern world; and while, as Herrup has shown, a monarch needed to balance both masculine and feminine qualities in order to rule successfully, the Aristotelian model of sex meant that maleness was considered inherently superior to femaleness. Such a hierarchy meant that it was acceptable in certain circumstances for a woman to exhibit masculine traits—hence the number of writers who praised Elizabeth’s ‘masculine spirit’.¹⁶⁰ This same hierarchy, however,

Monarch (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

¹⁵⁷ Mary Beth Rose, *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), p. 27; Herrup, ‘The King’s Two Genders’, p. 503.

¹⁵⁸ See: Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth*, p. 252.

¹⁵⁹ The only possible type might be the Queen of Sheba, but the briefness of her appearance in the Bible, and her clear submission to Solomon, largely negates the type’s power (to say nothing of that fact that her status as either a queen consort or regnant remains unclear).

¹⁶⁰ For instance, in 1613, Joseph Hall praised Elizabeth for her ‘Masculine graces of learning, valour, [and]

meant that it was generally *unacceptable* for a man to continually privilege the ‘feminine’ over the ‘masculine’, and to exhibit feminine traits at the expense of the idealised balance. This (perceived) imbalance meant that commentators derided monarchs including Edward II, Henry VI, and James VI & I for being ‘feminine’ and weak.¹⁶¹ The term ‘effeminacy’ could imply a variety of sins—James’s effeminacy was often linked to his distaste for the masculine activity of war, to say nothing of the perceived links between sodomy and effeminacy.¹⁶² Nevertheless, these issues were largely overcome by the doctrine of the king’s two bodies, given the body politic’s immortality and sanctity.

This duality allowed gender to be significant, but not constrictive, when Elizabethan analogies were invoked. Male monarchs were primarily equated with men (Henry VIII with David, Edward VI with Josiah), and female monarchs with women (Mary I with Judith, Elizabeth I with Deborah), but the types themselves were not entirely gender-specific: Solomon’s wisdom was an attribute that could be used for both male and female kings.¹⁶³ There were no fixed prescriptions on what typologies could be used, and, despite the limited

wisdom; in 1627, Henry Burton described how ‘In 88 that Masculine Queene slept not’; in 1628, George Wither praised Elizabeth as ‘A maiden Queene; with vertues masculine’; and in 1653, James Howell expanded on the praise of Elizabeth’s actions during the Armada crisis, describing ‘how notably did that Masculine Queen bestirre her self, in viewing her Armies, in visiting her Men of Warre, and Ships Royall, in having her Castles and Ports well fortified, in riding about, and in the head of the Army her self’. Joseph Hall, *An Holy Panegyrick. A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse upon the anniversary Solemnitie of the happie Inauguration of our Dread Sovereigne Lord King James, Mar. 24, 1613* (London, 1613; STC 12673), p. 54; Henry Burton, *The Baiting of the Popes Bull* (London, 1627; STC 4137.3), sig. ¶¶1r; George Wither, *Britain’s Remembrancer* (London, 1628; STC 25899), p. 18v; James Howell, *A German Diet: Or, The Ballance of Europe* (London, 1653; Wing H3079), p. 39.

¹⁶¹ For instance, in 1655, William Drummond called Edward II ‘an effeminate and weak Prince’; in the Earl of Monmouth’s translation of Giovanni Francesco Biondi’s history of the Wars of the Roses, Henry VI is derided as ‘carelesse, effeminate, [and] not minding the affaires of his kingdome’; and in 1653, Arthur Wilson claimed that James did not want to engage in warfare because he was ‘effeminate’. William Drummond, *The History of Scotland, From the year 1423 until the year 1542* (London, 1655; Wing D2196), sig. a2v; Francis Biondi and Henry Carey, *An History of the Civill Warres of England betweene the two howses of Lancaster and Yorke* (London, 1641; Wing B2936), p. 137 (sig. Ss1r); Arthur Wilson, *The History of Great Britain, Being the Life and Reign of King James the First, Relating To what passed from his first Access to the Crown, till his Death* (London, 1653; Wing W2888), p. 150.

¹⁶² See, for instance: Susan Doran, ‘Monarchy and Masculinity in Early Modern England’, in *The Palgrave Handbook of Masculinity and Political Culture in Europe*, ed. by Christopher Fletcher, Sean Brady, Rachel E. Moss, and Lucy Riall (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), pp. 201–223; Jamie Gianoutsos, ‘Criticizing Kings: Gender, Classical History, and Subversive Writing in Seventeenth-Century England’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 70.4 (2017), pp. 1366–1396; Frances E. Dolan, ‘Gender and Sexuality in Early Modern England’, in *Gender, Power, and Privilege in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Jessica Munns and Penny Richards (London: Pearson, 2003), pp. 7–20; Michael B. Young, ‘Queen Anna Bites Back: Protest, Effeminacy and Manliness at the Jacobean Court’, in *Gender, Power, and Privilege in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Jessica Munns and Penny Richards (London: Pearson, 2003), pp. 108–122; Danielle Clarke, ‘“The sovereign’s vice begets the subject’s error”: The Duke of Buckingham, “Sodomy” and Narratives of Edward II, 1622–28’, in *Sodomy in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Tom Betteridge (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 46–64; Michael B. Young, *King James and the History of Homosexuality* (New York: New York University Press, 2000), pp. 69–84; and Ian Frederick Moulton, ‘“A Monster Great Deformed”: The Unruly Masculinity of Richard III’, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 47.3 (1996), pp. 251–268.

¹⁶³ For Edward as Josiah, see: Christopher Bradshaw, ‘David or Josiah? Old Testament Kings as Exemplars in Edwardian Religious Polemic’, in *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe: The Later Reformation*, ed. by Bruce Gordon (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1996), pp. 76–90. For Mary as Judith, see: Aidan Norrie, ‘What Mary Did First: Re-assessing the Biblical Analogies of England’s First Female King’, in *Mary I in Writing: Letters, Literature, and Representations*, ed. by Jessica S. Hower and Valerie Schutte (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming).

attention the phenomenon has attracted in the scholarship, male leaders of early modern England were compared to female biblical figures. In the 1530s, for example, Henry Parker, 10th Baron Morley, declared that the joy of the English at Henry's break with Rome should be as potent and pronounced as the Hebrews' rejoicing over Judith's defeat of Holofernes:

What owe we unto you most gracious soveraigne lorde, which ar[e] by you, as by a most natural father, the bondes broken, set out of danger, from the captivite Babylonical, so that we may say plainly as the Jewes dydde to Judith: You are our beautie, you are oure honour, you are our glorie.¹⁶⁴

While the comparison is perhaps more allusory than strictly analogous, Parker made clear that Henry's and Judith's actions were comparable, and that their respective peoples were equally grateful.¹⁶⁵

The similarities between a proactive and triumphant Elizabeth and successful biblical figures allowed the dead Queen to serve as a potent tool of religio-political counsel. Indeed, as Walsham has wryly observed, 'Elizabeth became a whip with which to beat the Stuart monarchs, a yardstick by which to measure their perceived deficiencies.'¹⁶⁶ Elizabeth's body politic had been inherited by her successors, which meant that they could embody her actions. The idea of the king's two bodies, therefore, added to the inherent adaptability and flexibility of Elizabeth analogies. Writers were able to separate Elizabeth the woman from Elizabeth the (female) king. This separation allowed them to counsel, critique, or warn by showing that thanks to God's intervention, Elizabeth—or at least an idealised version of Elizabeth—was now part of the body politic, meaning that that there was no reason for the current monarch or lord protector not to put into practice actions and attitudes originally espoused by Elizabeth.

Methodology

Elizabeth analogies seem to have been ubiquitous in seventeenth-century England, and carried a multitude of meanings. Using a range of full-text keywords, and combing a variety of subject tags, I have searched *EEBO* widely, and have uncovered many Elizabeth analogies in pamphlets published between 1603 and 1659—more than could ever be analysed in a single thesis. In examining these Elizabeth analogies, however, I have noticed a distinct pattern: many commentators used Elizabeth analogies in an attempt to claim an explicit relevance to contemporary religio-political debates or concerns. Certainly, almost every use of a biblical

¹⁶⁴ Henry Parker, *The Exposition and declaration of the Psalme, Deus ultionum Dominus* [Psalm 94] (London, 1539; *STC* 19211), sig. A3r.

¹⁶⁵ See: Norrie, 'Elizabeth as Judith', p. 709n11; and King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, p. 219.

¹⁶⁶ Walsham, "'A Very Deborah?'"', p. 159.

typology served some kind of didactic function, but some writers were much more explicit than others in both their desire to make a didactic point through an Elizabeth analogy, as well as their claim to immediate relevancy. The examples analysed in this thesis for their particular importance are those that serve an overt political purpose, both in terms of the didactic nature of the analogy, and their use of Elizabeth's memory to counsel, rebuke, or warn.

Elizabeth analogies that emphasise an immediate religio-political relevancy, like the one employed by Thomas Adams in 1633, are thus foregrounded in this thesis. In his commentary on 2 Peter, Adams praised the reign of Elizabeth as an example for the present:

Let the memorie of her be blessed, even that our Debora, whereof all true hearted English are glad to heare: Shee was truely the Defender of this true, ancient, Catholike, and Apostolike Faith: she reared up the Preaching of this faith, she maintained this faith, shee lived in this faith, in this faith shee died: applying to her owne soule the mercies of God through the righteousness of Jesus Christ.¹⁶⁷

Adams's Elizabeth analogy is intended to exhort the English to follow her example, as well as serving as a rebuke to Charles I for allowing popery to re-emerge in England. Nevertheless, in order to give a sense of the rich variety of Elizabeth analogies that appeared in the period this thesis covers, Appendix 2 lists many extant Elizabeth analogies in order to emphasise the ubiquity of the device.

As the Adams example shows, one of the issues that this thesis has to contend with is that the very nature of biblical analogy means that it is usually invoked in a 'positive' way: that is, posthumous Elizabeth analogies are nearly always flattering or complimentary about the memory of Elizabeth. Monarchs were, of course, often compared negatively to biblical figures: in addition to the examples mentioned above, and the fairly common use of the Jezebel trope to slander a succession of female kings (including Mary I, Elizabeth, and Mary, Queen of Scots), typologies could be used to criticise a monarch.¹⁶⁸ A useful example of such criticism is Henry Parker's claim in 1650 that Henry VI lost his throne because 'he was no Solomon'.¹⁶⁹ These kinds of negative analogies were generally not, however, offered as part of an Elizabeth analogy. While a seventeenth-century English writer could have critiqued Elizabeth by comparing her to Jezebel, Ahab, or Abimelech, and then offered that analogy to

¹⁶⁷ Thomas Adams, *A Commentary or, Exposition upon the Divine Second Epistle Generall, written by the Blessed Apostle St. Peter* (London, 1633; STC 108), pp. 29–30. This example is analysed in Chapter 3.

¹⁶⁸ On the various uses of the Jezebel trope, see: Anne Mearns, 'Unnatural, Unlawful, Ungodly, and Monstrous: Manipulating the Queenly Identities of Mary I and Mary II', in *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I*, ed. by Sarah Duncan and Valerie Schutte (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 197–214; Paulina Kewes, 'Godly Queens: The Royal Iconographies of Mary and Elizabeth', in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, ed. by Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 47; and Janet Howe Gaines, *Music in the Old Bones: Jezebel through the Ages* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1999).

¹⁶⁹ Henry Parker, *The True Portraiture of the Kings of England, Drawn from their Titles, Successions, Raigns and Ends* (London, 1650; Wing P429), p. 34.

the current ruler as an example of what *not* to do, I have found no such examples.¹⁷⁰ Instead, it seems that English writers used Elizabeth analogies to show a positive example that a ruler should emulate, rather than offering an example of what should be avoided, with the negative typology sufficient rebuke.¹⁷¹ This distinction requires much further research in order to be fully understood, but the examples analysed in this thesis suggest that there was an implicit understanding in seventeenth-century England that exhorting a ruler to emulate England's Deborah was to be preferred over an exhortation to avoid the example of England's Jezebel (for instance).

Finally, the decision to end the thesis in 1659, and thus not to analyse the use of Elizabeth analogies at the Restoration and beyond, acknowledges the rich amount of material that is generally absent from discussions of Elizabeth analogies in the scholarship. The 1659 end-date also acknowledges that the Restoration seems to bring about a change in the way that Elizabeth is remembered—a shift that is itself worthy of much further analysis. As some of the examples assembled in the Conclusion suggest, Elizabeth's memory was invoked in much more metonymic and generalist ways at the Restoration. As John Watkins has observed, 'the Elizabethan prosperity that followed the chaos of the Marian years held out a model for future greatness, provided that Charles II would base his reign on sound Elizabethan precedents'.¹⁷² In 1660, writers seemed to be making a deliberate decision to return to Elizabethan England not only to help the new regime avoid the mistakes of the period 1603 to 1659, but also to prevent England ever descending into such turmoil again. This is not the case with Elizabeth analogies before the Restoration: while certainly using the 'history' of Elizabeth's reign to effect change in the present, there was no sense that the recent past needed to be forgotten. Elizabeth analogies of the Caroline period did not pretend that James did not reign, but those invoked at the Restoration contained what Watkins has described as a 'threatening countercontext', with the omissions of James and Charles implicitly critiquing them for not embodying Elizabethan monarchical ideals.¹⁷³ Before 1660, Elizabeth was

¹⁷⁰ This is not to say that such examples do not exist: if they do, they are most likely to be found in Catholic manuscript sources, or in tracts published outside England (and not in English). In terms of examples published in English, one I have found is the claim in 1630 by the Jesuit James Sharpe that the Elizabethan Reformation was done for political reasons: 'Jeroboam of old, and Queene Elizabeth of late, did relinquish the old, and introduce a new Religion, for reasons more politicke then divine'. Such an observation was not intended to counsel Charles I, however. [James Sharpe], *The Triall of the Protestant Private Spirit. Wherein Their Doctrine, making the sayd Spirit the sole ground and meanes of their Beliefe, is confuted* (Saint-Omer, 1630; STC 22370), p. 154.

¹⁷¹ To illustrate this distinction: a writer could depict Elizabeth as a Deborah in order to exhort Charles I to emulate the English Deborah's example. If this same writer wanted to criticise Charles for listening to wicked counsel, he could claim that Charles was an Ahab or a Jezebel—like his contemporaries, he did not need to invoke Elizabeth to criticise Charles for being a contemporary Jezebel.

¹⁷² Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England*, p. 108.

¹⁷³ Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England*, p. 109.

remembered as *an* example of good monarchical government; post-1660, Elizabeth was increasingly remembered as *the* example of good monarchical government—and this shift, while tacitly acknowledged in the scholarship, deserves much more analysis than can be given in this thesis.¹⁷⁴

Thesis Overview

In order to provide a study of the use of biblical analogy in early and mid seventeenth-century England, this thesis analyses the use of Elizabeth analogies diachronically between 1603 and 1659. Chapter 1 argues that because of their distant biological relationship, Elizabeth analogies were used to link James and Elizabeth to demonstrate the new King's legitimacy. These analogies, which drew on typological understandings of succession from the Old Testament, were intended to legitimise James's claim to the throne by emphasising the role of both hereditary right and providence in the succession. Writers paralleled Elizabeth with David, and James with Solomon, to understand and conceptualise the succession: Solomon was not David's eldest son, but God had chosen Solomon to succeed David, which was a useful parallel for the childless Elizabeth. As the examples analysed in this chapter demonstrate, however, such typological representations also allowed writers to critique Elizabeth's religious settlement, and to exhort the Solomonic James to 'finish' the temple that the Davidic Elizabeth had (only) started. This chapter also examines analogies that employed other biblical figures as a means of understanding the succession, arguing that such deliberate decisions to choose other typological figures suggest both a relief at the accession of a male monarch with three children, and a desire to counsel James to reign differently from Elizabeth.

Chapter 2 broadens out from the succession to consider the entirety of James's reign, and argues that Elizabeth analogies were regularly invoked to counsel and critique James, with events from Elizabeth's reign conflated with relevant examples from the Old Testament in order to advise James how various political or religious matters should be handled. This chapter also analyses the occasions where Elizabeth's memory was employed at specific moments of significant religio-political importance (such as the Bohemian Revolt in 1618), arguing that these examples were intended to counsel James to take a specific, Elizabeth-like action. As the preceding monarch, whose long reign was all that most people remembered,

¹⁷⁴ See: Erika Mae Olbricht, "Take from me first the softness of a Woman": Rewriting Elizabeth's Execution of Mary Stuart during the Seventeenth-Century Succession Crisis', in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. by Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison, WI: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007), pp. 222–224; and Patrick Collinson, 'The Elizabeth Exclusion Crisis and the Elizabethan Polity', in *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 61–66.

Elizabeth cast a long shadow over Stuart politics. Nevertheless, when James was seen to diverge from Elizabeth's 'style' of government (or how her style of government was sentimentally conceived), writers used Elizabeth analogies to criticise James, and the various typologies invoked demonstrate both the close association between Elizabeth and the figures of the Old Testament, and the potent mix of providential expectation and practical counsel the analogies evoked.

Chapter 3 argues that Elizabeth analogies were used throughout the Caroline period, showing that they were invoked against the backdrop of the Thirty Years' War to counsel Charles to heed the example of Elizabeth and defend England's Protestant Church from both internal attack and expansionist Catholics. Analogies were also employed to criticise Charles's Personal Rule, drawing on the close links between Elizabeth, Deborah, and parliamentary government. In particular, this chapter emphasises the centrality of Elizabeth analogies to the period's wider discussions concerning England's status as the new Israel. In the lead up to, and during, the Civil War, a variety of commentators used Elizabeth analogies to warn both King and Parliament that the apparent resurgence of popery would cause the English to lose their status as God's chosen people, and that the only way out of the current turmoil was to finish, or 'perfect', the Reformation that Elizabeth had begun.

The Regicide did not halt the use of Elizabeth analogies, and the Commonwealth, despite being a system of government created to replace a monarchy, saw both royalists and parliamentarians invoke Elizabeth's memory to offer potent didactic and polemical counsel. Chapter 4 argues that Elizabeth analogies were employed in the Commonwealth (and especially during the Protectorate) to counsel both Cromwells on how they should rule—especially in terms of their (poor) relationship with parliament—and to exhort the Lords Protector to rule in a way that was acceptable to God. This chapter argues that Deborah—who was a judge, not a monarch—was a key typological figure for writers during the Commonwealth period, and analogies that compared Deborah and Elizabeth sat comfortably alongside ones that depicted Oliver as a new Moses, and Richard as a new Joshua.

The thesis's Conclusion offers some preliminary considerations related to the use of Elizabeth analogies between 1660 and 1700, specifically at moments of intense religio-political turmoil (especially the Exclusion Crisis of 1679–1681), suggesting that there is both continuity and change in the use of Elizabeth analogies pre- and post-Restoration. In doing so, it posits areas of further research, and suggests that Elizabeth analogies are partially responsible for Elizabeth's paramount place in contemporary Anglophone culture.

Chapter 1

Elizabeth Analogies and the 1603 Succession

Elizabeth I of England died in the early hours of the morning of 24 March 1603. Childless, she was succeeded on the English throne by her first cousin twice removed, James VI of Scotland, who was publicly proclaimed king a few hours later. In premodern monarchies, the ‘ideal’ succession occurred when a monarch—who had died of old age—was succeeded by their eldest son, who had himself achieved his majority.¹ The 1603 succession was a clear deviation from this ideal: Elizabeth neither had any children, nor did she have any surviving, immediate family (such as a sibling or a nephew). As scholars are now aware, this deviation from the ‘ideal’ in March 1603 caused more anxiety than has previously been acknowledged. According to Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, because ‘people tended to jump on the bandwagon of the successful candidate, or at least to keep quiet about their misgivings’, the ‘outcome seem[ed] more inevitable than it actually was.’² The vast number of congratulatory verses and panegyrics produced in the immediate aftermath of the succession—which Doran and Kewes suggest ‘scholars have perhaps been taken in by’—made it seem that James’s claim to the English throne through hereditary right was universally accepted and unchallenged.³ Indeed, Doran claims that ‘it is a serious mistake to see James’s accession as smooth and underestimate the difficulties confronting the new regime’.⁴ As scholars are increasingly noting, James’s claim faced several, serious complications—to say nothing of the widespread anxiety over the unresolved nature of the succession in the final decade of Elizabeth’s reign. As Catharine MacLeod has observed, along with the succession came the need to ‘explain to the wider public’ the familial links between the Tudors and the Scottish Stuarts.⁵ This was a rather herculean task, given that James’s mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, had been executed by Elizabeth for treason, and had been publicly demonised in a variety of tracts.⁶ In the weeks

¹ On this subject, see the chapters in: *Unexpected Heirs in Early Modern Europe: Potential Kings and Queens*, ed. by Valerie Schutte (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).

² Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, ‘Introduction: A Historiographical Perspective’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), p. 4. For Catholic perspectives on the succession, see: Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *All Hail to the Archpriest: Confessional Conflict, Toleration, and the Politics of Publicity in Post-Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 228–275.

³ Doran and Kewes, ‘Introduction’, p. 12. See also: Susan Doran, ‘James VI and the English Succession’, in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. by Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 26, 42; and Christopher Ivic, *The Subject of Britain, 1603–25* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), pp. 11–22.

⁴ Susan Doran, ‘1603: A Jagged Succession’, *Historical Research*, 93.261 (2020), p. 465.

⁵ Catharine MacLeod, *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2012), p. 48.

⁶ See: James Emerson Phillips, *Images of a Queen: Mary Stuart in Sixteenth-Century Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964); Susan Doran, ‘Revenge her Foul and Most Unnatural Murder? The Impact of Mary

and months after Elizabeth's death, there was, therefore, a pressing need to both 'rehabilitate' the Stuart monarchy, and to clarify James's position in the line of succession.

Explaining James's position was made all the more difficult by two key legal problems. Henry VIII's will, which had been given the force of law by parliament, had elevated the claim of the descendants of his younger sister, Mary, over that of his elder sister Margaret (from whom James traced his descent). There was also debate as to whether James was an 'alien' in English law: according to a statute dating from 1351 (*De natis ultra mare*), those born outside of England—like James—could only inherit if their parents were abroad in the service of the crown. These issues had not been resolved by the time of Elizabeth's death—a situation that was entirely her own making.⁷ Since 1566, virtually all discussion of the succession had been forbidden, with Elizabeth claiming that she did not want to inflict the role of 'second person' onto her heir, remembering the 'peril' it caused her under Mary I.⁸ Whether or not this was a genuine motivation, or just a convenient excuse, remains unclear. James was certainly praised at his accession, which was depicted almost as a *fait accompli* across the succession literature, but many of the pamphlets analysed in this chapter allow for a much more ambivalent reading of his succession, with the ambiguous nature of James's claim offering an opportunity to

Stewart's Execution on Anglo-Scottish Relations', *History*, 85.280 (2000), pp. 589–612; John D. Staines, *The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots, 1560–1690: Rhetoric, Passions, and Political Literature* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009); and Richard A. McCabe, 'The Poetics of Succession, 1587–1605: The Stuart Claim', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 192–211.

⁷ Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', pp. 35–36; Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603–1714* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995), p. 58; and Mortimer Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question, 1558–1568* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966), pp. 122, 147–162. Several interesting readings of *De natis ultra mare* were offered in support of James's claim: some suggested that because Scotland was not 'beyond the seas', the act's proscriptions did not apply to James, while others suggested that the law only applied to property, and that the crown was not property. See: Thomas Craig, *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England* (1602; London, 1703), p. 259 ('The Words of that Statute, which forbids those born out of England to Succeed, extends only to them who are born beyond [the] Sea'); and John Harington, *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown (A.D. 1602)*, ed. by Clements R. Markham (London, 1880), p. 61 ('children borne out of English allegiance beyond the seas, whereby cannot be understood Scotland, for that it is a piece of the continent land within the seas').

⁸ On 5 November 1566, Elizabeth reacted furiously to a petition from both Houses that exhorted her to marry and exclude Mary, Queen of Scots, from the succession (*Collected Works*, pp. 93–100). She sent a 'gag order' to parliament on 9 November, forbidding them to discuss the succession. This encroachment on parliamentary privilege was debated fiercely, and Elizabeth relented on 24 November (*Collected Works*, pp. 101–103). Elizabeth explained her personal reasons for being wary of appointing her heir in the reply to the petition of 5 November 1566. While various copies of the reply Cecil gave to delegates from both Houses survives, this quote is representative: 'she knew many causes and some of hir own experience, having bene a second person to a sistar, the late Quene, how perillous it was for hir own person, but yet if she did not also see how perillous it was for hir subjectes at this tyme she wold not forbear for hir own perill to deale therin'. TNA SP 12/41, fol. 9v. As late as 1593, puritan MP Peter Wentworth was sent to the Tower for petitioning the Queen to name a successor—he remained imprisoned until his death 1597. See: Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, pp. 165–206; and Stephen Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558–1569* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 142–157, 182–222. On Wentworth, see: J.E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584–1601* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1957), pp. 251–266.

counsel a monarch whose succession was based, at least in part, on the assent of the English people.

This chapter analyses how, in this fraught and uncertain time, a range of commentators used biblical analogies to conceptualise the succession, to argue that James was Elizabeth's legitimate successor, and to offer counsel on the directions the new regime should take. It suggests that the texts that use Elizabeth analogies to conceptualise the succession are an important, yet largely disregarded, part of the unprecedented proliferation of succession tracts that Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae argue characterise all of the Stuart successions, but particularly James's.⁹ Biblical analogies were a uniquely effective and fertile resource for legitimising the Stuart succession. Scholars have largely overlooked this resource, but the examples analysed in this chapter show that in the immediate aftermath of the new King's accession, biblical analogies enabled commentators to explain the succession and to make an array of arguments in support of James's legitimacy and, at the same time, to offer pointed counsel to the new King. Crucially, biblical analogies allowed commentators to show an awareness of the uncertainty surrounding James's claim, even as they swept away such concerns by asserting that the succession was the will of God.

The pamphlets analysed in this chapter, which explicitly link Elizabeth and James, should also be understood as being part of the 'programme' identified by MacLeod and Doran and Kewes that was intended to legitimise the Jacobean regime. This 'programme' was not a formal, educative campaign managed by the new regime: the official stance, as contained within the accession proclamation, was that James had succeeded to the throne through hereditary right, according to the normal customs of English monarchical succession.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the uncertainty over the succession in the 1590s and 1600s—which Alexandra Gajda has described as causing an 'intense paranoia' in various echelons of the regime—was not immediately forgotten.¹¹ The succession may have gone smoothly—thanks largely to the

⁹ Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae, 'Introduction', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 1–13. See also: Andrew McRae and John West, 'General Introduction', in *Literature of the Stuart Successions: An Anthology*, ed. by Andrew McRae and John West (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), pp. 1–25; and Andrew McRae and John West, '1603: Introduction', in *Literature of the Stuart Successions: An Anthology*, ed. by Andrew McRae and John West (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), pp. 29–31.

¹⁰ The importance of James's accession proclamation in perpetuating the new regime's legitimacy is made clear by the sheer number of pamphlets that make explicit references to its content. See, for instance: Anthony Nixon, *Elizae's Memoriall, King James His Arrivall, and Romes Downefall* (London, 1603; STC 18586); *A New song to the great comfort and rejoycing of all true English harts, at our most gracious King James his proclamation upon the 24 of March last past in the Cittie of London* ([n.p], 1603; STC 14426.7); and Robert Fletcher, *A Brieve and Familiar Epistle, shewing his Majesties Most Lanfull, Honourable and Just Title to All His Kingdoms* (London, 1603; STC 11086) (see below). See also: Nenner, *The Right to be King*, pp. 61–62.

¹¹ Alexandra Gajda, *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 25.

work of Sir Robert Cecil—but there still seems to have been a need to explain how exactly James was Elizabeth’s legitimate successor.¹² Between March 1603 and James’s coronation procession in March 1604, a variety of writers, commentators, and pamphleteers not only sought to legitimise James’s accession—irrespective of any purported legal obstacles or supposed deficiencies in his hereditary claim—but also to elide any and all memory of the uncertainty about the succession in the years and months before Elizabeth’s death.

Most commentators who offered analogical understandings of the 1603 succession turned to the succession of Solomon after David’s death, recognising that it provided a useful parallel for the current circumstances. Writers thus described the Solomonic James succeeding the Davidic Elizabeth to demonstrate the role of providence in James’s accession, to counter any claims that James was not Elizabeth’s legitimate heir, and to suggest a religio-political continuity between the two monarchs. The typological thrust of these analogies was simple: Solomon was not David’s eldest child, but he was appointed by David (at God’s behest) to succeed to the throne.¹³ This was neither a new nor a unique strategy: Henry VIII was hailed as both a David and a Solomon, and Edward VI’s associations with both biblical kings also linked him to his father.¹⁴ Such a trope, as I have previously discussed, was also used outside of England, with Counter-Reformation polemicists linking the Davidic Charles V and the Solomonic Philip II.¹⁵ The succession, however, was also conceptualised in other ways, and this chapter also engages with commentators who depicted Elizabeth as a Deborah, succeeded by a Gideon or a David. In using these different analogies, commentators sought to emphasise the role of providence in the succession, and to offer more overt criticism of Elizabeth’s reign in order to exhort James to behave differently. This range of examples shows not only the didactic power of analogies in legitimising James’s accession, but also the way that biblical typologies remained a potent tool for making sense of the events of the present.

That there was concern over whom Elizabeth’s successor would (or should) be is visible in the many stories that sprang up after the Queen’s death in which her councillors were said to have tried various methods to force her to name her successor in her final days. For instance, according to an account attributed to one of Cecil’s secretaries, she ‘nominated’ James on 23 March—the day before her death—by telling the assembled privy councillors

¹² On Cecil’s role in effectively stage-managing the succession, see: Alexander Courtney, ‘The Scottish King and the English Court: The Secret Correspondence of James VI, 1601–3’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 134–151.

¹³ 1 Kings 1:30.

¹⁴ John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 93; and Aidan Norrie, ‘“Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise, and Chaste” – Queen Elizabeth I’s Biblical Analogies After Her Death’, *Royal Studies Journal*, 2.2 (2015), p. 26.

¹⁵ See: Introduction, pp. 16–17.

(including Cecil and the Earl of Nottingham), ‘my seat had been the seat of kings, and I will have no rascall to succeed mee: and who should succeed mee but a king?’¹⁶ Likewise, the Venetian ambassador in France reported to the Doge and Senate that when asked who should succeed her, Elizabeth made a sign signifying a crown; she was asked if she meant either the King of France or the King of Spain, but she shook her head to both, only agreeing when they asked if she meant the King of Scots.¹⁷ While the concept of hereditary right held that a monarch’s choice of successor was moot if they were not their closest relative, the successor to a childless (and family-free) monarch made the succession less clear. Cecil had been secretly communicating with James to ensure a smooth transition, and Elizabeth had herself made clear during the negotiations for the Treaty of Berwick (1586) that she would not do anything to prevent James from succeeding, but her councillors were unsure that his hereditary claim alone was strong enough to enable him to succeed.¹⁸ This anxiety is evident in the proclamation issued announcing James’s accession, which went to great lengths to lay out James’s hereditary claim, asserting that ‘the Imperiall Crowne of these Realmes aforesaid are now absolutely, wholly, and solely come to the High and Mightie Prince, James the sixt King of Scotland ... who it is that by Law, by Lineall succession, and undoubted Right is now become the onely Sovereigne Lord and King of these Imperiall Crownes’.¹⁹ Indeed, it was not uncommon for James to contend with claims both before and after his accession that because Elizabeth was childless, she had chosen him as her successor and that her councillors ‘elected’ him king—rather than the new King inheriting by hereditary right. As Rei Kanemura has argued, from the late 1590s, James was fixated on proving ‘his status as a hereditary prince rather than an elected one’.²⁰ Such a fixation took on a new urgency in the aftermath of the publication of *A Conference about the Next Succession for the Crown of England* (1595), a succession

¹⁶ BL Cotton MS Titus C VII, fol. 57v. Catherine Loomis analyses the various accounts of Elizabeth’s death, and the various discussions over the succession, in: Catherine Loomis, ‘Elizabeth Southwell’s Manuscript Account of the Death of Queen Elizabeth [with text]’, *English Literary Renaissance*, 26.3 (1996), pp. 482–509.

¹⁷ *Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 10, 1603–1607*, ed. by Horatio F. Brown (London: HMSO, 1900), pp. 509–510 (no. 739). This is a more detailed account of the succession he originally sent to the Doge and Senate on 20 April 1603. See: *CSP Venice Vol. 10*, p. 7 (no. 16).

¹⁸ In a letter to James dated 2 June 1586, Elizabeth discussed the succession in generalist terms in order to hide her meaning: ‘whereof by this owre writing wee would have you to make an assured accompt, as longe as your present kindnes shall also appeare to continue towards us. And furthermore wee ad hereunto an other firme promise in the word of a Quene, that as wee never did willingly suffer anie Act to be attempted publiquelie or privatlie to dammegie or derogate your Honor: so will wee never directlie or indirectlie do or suffer to be done anie thinge that wee may sett or withstand, to the diminution emparing or derogation of anie greatnes, right or title that maie be due to youe in anie sort, or in anie time present or future, unles by anie manifest ingratitude (which we hope shall never proceede from you) wee should be justlie moved and provoked to the contrarie’. TNA SP 52/40, fol. 2v.

¹⁹ TNA SP 14/187, fol. 6r (STC 8295). The accession proclaims of both Elizabeth and Charles I do not contain such forceful statements of hereditary right.

²⁰ Rei Kanemura, ‘Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election?: The Contested Title of James VI and I’, *Journal of British Studies*, 52.2 (2013), p. 321.

treatise written by Jesuit exile Robert Parsons that argued against James's claim and instead proposed the Spanish Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia as the legitimate heir.²¹ While a variety of succession tracts had been published throughout Elizabeth's reign, the publication of *A Conference* proved to be the first real challenge to James's so far largely uncontested road to the English throne.²² The challenge posed by *A Conference* remained unresolved at his accession, despite the publication of several treatises in support of his claim.²³

²¹ Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia, Sovereign of the Netherlands—or 'the Infanta' as she was generally called—was ostensibly the Catholic candidate for the throne at Elizabeth's death. She was the eldest daughter of Philip II of Spain and his third wife Elisabeth of Valois, and her claim came from her descent from Catherine, the daughter of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster (Edward III's third son to live to adulthood) and his second wife, Constance of Castile. Catherine married Henry III of Castile; the couple's granddaughter was Isabella I (one of the Catholic Monarchs), who in turn was the great-grandmother of the Infanta. It was thus claimed that the Infanta was the senior claimant of the Lancastrian line, rather than the 'usurping' Tudor line. Her claim, which had largely been overlooked, was made famous by Parsons's *A Conference*. (Parsons, however, does not explain why the Infanta should be heir over her father, Philip II, or indeed her brother—the future Philip III. In suggesting the Infanta, it is possible that Parsons was acknowledging that the union of the English and Spanish crowns that would come about by the succession of either Philip would face considerable resistance, both in England, and in France). As the 'nominated' Catholic successor, fears that foreign Catholics would invade England after Elizabeth's death to install the Infanta were not uncommon; indeed, at his trial after his failed rebellion, Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, claimed that he had acted, in part, because Cecil had apparently told 'one of his fellow-counsellors' that 'none in the world but the infanta of Spain had right to the crown of England'. Nevertheless, because James had suggested that he would allow Catholic toleration in England, continental powers were less eager to intervene in the succession, with Philip III showing limited appetite to invade England in support of his sister. The Infanta herself never showed any interest in pursuing her claim, and after James's accession, no serious attempts were made to install her on the throne. *A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Year 1783, Volume 1*, ed. by T.B. Howell (London, 1816), col. 1351. Essex's outburst, which was a complete fabrication, was part of the Earl's self-fashioning (both before and during his trial) as the defender of England's Protestantism. Janet Dickinson, *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex, 1589–1601* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012), p. 83. See also: Alexandra Gajda, 'Essex and the "Popish Plot"', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 115–133. Parsons's treatise has been extensively analysed in: Susan Doran, 'Three Late-Elizabethan Succession Tracts', in *Struggles for the Succession in Late Elizabethan England: Politics, Polemics and Cultural Representations*, ed. by Jean-Christophe Meyer (Montpellier: Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, 2004), pp. 91–117; Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', pp. 25–42; M.J.M. Innes, 'Robert Persons, Popular Sovereignty, and the Late Elizabethan Succession Debate', *The Historical Journal*, 62.1 (2019), pp. 57–76; Victor Houlston, *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Persons's Jesuit Polemic, 1580–1610* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 71–92; and Paulina Kewes, "'The Idol of State Innovators and Republicans': Robert Persons's *A Conference about the Next Succession* (1594/5) in Stuart England", in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 149–185.

²² As Doran has argued, 'Until 1595, James had every reason to feel confident that his title to the English throne was reasonably secure. ... From 1595 onwards, however, James ceased to be so relaxed about the English succession.' Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', pp. 27, 29. Other than the Infanta, the two key 'rivals' to James for the throne throughout the 1590s and 1600s were Lady Arbella Stuart and Edward Seymour, Lord Beauchamp. Like James, Arbella was the grandchild of Margaret, Countess of Lennox, daughter of Margaret Tudor—meaning that both James and Arbella were the great-great-grandchildren of Henry VII. Arbella was the daughter of Charles, Earl of Lennox, who was the younger brother of Henry, Lord Darnley (James VI's father). Arbella's claim was thus junior to James's, but she had the distinct advantage of being born in England—meaning she was not affected by the proscriptions of *De natis ultra mare*. Arbella was ten years younger than James, and it is perhaps unsurprising that in the 1590s the Cecils were more interested in supporting the claim of a married man who could defend England from foreign invasion. She was, however, the subject of several post-1603 plots to oust James by Catholics who believed that even if she did not convert to Catholicism she would enact toleration (especially if she were forced to marry a Catholic nobleman). TNA SP 14/2, fol. 64r; BL Harley MS 39, fol. 275v; Sara Jayne Steen, 'Introduction', in *The Letters of Lady Arbella Stuart*, ed. by Sara Jayne Steen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 45–46. See also: Sarah Gristwood, *Arbella: England's Lost Queen* (London: Bantam Books, 2003), pp. 267–269. Beauchamp represented the Suffolk claim through Henry VIII's

The Davidic Elizabeth and the Solomonic James

The links between the Davidic Elizabeth and the Solomonic James were made almost immediately after Elizabeth's death. The earliest, dateable example I have located is a sermon preached at St Paul's Cross by John Hayward on 27 March 1603—three days after the Queen's death—which was then entered into the Stationers' Register on 2 April. The sermon, called *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed*, sought not only to reinforce James's legitimacy to the English throne, but also allowed Hayward to argue against Catholic toleration.²⁴ Almost nothing is known of Hayward: he became rector of St Mary Woolchurch in London in 1594, a position he held until his death in 1618.²⁵ Hayward only published three pamphlets (two of which were sermons), and most of what is known about him comes from the statement written by his nephew, Henry Lanman, for admission to the English College at Rome in 1600, which describes Hayward as 'a bitter heretic Minister'.²⁶

Unsurprisingly, given the context of the sermon's preaching, the latter portion of *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed* discussed the succession, and focused on what Hayward saw as

sister, Mary—Queen of France as wife of Louis XII, and then Duchess of Suffolk. This was the line that Henry's will privileged over the Stuart line. Beauchamp's mother was Katherine Grey (younger sister of Jane Grey), whose own mother, Frances, was Mary's daughter. Apart from Mary, Queen of Scots, the Greys had been the most prominent heirs during the first decade of Elizabeth's reign, but their clandestine and unsanctioned marriages enraged the Queen, who kept both Katherine and her younger sister Mary under arrest for most of their married lives. By the late 1590s, Beauchamp (and his younger brother Thomas) were the only living descendant of the Greys, meaning that according to the terms of Henry VIII's will, Beauchamp was technically Elizabeth's heir. Beauchamp never enjoyed any real support for his claim, partially because he had previously been declared illegitimate (although in the 1590s Burghley had looked into Beauchamp's claim), and unlike both Arbella and the Infanta, he was never the 'choice' candidate of any faction. Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Her Circle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 43–64; BL Cotton Titus C VII, fol. 11v; CP MS 201/145; CP MS 201/143; CP MS 33/28.

²³ The English were clearly aware of the various, potential outcomes concerning the succession: indictments for sedition in the Courts of Assize in the days and weeks after Elizabeth's death show that James and his supporters really did need to prove the new King's (legitimate) claim to the throne. For instance, Robert Vincrest, a blacksmith from Brenchley, Kent, was indicted for saying, on 31 March 1603, 'That ther would com out of Spaine a Queene [the Spanish Infanta], which queene would come with a great troupe of men to be queene of England, and that the kinge should not live to be crowned or that the Infanta should com to putt him from his Crowne', showing an awareness of the Infanta's claim that suggests familiarity with Parsons's *A Conference*. At the same time, there was also frustration that Elizabeth had not produced an heir (mainly because her lack of a child did not allow for an 'ideal' succession), but interestingly, this frustration was directed at her counsellors. Richard Hartropp, a labourer from Maidstone, Kent, was indicted for saying on 18 June 1603: 'What Roagues are theis of the late Queenes Counsell that would not suffer her to marry while she was younge that by hir we might have had an heire to have bynn our kynge, whereas now we must have a strange kinge com out of an other land with a company of Spaniells following him; he thinketh to be kinge but he wilbe in daunger to be killed before Michaelmas daie next'. *Calendar of Assize Records: Kent Indictments, James I*, ed. by J.S. Cockburn (London: HMSO, 1980), pp. 7, 3. See also: Judith M. Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI: "National" Identity, Gender and the Personal Monarchy of England', *English Historical Review*, 117.472 (2002), pp. 513–535.

²⁴ This is not the same John Hayward who, only fourteen days after Elizabeth's death, had *An Answer to the First Part of a Certain Conference Concerning Succession* (1603) entered into the Stationers' Register. This pamphlet argued for the superior claim of the Stuarts as opposed to the Spanish claim. See: John J. Manning, 'Hayward, Sir John (1564?–1627)', ODNB.

²⁵ *The Transcript of Registers of the United Parishes of St Mary Woolnoth and St Mary Woolchurch Haw in the City of London, from their Commencement 1538 to 1760*, ed. by J.M.S. Brooke and A.W.C. Hallen (London, 1886), pp. 297, 388.

²⁶ *The Responsa Scholarum of the English College, Rome. Part One: 1598–1621*, ed. by Anthony Kenny (Bromley: Catholic Record Society, 1962), p. 86. Original Latin: 'quippe qui et mordicus hæreticus, et Minister'.

providence's direct intervention. After praising Elizabeth as 'a most gracious Queene' who, 'raigning by God and raigning for God', had 'happilye swayed the scepter of this mighty kingdome', Hayward used David and Solomon analogies to explain the succession:

As Salomon succeeding David (unto which two in Israel I compare these two in England for wisdom, piety, and love to Gods house) we have and shall have (ah word of comfort that we may say, as was hartely wished by most that feare God, that we have and shall have) the heigh and mighty king, James by the grace of God ... to raigne over us.

Hayward then made clear that he believed James would continue Elizabeth's policies, both religious and political:

When Salomon was annoynted king in Israel the servants of David, came in unto him and said God make the name of Salomon more famous then thy name, and exalt his throne above thy throne. And James being proclaimed [sic] king in England, so we say of him, if it be possible, God make his name more famous then the name of Elizabeth ... and exalt his throne above her throne, (whose throne was highly and honourably exalted, when she sat therein a true defender of the faith).²⁷

Hayward was careful to depict both monarchs as wise, pious, and God-loving, but the analogies are used for a clear typological purpose. Like others writing in the aftermath of Elizabeth's death, Hayward does not explain the biological link between David and Solomon; instead, he emphasises that like Solomon, James succeeded Elizabeth 'by the grace of God'. He further cemented the link by emphasising the 'smoothness' of the transition between the two monarchs: just as David's nobles pledged their allegiance to Solomon, so had Elizabeth's counsellors (and indeed subjects) accepted their new king.²⁸

Hayward was certainly using the Davidic Elizabeth/Solomonic James typology to conceptualise the succession, but the description of Elizabeth as 'a true defender of the faith' emphasises the counsel contained within the sermon. The qualifier that Elizabeth had reigned as a 'true defender of the faith' may have been a subtle glance at the rumoured Catholicism of James's wife, Anna of Denmark.²⁹ It might also have alluded to James's lenient treatment of Catholics in Scotland. The new King believed that the most significant opponents to his claim

²⁷ John Hayward, *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed. A sermon preached at Paules Crosse, the 27 of March 1603, being the next Sunday after her Majesties departure* (London, 1603; STC 12984), sigs. C7v–C8r.

²⁸ Fears over unrest at the Queen's death were not unfounded paranoia. Indeed, in a proclamation issued in October 1603, James wrote: 'As we have ever from our infancie had manifold proofes of Gods great goodnes towards us in his protecting of us from many dangers of our Person, very neerely threatning us, and none more notorious then his happy conducting of us in the late case of our succession to this Crowne, which contrary to most mens expectation wee have received with more quiet and concurrencie of good will of our people (otherwise perhaps of different dispositions) then ever in like accident hath bene seene.' 'A Proclamation Concerning Such As Seditiously Seeke Reformation in Church Matters', in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603–1625*, ed. by James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 62.

²⁹ On Anna's Catholicism, see: Jemma Field, 'Anna of Denmark and the Politics of Religious Identity in Jacobean Scotland and England, c.1592–1619', *Northern Studies*, 50 (2019), pp. 87–113.

to the English throne would be Catholic monarchs on the continent, so he purposely adopted a lenient policy towards Catholics in Scotland to prevent a Catholic invasion of England to seize the throne at Elizabeth's death.³⁰ This policy of leniency had alarmed many in England, both in Elizabeth's privy council and in the populace more widely. Given James's previous leniency, Catholics greeted James's accession with cautious optimism.³¹

Hayward, who worried 'that the Gospell should bee buried' by the time of Elizabeth's funeral, almost certainly opposed such religious toleration.³² To prevent the 'Antichrist' taking hold in England again, Hayward appealed both to James's vanity, and his desire to have European-wide political influence. In praying that God would make James's 'name more famous then the name of Elizabeth, whose name was famous to the endes of the world', Hayward implied that this fame would be the result of his defence of Protestantism. The sermon suggests that there was concern that the succession might re-open the issue of the Elizabethan religious settlement, but by depicting James's reign as a continuance of Elizabeth's, Hayward sought to prevent such a re-opening.

In seeking to present James's reign as a continuation of Elizabeth's, Hayward also sought to demonstrate the legitimacy of the new regime. That he was emphasising the validity of James's hereditary right is made explicit at the end of the pamphlet, when he declared that the King 'is the next and rightfull heire of Henrie the seventh of famous memorie, of the house of Lancaster, and of Elizabeth his wife ayre of the house of Yorke.'³³ This claim clearly echoes James's proclamation. Despite claiming that he 'speake[s] not these things in flatterye', it seems obvious that in publishing this sermon with this clear pronouncement of James's hereditary right, Hayward was not only jumping on the bandwagon in support of the new regime, but he was also seeking to erase the uncertainty of the succession over the last decade.

³⁰ James Ellison, 'Measure for Measure and the Executions of Catholics in 1604', *English Literary Renaissance*, 33.1 (2003), pp. 46–50; Maurice Lee, Jr., *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), p. 66. See also: Ruth Grant, 'The Brig o' Dee Affair, the Sixth Earl of Huntly and the Politics of the Counter-Reformation', in *The Reign of James VI*, ed. by Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2000), pp. 93–109; and Cynthia Fry, 'Diplomacy and Deception: King James VI of Scotland's Foreign Relations with Europe (c.1584–1603)' (PhD thesis, University of St Andrews, 2014).

³¹ For instance, in a widely circulated manuscript pamphlet that took the form of a letter from English Catholics to James 'at his first enterance into England', they asked 'for approbation and toleration of their religion', noting that they requested 'noe more favor at your graces hands then that wee may securely beleieve and professe that Catholike religion which your happy predecessors professed'. The letter also sought to distance James's religious policies from those of Elizabeth, suggesting 'how gratefull will it bee to all princes abroad and honorable to your Majestie to understand how Queene Elizabeths severity is changed into your royall Clemency'. BL Add MS 44848, fols. 111v, 113r. See also: John Watkins, "'Out of her Ashes May a Second Phoenix Rise": James I and the Legacy of Elizabethan Anti-Catholicism', in *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts*, ed. by Arthur F. Marotti (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999), pp. 116–136.

³² Hayward, *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed*, sig. D1v.

³³ Hayward, *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed*, sig. D7r.

In addition to this discussion of James's legitimacy, the sermon offered a clear warning against undermining the Protestantism that God had so clearly favoured. Hayward emphasised the 'worke of the Lord' in 'taking from one, and giving unto another, the throne and scepter of this noble kingdome', but warned against complacency: 'the change being better for us then we durst expect, we should be worthy of much blame, if we doe not carry our selves, in an even reverence'.³⁴ The peaceful transition to James was thus God's doing, but it was not without expectation. For Hayward, God's providential favour was not necessarily permanent: while God had replaced Elizabeth with a worthy monarch, the English would only have themselves to blame if they did not 'reverence' their new King, with James, in turn, warned against winding back the Elizabethan settlement.

Hayward's sermon sought to demonstrate that James was Elizabeth's legitimate successor, and to urge the new King to defend England's Protestantism by standing firm against calls to tolerate Catholics. Doing so, Hayward suggests, would ensure that he was worthy of the title 'a true defender of the faith'. The Davidic Elizabeth and the Solomonic James are both praised for their 'wisdom, piety, and love to Gods house', but the typologies also hint that Hayward hoped James would enact some kind of further, godly reformation, and complete what Elizabeth had left unfinished at her death.

Hayward's themes were echoed in an anonymous broadside from 1603 called *Weepe with Joy*. The broadside presented the succession of James as a parallel to Solomon's succession:

But when David died and Salomon was installed, there was a continuance of joy, because he continued true religion as his fathers did before. And so, though God hath taken away Queene Elizabeth our late and loving Nurce-mother, yet the succeeding of that mightie and godly Prince, King James, our new and renowned Nurce-father, doeth give us exceeding cause of joy.³⁵

The Davidic Elizabeth had thus been succeeded by the Solomonic James, which was the will of God, and it had ensured the peacefulness of the realm. The recourse to the succession's 'continuance of joy' emphasised James's Protestantism, which had ensured that England 'continued [in] true religion', rather than being subjected to popery. The description of Elizabeth and James as the 'nurses' of the English people also linked the two monarchs, in addition to inserting the workings of providence into the succession. According to a prophecy of Isaiah, 'kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers'.³⁶ Elizabeth

³⁴ Hayward, *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed*, sigs. C8r–C8v.

³⁵ *Weepe with Joy: A Lamentation, for the losse of our late Sovereigne Lady Queene Elizabeth, with joy and exultation for our High and Mightie Prince, King James, her lineall and lawfull Successor* (London, 1603; STC 7605.3), p. 1.

³⁶ Isaiah 49:23. The term, when applied to male monarchs, generally focused on protection, rather than anything biological. For instance, in 1644, Samuel Rutherford wrote that Henry VIII defended England from the pope 'by

had been fashioned as, and indeed had fashioned herself as, a nurse to the English people, and the author was evidently using this trope to suggest that James would continue to look after the English people, just as Elizabeth had.³⁷

Nevertheless, the description of Solomon being ‘installed’ as David’s successor does suggest that the author believed that there was some kind of problem with James’s hereditary claim: while James is described as ‘succeeding’, the recourse to Solomon being installed hints at some kind of election. This is hinted at through the term’s more common use in an ecclesiastical setting: bishops are ‘installed’ in their cathedra after having been elected, ostensibly through the workings of the Holy Spirit.³⁸ Monarchs are generally not described as being ‘installed’. This might suggest that while the author accepted that James was Elizabeth’s legitimate successor, they recognised there was some wider uncertainty about James’s claim—after all, ‘succeed’ does not necessarily mean to take on a role through hereditary succession.³⁹ In using the typology of the Solomonic James succeeding the Davidic Elizabeth to conceptualise the succession, however, the author sought to sweep away any concerns about James’s claim by asserting that his succession was the will of God.

Robert Fletcher’s *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle, shewing his Majesties Most Lawfull, Honourable and Just Title to All His Kingdoms* further illuminates these themes. A poet about whom little is known, Fletcher described himself in the pamphlet as a ‘Yeoman Purveyor of Cariages for remooves’ to Elizabeth.⁴⁰ His pamphlet is short, suggesting that it was written and published quickly to make the most of the public interest in the succession. After a brief epistle reiterating James’s legitimate right to the English throne, and two short epitaphs (or lamentations) on Elizabeth’s death, the pamphlet concluded with a prayer for the new King and Queen and their children. The prayer began with an Elizabeth analogy:

his Sword, as he is a Nurse-father’. Samuel Rutherford, *Lex, Rex: The Law and the Prince. A Dispute for the just Prerogative of King and People* (London, 1644; Wing R2386), p. 430. See also: Jeffrey Stackert, *A Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 94–95.

³⁷ Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*, 2nd edn (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2013), p. 195n. 52. For instance, in a ‘Prayer for the Whole Kingdom and the Body of the Church According to their Estates and Members’ (1569), Elizabeth prayed that God would ‘give me the grace to be a true nourisher and nurse of Thy people’. Likewise, Thomas Norton described Elizabeth as ‘the most loving mother and nurse [sic] of all her good subjectes’, and Anthony Marten’s depicted the Queen as being ‘sent from above, to nurse and protect the true Christian Common weale’. *Collected Works*, p. 149; Thomas Norton, *To the Quenes Majesties poore deceyved Subjectes of the North Countrey, drawen into rebellion by the Earles of Northumberland and Westmerland* (London, 1569; STC 18679.5), sig. B4v; Anthony Marten, *An Exhortation, to Stirre up the mindes of all her Majesties faithfull Subjects, to defend their countrey in this dangerous time, from the invasion of Enemies* (London, 1588; STC 17489), sig. C3r.

³⁸ OED, s.v. ‘install, v. 1a’. On the election and installation of post-1558 Church of England bishops, see: Brett Usher, ‘New Wine into Old Bottles: The Doctrine and Structure of the Elizabethan Church’, in *The Elizabethan World*, ed. by Susan Doran and Norman Jones (New York: Routledge, 2011), pp. 213–214.

³⁹ OED, s.v. ‘succeed, v. 1a’.

⁴⁰ Nick de Somogyi, ‘Fletcher, Robert (fl. 1581–1606)’, ODNB.

Thou didst first in great mercie send unto this realme a Deborah to defend us from Sissera: a most blessed woman to redeeme us from Roome [sic] and Romish religion, and the tyranny thereof formerly inflicted upon this Church of England, and the true professors of thy most glorious Gospell.⁴¹

Deborah here is virtually a metonym for Elizabeth, with Elizabeth a Deborah not only for returning England to Protestantism after the reign of Mary I, but also for defeating the Catholic Sisera—that is, Philip II.⁴² Fletcher also emphasised the role of providence in both Elizabeth's accession (especially after the reign of Mary I) and her continued fight against Catholics—an intervention reminiscent of the way Deborah was sent to the Hebrews in their time of trouble.

Deborah was not the only biblical typology Fletcher thought applied to Elizabeth. He conceptualised the succession through the typology of the Solomonic James succeeding the Davidic Elizabeth:

[We humbly beseech you] to inspire the hart of our King to looke into the ruines of the Church and common-weale of that as her late Majestie like David had conceived to build the Temple, &c. So his Majesty like Solomon, may fully finish and effect the same.⁴³

Given that Fletcher had made clear earlier in the pamphlet that James was Elizabeth's legitimate successor according to the principles of hereditary right (James is 'the very heire to the imperiall Crowne of this land' and the 'true undoubted King'), these analogies go beyond simply describing the succession.⁴⁴ According to Fletcher, Elizabeth had started the work of re-establishing Protestantism in England, and restoring good governance to both Church and State, but these tasks remained unfinished at her death—hence the innocuous '&c' that elides both the difficult parts of David's story (such as his fall into idolatry), and deliberately leaves the critique of Elizabeth vague in order to emphasise the continuity between the two monarchs. In his epistle, Fletcher claimed that Elizabeth 'planted religion' and 'suppressed, though not cleane supplanted superstition and idolatry'.⁴⁵ It was therefore up to James to complete these tasks. The analogy thus offered a critique of Elizabeth's 'unfinished' religious settlement, and claimed that popery was yet to be fully rooted out in England—which is perhaps why Fletcher used *both* the Deborah and David typologies to describe Elizabeth. The Hebrews had fallen into idolatry after Deborah's death, and the work on the Temple was

⁴¹ Robert Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle, shewing his Majesties Most Lawfull, Honourable and Just Title to All His Kingdoms* (London, 1603; STC 11086), sig. B3v.

⁴² Sisera was the commander of the army of King Jabin, meaning that Philip II was a Sisera for carrying out the battle on behalf of the Pope/Jabin.

⁴³ Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle*, sigs. B3r–B3v.

⁴⁴ Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle*, sig. A4r.

⁴⁵ Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle*, sig. A3v.

unfinished at David's death: in using both these analogies to describe Elizabeth's reign, Fletcher not only expressed his desire that James would clean supplant 'superstition and idolatry' as England's Solomon, but also warned against allowing 'the tyranny ... formerly inflicted upon' the Church to again take root.

Not all the David and Solomon analogies used the typology to claim that Elizabeth's reign had been in some way deficient, and that James would 'complete' whatever the writer believed was unfinished at Elizabeth's death. The use of these analogies allowed writers to smooth over any potential difficulties with James's claim, and to insert the workings of providence into the succession. Examples of this kind of analogy can be found in *Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimae et beatissimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliae, Francia, & Hiberniae Reginae* (*The Funeral Rites of the University of Oxford in Most Honoured Memory of the Most Serene and Blessed Elizabeth, Lately Queen of England, France and Ireland*), a collection of elegiac verses composed by scholars at the University of Oxford.⁴⁶ The pamphlet contained more than two hundred verses composed in honour of Elizabeth—most in Latin, with some written in (or including sections in) Greek, Hebrew, French, and Italian.

Many of the verses included Elizabeth analogies; some of these were more commemorative in purpose, and others were more openly didactic.⁴⁷ John Yonge's 'A Comparison of Elizabeth with David' used the analogy to argue that the last Tudor monarch had been succeeded by the Solomonic James. Yonge died in c.1607, aged about 30, and very little is known about him, but his elegy was clearly an attempt to present James as Elizabeth's legitimate successor, irrespective of James's claim through hereditary right:

Hear why I am comparing Eliza with David:
Both the woman and the man were as equal as they could be.
Saul desired to take David's life,
When he was not yet the king of his people.
And a crowd of Sauls, when you did not yet hold the sceptre,
Desired, Eliza, to take away your life.
But God placed David on the throne of the kingdom,
And God entrusted the royal sceptre to you.
When David had acquired the throne, his greatest concern
Was to worship God with pure religion.
When Eliza was placed on the throne, she had no greater love
Than that of the true religion of Christ.
... And finally, Solomon succeeded as heir to David:
And Eliza left Solomon on the throne of England.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ *Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimae et beatissimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliae, Francia, & Hiberniae Reginae* (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018). The pamphlet served as a companion to a collection of verses written to celebrate the accession of the new King: *Academia Oxoniensis pietas erga serenissimum et potentissimum Iacobum Angliae Scotiae Francia & Hiberniae* (Oxford, 1603; STC 19019).

⁴⁷ See Appendix 2 for details of the other Elizabeth analogies.

⁴⁸ John Yonge, 'A Comparison of Elizabeth with David', trans. by Martin Brooke and Dana Sutton, in *John*

Yonge made clear that Elizabeth and David are equal or equivalent (*æquiparemus*), because both monarchs' lives were in danger during the reigns of their predecessors, but God preserved them and allowed them to ascend to the throne. Both monarchs also reformed their respective religions, with David enforcing pure (*pura*) worship of God, and Elizabeth instilling the love of Christ and true religion (*Quàm veræ Christi religionis amor*) in England. In conflating Elizabeth with David, Yonge not only demonstrated the providential favour both monarchs had received, but also explained the succession. Yonge does not question James's legitimacy—the new king is the 'Solomon on the throne of England', but he also does not assert James's *hereditary* claim to the throne. Elizabeth is described as 'liquit'—leaving or quitting—the throne to James. Yonge seems therefore to suggest that James was Elizabeth's nominated or elected successor, rather than her successor through hereditary right—or at the very least that he was aware of the implications of such an argument. Nevertheless, the use of these analogies to conceptualise the succession demonstrates that James was Elizabeth's legitimate successor, and that the Solomonic James deserved the same obedience the English had shown to the Davidic Elizabeth.

The examples of the Solomonic James succeeding that Davidic Elizabeth analysed thus far were relatively explicit in their intended meaning, and/or used the analogy to claim that James's reign would be a continuation of Elizabethan policy. Not all instances of this typological understanding of the 1603 succession were as explicit, however, which further demonstrates the contested and unclear view of James's claim. John Davies's rambling tome, *Microcosmos*, which presented his views on the 'world' (that is, government, nature, and properties of the human mind), is an example of a convoluted and unclear use of the

Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources, Volume IV: 1596–1603, ed. by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 660–661. Original Latin:

Accipe, Davidi cur æquiparemus Elisam,
 Esse prout poterunt fæmina, virque pares.
 Concupijt Saulus Davidis tollere vitam,
 Cùm nondum populi Rex foret ille sui:
 Turbaque Saulorum, cùm nondum sceptrā teneres,
 Concupijt vitam tollere, Elisa, tuam.
 Sed Deus in regni Davidem sede locavit:
 Et tibi commisit regia sceptrā Deus.
 Maxima cura fuit regnum Davidis adepti,
 Vt coleret pura relligione Deum:
 In regno positam nec maior habebat Elisam
 Quàm veræ Christi relligionis amor.
 ... Denique Davidi Solomon successerat hæres:
 Et Solomona Anglo liquit Elisa throno.

John Yonge, 'Elisabethæ cum Davide Comparatio', in *Oxonienſis Academiae funebre officium*, pp. 108–109.

David/Elizabeth and Solomon/James succession typology that supported James's claim.⁴⁹ Uniquely among the commentators analysed in this chapter, Davies (generally called John Davies of Hereford to distinguish him from his contemporary, Sir John Davies) was probably a Catholic (he certainly was by 1611)—although nothing in his oeuvre overtly suggests this.⁵⁰ Indeed, *Microcosmos* advocates the total subjugation of Ireland, with Davies writing that 'Ireland a woefull wittnesse is' of the God-ordained monarchy.⁵¹ *Microcosmos* contained a lengthy preface to James (to whom the tome was dedicated), in which Davies went to great lengths to lay out his views concerning the validity of James's accession. This preface, which is unrelated to the content of the pamphlet, suggests that Davies was attempting to curry favour with the new regime by adding to the already voluminous mountain of tracts dedicated to the new King that emphasised his legitimate right to the English throne.

To Davies's mind, James was indisputably Elizabeth's legitimate successor through hereditary right—'He to this Crowne, by ... Bloud ... belong[s]'—but he also claimed that the succession was the work of God. The first way that Davies linked James and Elizabeth was through their shared providential protection: 'And as this Queene was oft from death preserv'd / ... So was this King from like distresse conserv'd, / And both (no doubt) for Englands life reserv'd.'⁵² It is unclear when in 1603 *Microcosmos* was published. James had (famously) survived the Gowrie Conspiracy of August 1600, but in July 1603, the Bye and Mains Plots were discovered.⁵³ The plots had aimed to kidnap James and replace him with his cousin Arbella in order to secure Catholic toleration in England. It is possible, therefore, that Davies was writing in response to these plots.

Davies's discussion of James's blood as an allusion to his hereditary right then shifted to a discussion about literal blood. Davies recounted, in general terms, the blood that had been spilt in the various battles Elizabeth had engaged in to defend England. In mentioning this blood, Davies further linked Elizabeth and James through analogies to David and Solomon:

Much Bloud, though drawne from Heavens unholy foes,
Seemes irksome (if not loathsome) to their sight:
For, when just David thought their Arke t'inclose
Within a Temple, with all glory dight [prepared],

⁴⁹ Thomas Corser, *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica: Or A Bibliographical and Descriptive Catalogue of a Portion of a Collection of Early English Poetry, Volume V* (Manchester, 1873), p. 70.

⁵⁰ P.J. Finkelpearl, 'Davies, John (1564/5–1618)', ODNB.

⁵¹ John Davies, *Microcosmos: The Discovery of the Little World, with the Government thereof* (Oxford, 1603; STC 6333), p. 149; Joshua Scodel, *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), p. 111.

⁵² Davies, *Microcosmos*, p. 2 (sig. C1v).

⁵³ See: Lake and Questier, *All Hail to the Archpriest*, pp. 256–275; and Mark Nicholls, 'Treason's Reward: The Punishment of Conspirators in the Bye Plot of 1603', *The Historical Journal*, 38.4 (1995), pp. 821–842.

(Which hee (in zeale) meant to erect outright)
 Hee was forbad by Heav'ns most holy One
 For making Bloud to flow (though in their right)
 And that Taske put on peacefull Salomon:
 Then peacefull be thy Raigne (deare Lord) alone
 To build the Temple of true Union.
 ... Deere King, drade Sov'raigne, sacred Majesty.⁵⁴

James was thus a new Solomon, and Elizabeth, although the analogy was implicit, was paralleled with David. The typology of the peaceful Solomon succeeding the more militaristic David was clearly intended to apply to the 1603 succession, and it seems that Davies hoped the accession of a 'peacefull Salomon' would put an end to the bloody wars of James's predecessor. With the Nine Years' War over, and James already making clear his intention to come to terms with Spain, Davies's description of James as peaceful is apt, and may also be intended to be an implicit critique of the costly (and largely unsuccessful) wars of Elizabeth's reign.⁵⁵ What the 'Temple that Elizabeth had been 'forbade' from 'erect[ing] outright' is unclear, but given his desire to see the rebellion in Ireland quashed, Davies might have been suggesting that God had not allowed Elizabeth to live to see the signing of the Treaty of Mellifont, which had brought the war in Ireland to an end. The implicit analogy between David and Elizabeth makes discerning Davies's purpose more difficult, but his praise of the newly ascended Solomonic James, in addition to the way he had linked Elizabeth and James through their providential favour, made clear that he was presenting James as Elizabeth's legitimate successor. In explaining that James was Elizabeth's successor both through blood and providential intervention, Davies was contributing to the wider legitimisation of James's claim. His use of biblical analogies to do so, however, demonstrates the malleability of the device, and more importantly, emphasises that analogies did not necessarily have to serve a godly Protestant reading of either the succession, or the present.

This typological conception of the succession carried over into 1604—a possible consequence of the delay to James's coronation procession, which was finally held on 15

⁵⁴ Davies, *Microcosmos*, p. 3 (sig. C2r).

⁵⁵ The costs of England's various wars were a constant drain on crown (and local) finances, and by the 1590s, people were beginning to publically to question whether the costs of these protracted foreign wars were in England's best interests. For instance, John Eliot's 1591 translation of Bertrand de Loque's *Discourses of Warre*—published as England faced wars with Spain, in Ireland, and in the Netherlands—agreed that wars were necessary, but at the same time strongly cautioned against costly and protracted foreign wars, as they cause 'great inconveniences and mischiefs' and they 'soweth the very seedes of all trouble and sedition'. Likewise, Essex's *Apologie* (published without permission in 1600 after circulating in manuscript since 1598) contained several, striking rebuttals to those who claimed England 'to be poore' and thus unable to continue fighting Spain. Bertrand de Loque, *Discourse of Warre and Single Combat*, trans. by John Eliot (London, 1591; STC 16810), sigs. C3v, C4r; Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, *To Maister Anthonie Bacon. An Apologie of the Earle of Essex, against those which falsly and maliciously taxe him to be the onely hinderer of the peace, and quiet of his countrey* (London, 1600; STC 6787.7), sig. D3r. See: Alexandra Gajda, 'Debating War and Peace in Late Elizabethan England', *Historical Journal*, 52.4 (2009), pp. 852, 860; and Hammer, *Elizabeth's Wars*, pp. 6, 240, 248–253.

March.⁵⁶ William Stoughton, a radical presbyterian who is perhaps most famous for his development of a model of classical republicanism for England, saw the accession of a Scotsman to the English throne as the ideal time to advocate for the adoption of presbyterianism in England. His *An Assertion for True and Christian Church Policy* was a lengthy treatise that contained responses to the various legal and ecclesiastical objections offered against the establishment of presbyteries in England.⁵⁷

To Stoughton's mind, the classical republicanism of which he was a great proponent was visible in parish presbyteries, especially as they removed the need for bishops, and he hoped that the educated Scot who now sat on the English throne would see the logic to his argument.⁵⁸ In order to make his case, however, Stoughton had to demonstrate carefully that the structure of the Church of England, left largely untouched during the reign of Elizabeth, was not the ideal, godly structure. In using the David and Solomon analogies to conceptualise the succession, Stoughton hoped that the new King would finish the task left unfinished by his predecessor:

Wherefore, seeing we have not an Ester, to succeed our Deborah, but a Salomon rather, to succede a David; yea such a Salomon, as whose heart the Lord hath filled with an excellent spiritie of wisdom, of understanding, and of knowledge, to finde out, and to dissolve hard and curious parables, and hath put in his heart, to teach and to guide others; we rest perswaded in our hearts, that the King for his part, treading in the steppes of the godlie Kings, Prince, and Governours of Judah, will go.⁵⁹

The four biblical figures Stoughton invoked made his point about England needing to undergo further reformation explicit. While Elizabeth was 'our Deborah', she was also a David, who had been unable to complete the construction of the Temple before dying. It was therefore up to James, England's Solomon, who was 'treading in the steppes of the godlie Kings' to complete the Reformation the Davidic Elizabeth began and replace the 'Popish Bishops' with godly presbyteries.⁶⁰

In using these analogies to present James as Elizabeth's legitimate successor, Stoughton showed an awareness of the doctrine of the king's two bodies. There is no link

⁵⁶ While the coronation procession was delayed on account of plague, the coronation itself took place in Westminster Abbey on 25 July 1603.

⁵⁷ Phil Withington, 'An "Aristotelian moment": Democracy in Early Modern England', in *Popular Culture and Political Agency in Early Modern England and Ireland: Essays in Honour of John Walter*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick and Phil Withington (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2017), p. 214.

⁵⁸ Withington, 'An "Aristotelian moment"', p. 214.

⁵⁹ William Stoughton, *An Assertion for True and Christian Church Policy* ([Middelburg?], 1604; STC 23318), p. 159.

⁶⁰ Stoughton, *An Assertion for True and Christian Church Policy*, p. 184. On the survival of presbyterianism as a part of English puritanism, see: Polly Ha, *English Presbyterianism, 1590–1640* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011), esp. pp. 24–27, 33–36; and Peter Lake, 'Presbyterianism, the Idea of a National Church and the Argument from Divine Right', in *Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth Century England*, ed. by Peter Lake and Maria Dowling (London: Croom Helm, 1987), pp. 193–224.

between Deborah and Esther in the Bible, save the fact that Esther is arguably the next most prominent woman who holds some kind of leadership position to appear in the Bible after Deborah. These analogies thus acknowledge the gendered reality of the 1603 succession—that Elizabeth had been succeeded by a man. Nevertheless, Stoughton seems uninterested in presenting a narrowly gendered view of Elizabeth, describing her as both a Deborah and a David. For Stoughton, it is the *typology* of the biblical figure that matters, with the typologies used to explain how he wanted James's reign to proceed. Esther, as the wife of the Persian King Ahasuerus (likely Xerxes I), is less impressive than Deborah, who had been chosen by God to be the supreme political and religious leader of the Hebrews. By contrast, Solomon is traditionally seen as being a better king than his father, David. At Solomon's coronation, Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada the priest and one of David's most trusted commanders, prophesied: 'As the Lord hath been with my lord the king, even so be he with Solomon, and make his throne greater than the throne of my lord king David'.⁶¹ Stoughton thus emphasised the typology of Solomon completing what David left unfinished, exhorting the King to implement ecclesiastical reform in England—reform that had already taken place, to a certain extent, in Scotland.⁶²

Stoughton's pamphlet depicted the Solomonic James succeeding the Davidic Elizabeth not only to demonstrate James's legitimacy as king of England, but also to exhort James to complete the reformation of English ecclesiastical policy that remained unfinished at his predecessor's death. Of all the pamphlets analysed here, this is probably the most critical of Elizabeth, or is the one that most explicitly seeks to praise James at Elizabeth's expense: Elizabeth may have been a Deborah, but it is James who is lauded as having divinely granted 'excellent spiritie of wisdom'. As a presbyterian, Stoughton was no doubt frustrated by Elizabeth's stymying of further church reform, and he saw the accession of the Scottish James as the ideal opportunity to press the new King to embrace his view of church governance. Elizabeth may have defended her people like Deborah, but she had died a David, leaving England's Reformation incomplete. It was therefore up to the Solomonic James to complete what his predecessor had left unfinished.

⁶¹ 1 Kings 1:37.

⁶² Stoughton, however, seems to ignore the fact that presbyterianism had been introduced into Scotland without the crown's consent, and that James had begun to move the Scottish church towards the English model by re-introducing bishops in 1600. See: Alan R. MacDonald, 'James VI and I, the Church of Scotland, and British Ecclesiastical Convergence', *The Historical Journal*, 48.4 (2005), pp. 885–903; and Maurice Lee, Jr., 'James VI and the Revival of Episcopacy in Scotland: 1596-1600', *Church History*, 43.1 (1974), pp. 50–64.

Providence and the Succession

In conceiving of the 1603 succession through the typology of Solomon succeeding David, writers were, either explicitly or implicitly, explaining the link between James and Elizabeth with the intention of emphasising the legitimacy of James's accession and eliding the uncertainty over the succession in the last decade, while also expressing a hope (or expectation) as to what direction James's reign might take. Not all commentators, however, used this typological conception of the succession, and instead turned to other figures from the Bible to demonstrate James's legitimacy. The poet John Lane's elegy for the dead Queen was entered into the Stationers' Register on 15 April. He eulogised Elizabeth through an analogy, but crucially, then linked Elizabeth and James through the Hebrew judges Deborah and Gideon. Unlike the writers who sought to link Elizabeth and James through a typological reading of the succession as being akin to that of David and Solomon, Lane seemed to be less interested in showing that Elizabeth and James were distantly related, and instead seemed to suggest that James's accession was a kind of providentially sanctioned election. As Paulina Kewes has argued, a variety of sixteenth-century chronicles and succession treatises made people aware that England's monarchy had been elective, and that more recent monarchs—including Henry VII—had relied on a kind of election as well as hereditary right and the will of providence to assert their claim to the throne.⁶³ Certainly, Lane did not seek to deny James's legitimacy, but the analogies he used provide further evidence of the imprecise understanding of James's claim to be Elizabeth's successor according to the rules of hereditary right.

The first part of the elegy detailed his grief at Elizabeth's death. For Lane, Elizabeth had been a contemporary Esther:

The royall daughter of that royall King,
 ... Esther our Queene, whose fame (with triumph crownd)
 Haman of Spaine had never force to wound,
 In spite of whom although he dar'd to strive
 She has preservde her people all alive.⁶⁴

⁶³ Paulina Kewes, 'Narrative Historiography and the Rules of Succession', *The Holinshed Project*, <http://www.cems.ox.ac.uk/holinshed/paper1.pdf>. See also: Paulina Kewes, 'History Plays and the Royal Succession', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Felicity Heal, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 493–509; and Paulina Kewes, 'Parliament and the Principle of Elective Succession in Elizabethan England', in *Writing the History of Parliament in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, ed. by Paul Cavill and Alexandra Gajda (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp. 106–132. I thank Professor Kewes for allowing me to see chapters from her forthcoming monograph: *This Great Matter of Succession: England's Debate, 1553–1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

⁶⁴ John Lane, *An Elegie Upon the Death of the High and Renowned Princesse, Our Late Sovereigne Elizabeth* (London, 1603; STC 15189), sig. A4v.

Like Esther, who had prevented the vizier Haman from committing mass genocide of the Jews during the reign of the Persian king Ahasuerus, Elizabeth had preserved the English from Spain and Catholicism. Lane also reminded James of the need to continue to preserve the English against the ‘force’ of popery. This would have been a salient point, given that the Treaty of Mellifont had only been agreed two weeks before, and that James was already seeking peace with Spain, England’s perennial enemy.⁶⁵

As with many of the elegies published to commemorate Elizabeth, the latter portion of Lane’s focused on the new King. In addition to linking Elizabeth and James through the image of a phoenix—Elizabeth had been the ‘Phoenix of the world’, but James was now ‘our Phoenix [who] mounts about the skies’—Lane used the succession of the Hebrew judges to characterise the 1603 succession:

For though our Deborah be dead and gone,
Whose Scepter scourg’d the towers of Babylon,
Yet Gideon lives, and like a man of God,
Suffers not Madian⁶⁶ to be Israel’s rod:
But tramples still upon thy craven crowne,
And breakes thy hornes, and treads thy altars downe.⁶⁷

Not only were the judges chosen by God, there was also no hereditary basis for their appointment; instead, they were worthy people chosen by God to lead the Hebrews out of the punishment to which they had been subjected.⁶⁸ Despite the number of pamphlets that sought to emphasise James’s hereditary right to the throne, Lane seems to downplay this, and instead suggests that James was chosen by God to succeed Elizabeth, and that his acceptance by the English people was akin to a kind of election. While Gideon did succeed Deborah as judge, there was no biological relationship between the two, and at least seven years had elapsed

⁶⁵ By the middle of the sixteenth century, Hispanophobia—more commonly known as ‘The Black Legend’ (*La leyenda negra*) was deeply ingrained in the English psyche. It was properly cemented in the English consciousness after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, helped by Elizabeth and her councillors’ manipulation of such anti-Spanish sentiments. See: Eduardo Olid Guerrero, ‘Introduction: *Semper Eadem, Semper Mutatio*’, in *The Image of Elizabeth I in Early Modern Spain*, ed. by Eduardo Olid Guerrero and Esther Fernández (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), p. 2; Magdalena de Pazzis Pi Corrales, ‘From Friendship to Confrontation: Philip II, Elizabeth I, and Spanish-English Relations in the Sixteenth Century’, in *The Image of Elizabeth I in Early Modern Spain*, ed. by Eduardo Olid Guerrero and Esther Fernández (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), pp. 51–79; Ricardo García Cárcel, *La leyenda negra. Historia y opinión* (Madrid: Alianza, 1992); and William S. Maltby, *The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558-1660* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1971).

⁶⁶ Possibly meaning ‘judgment’, but more likely a reference to the Midianites, Israel’s idolatrous, Baal-worshipping neighbours, which was a common parallel for Catholicism. The Midianites are described (perhaps erroneously) in the ‘land of Madian’ in Acts 7:29.

⁶⁷ Lane, *An Elegie*, sig. B3r.

⁶⁸ The only possible exception to the non-hereditary nature of the succession of the judges is the description of Gideon’s illegitimate son, Abimelech, who was briefly king of Shechem. He was soon overthrown, however, on account of his cruelty and warmongering, and is generally not counted as one of the ‘true’ judges. See: Brian P. Irwin, ‘Not Just Any King: Abimelech, the Northern Monarchy, and the Final Form of Judges’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 131.3 (2012), pp. 443–446.

between Deborah's death and Gideon's taking on the role.⁶⁹ According to Lane, James had succeeded through the direct intervention of providence, and the succession between the Hebrew judges provided a direct precedent for the 1603 succession.

The analogy between Gideon and James, however, reminded James of his need to continue the English Deborah's fight against popery and idolatry. Since the Reformation, a variety of writers had compared Gideon's victories with those of Protestants over popery. For instance *Gedeon* (1540), by Swiss playwright Hans von Rüte, depicted Catholics as idolatrous Baal-worshippers and equated Gideon's destruction of the altar to Baal with the contemporary destruction of relics.⁷⁰ Elizabeth's own translation of Marguerite of Navarre's *Mirror of the Sinful Soul*, which was published by John Bale in 1548, called Gideon a 'most worthy conquerour ... for destroyenge false relygyon'.⁷¹ Similarly, in 1588, Robert Some claimed that Elizabeth would 'vanquish our Popish enemies, as Gedeon did the Madianites', and in 1600, Robert Cawdry praised Gideon, who was 'stirred up by the goodnesse of God,' and 'was the cause of a very great deliverance to the whole nation from most mightie and cruell enemies, and most abhominable Idolatrie'.⁷² The Hebrew judge may have provided a typological understanding of the succession, but the greater force of the analogy appears to be the conferral of a divine mandate to defend England against Catholic idolatry.

To Lane's mind, the 1603 succession was thus a clear example of the intervention of providence. Elizabeth had reigned as a second Esther, protecting England from the expansionist Spanish Catholics. As Lane made clear, however, Elizabeth's claim to the throne came from the fact that she was 'the royall daughter' of Henry VIII. Lane was evidently aware of the role of hereditary right in monarchical succession, and therefore seems to have made a deliberate decision to equate the 1603 succession with the succession between judges. Indeed, Lane seems to be aware of the association between Elizabeth and David, as he twice describes

⁶⁹ Judges 6:1,11–18.

⁷⁰ See: Glenn Ehrstine, *Theater, Culture, and Community in Reformation Bern, 1523–1555* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 166–176. The story of Gideon defeating the Midianites (as well as Deborah's victory over the Canaanites) was dramatised in 'The Tenth Pageant of Gideon', part of *The Stonyhurst Pageants*. The pageants were performed in the north of England sometimes between 1610 and 1642. See: J. Case Tompkins, 'Old Testament Adaptation in "The Stonyhurst Pageants"', *Early Theatre*, 16.1 (2013), pp. 119–137; and Martin Wiggins, ed., *British Drama 1533–1642: A Catalogue, Volume VIII: 1624–1631* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 55–58 (no. 2108).

⁷¹ *A Godly Medytacyon of the christen soule, concerninge a loue towardes God and hys Christe, compyled in frenche by lady Margarete quene of Nauerre, and aptely translated into Englysh by the ryght vertuose lady Elyzabeth daughter to our late souerayne Kynge Henri the VIII* (Wesel, 1548; STC 17320), sig A5r. It remains unclear whether Elizabeth instigated publication, or if Day published it without her knowledge. See: *Elizabeth I: Translations, 1544–1589*, ed. by Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), pp. 25–26.

⁷² Robert Some, *A Godly Treatise containing and deciding certaine questions, mooued of late in London and other places, touching the Ministerie, Sacraments, and Church* (London, 1588; STC 22909), p. 18; Robert Cawdry, *A Treasurie or Store-House of Similies: Both pleasaunt, delightfull, and profitable, for all estates of men in generall* (London, 1600; STC 4887), pp. 612–613.

the English throne as ‘Davids throne’.⁷³ Lane’s elegy does not question James’s right to the throne, but it serves as further evidence of the contested nature of the 1603 succession that was largely the result of the lack of clarity regarding James’s claim. To Lane’s mind, however, any difficulty with the hereditary aspect of James’s claim was overcome not only by acknowledging the role of providence, but also by conceptualising the succession through the typological lens of the Hebrew judges. Just as Gideon succeeded Deborah, so James succeeded Elizabeth; but crucially, these analogies also reminded James, as England’s Gideon, of the importance of keeping England free from the idolatry of Babylon—just as England’s Deborah had.

Lane was not alone in using other analogies to conceptualise the succession. In his contribution to *Oxoniensis Academiae* (discussed above), William Thorne linked Elizabeth with Deborah, and counselled James to be a worthy David as her successor. Thorne was a reliably loyalist theologian and scholar, and was favoured by both Elizabeth and James: he was Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford from 1598 to 1604, became Dean of Chichester in 1601 and later a chaplain to James, and was one of the Oxford translators of the King James Bible.⁷⁴ Given this royal preferment, it is unsurprising that he sought to emphasise James’s legitimacy, but his use of biblical analogies to conceptualise the succession suggests that, like Yonge, he engaged with some of the potential problems surrounding James’s hereditary claim to the throne.

Thorne’s verse was presented as a ‘Lamentation of Jeremiah’. The Book of Lamentation contains five chapters, each a distinct poem that focuses on the destruction of Jerusalem because of God’s desertion, the bereavement at the loss of life, and the eventual return of God. Thorne’s verse broadly follows the structure of Lamentations, although the popularity of emulating biblical literary styles in the premodern period means that he was not the only scholar in the collection to write a lamentation verse.

In an echo of the Book of Lamentations, Thorne began by linking Elizabeth’s death with the fall of Jerusalem. Elizabeth’s death was a reason to grieve—‘Lament, O Zion, and sad dweller in Jerusalem, ... To be sure, your honour lies buried in the ground’ (‘Lamentare Sion, Solymarumque incola tristis, ... Nempe tuus requievit honos tellure repostus’)—but Thorne emphasised Elizabeth’s providential favour, noting that the Queen was ‘the pupil of his [God’s] own right eye’ (‘ceu dextri pupillam nuper ocelli’), and that she had been ‘kept safe

⁷³ Lane, *An Elegie*, sigs. A4r, B2v.

⁷⁴ Mathew DeCoursey, ‘Thorne, William (1568?–1630)’, *ODNB*.

under his own wings' ('Sub proprijs tutum semper servaverat alis').⁷⁵ After establishing the grief felt by the English at Elizabeth's death, he used biblical analogies to encapsulate her reign, and to present his hopes for James's reign:

Now this time demands that your caskets be filled with tears,
And that prayers be poured out from trembling mouths.
That, although Deborah lies buried in the retentive stone,
And will sleep for long with her fathers,
Some David should rise up on her ancestral throne,
And bear the royal sceptre with unconquered hand.
Let this man restore the adornments of grieving Zion,
And not allow Jerusalem to weep for ever.⁷⁶

Elizabeth was remembered as a Deborah, with her reign conflated with that of her biblical antecedent. Like Lane's use of the Hebrew judge, the typology made clear that Elizabeth had defended the English like Deborah had the Jews, and allowed Thorne to link James and Elizabeth through the workings of providence. The recourse to unconquered hand ('invictâ ... manu') seems to refer to the various, unsuccessful attempts to 'conquer' England during Elizabeth's reign, with Thorne suggesting that because of God's intervention, James would also ensure England remained 'unconquered'. Like Elizabeth, James is not explicitly named, although the analogy to David makes clear that he is referring to the new King. The verse, while praising Elizabeth, reminded James that he must work to be worthy of his new throne: he should rise up ('consurgat') and reign like another David, and must rule wisely to 'not allow Jerusalem to weep for ever' ('Æternùm Solymas nec lachrymare sinat').

The verse's conclusion also hinted at the benefit James's accession provided to the English: Thorne prayed that England's David would restore the country's comforting adornments ('restituât mœstæ ornamenta'). In addition to helping the country come together in the aftermath of the grief expressed at the death of the only monarch that most would have

⁷⁵ William Thorne, 'לירמיה קינה' ['Lamentation of Jeremiah'], in *Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium*, p. 171; William Thorne, 'Lamentation of Jeremiah', ed. by Felicity Henderson and Lawrence Green, trans. by Martin Brooke and Dana Sutton, in *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources, Volume IV: 1596 to 1603*, ed. by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 723.

⁷⁶ Thorne, 'Lamentation of Jeremiah', p. 724. Original Latin:

Iam lachrymis vestras repleti hoc tempus acerras,
Et timido fundi postulat ore preces;
Vt, Deborah quamvis saxo tumulata tenaci
Cum patribus longum dormiat ista suis;
Davides aliquis solio consurgat avito,
Et ferat invictâ Regia sceptrâ manu:
Hic sua restituât mœstæ ornamenta Sioni,
Æternùm Solymas nec lachrymare sinat.

Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium, p. 172.

remembered, he seemed to celebrate James's wife and children, who offered the security and continuity that Elizabeth's councillors had begged their Queen to provide.

The recourse to David, however, does hint at a kind of election for James. David had been chosen by God to succeed Saul because of Saul's disobedience (and his subsequent rejection by God), but was also accepted by the Hebrews as their new king.⁷⁷ This is not to suggest that Thorne was depicting Elizabeth as an evil Saul, but rather that, like David, James had been chosen by God to succeed to the throne. Given the deep awareness Thorne would have had with the biblical story of David, it is very possible that the analogy also allowed him to express his concerns over a potential Catholic rebellion or invasion against James's accession. David had faced a rebellion by Saul's surviving son, Ish-bosheth, who was declared king as Saul's successor by those loyal to the first Hebrew king. It took two years for David to finally prevail over Ish-bosheth's faction, and even then, it was only achieved after Ish-bosheth's general, Abner, defected to David, and Ish-bosheth was assassinated by two of his own captains.⁷⁸ Hindsight shows that fears of Spanish attempts to place the Infanta on the throne as Elizabeth's successor were unfounded, as were concerns over a potential uprising of Catholics in the North, but contemporaries were not assured of the smoothness of James's succession.⁷⁹ In the final days of Elizabeth's illness, Sir Roger Wilbraham recorded in his journal that 'the Lords hath ordered the navie to be in redines against foren attempts', and London remained in a heightened state of alert until James arrived in the capital on 7 May.⁸⁰ While James did not have to face down a usurper, the possibility had been of genuine concern to those involved in the transition between the Elizabethan and Jacobean regimes, and this may be reflected in Thorne's choice of a David analogy for James.

Like Yonge, Thorne was clearly aware of some of the more detailed and legalistic concerns that revolved around James's claim to the English throne. Thorne did not see the need, however, to conceptualise the succession as the Solomonic James succeeding the Davidic Elizabeth. Instead, in depicting Elizabeth as a Deborah, and James as a David, Thorne emphasised the work of providence in the succession, which irrefutably swept away any potential 'defects' in James's claim. Just as Deborah had been chosen by God to lead the Hebrews, and David had been chosen to succeed Saul, James and Elizabeth had been raised to their thrones because it was the will of providence.

⁷⁷ 1 Chronicles 11:2–3.

⁷⁸ 2 Samuel 2:8–9; 3:1, 20–21; 4:1–12.

⁷⁹ Nenner, *The Right to be King*, p. 17; CP MS 187/11.

⁸⁰ *The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General in Ireland and Master of Requests, for the Years 1593–1616, together with Notes in another Hand, for the Years 1642–1649*, ed. by Harold Spencer Scott (London: The Royal Historical Society, 1902), p. 54.

The legitimisation of James's accession to which the pamphlets in this chapter contributed did not focus solely on James as Elizabeth's legitimate successor—writers also portrayed James as the successor of all the Tudors, including Elizabeth's half-brother and father. For Henoah Clapham, a puritan preacher and theologian, James was the legitimate successor of all the *three* reforming Tudor monarchs, and Clapham used this link to counsel the new King to enact further, godly reform.⁸¹ His pamphlet, *Three Partes of Salomon his Song of Songs*, was a mixture of commentary and sermons designed to be a reader's guide to the Song of Solomon. Uniquely among the books of the Old Testament, the Song of Solomon is not concerned with Jewish law or history, or indeed with a person's (or people's) relationship with God. The Song of Solomon is literally about love and sexual longing between a man and a woman—to find a religious meaning behind the text, writers resorted to allegory to claim that the Song celebrates the love between God and his people.⁸² For instance, as Elizabeth Clarke has noted, Clapham's commentary on Song of Songs 2:15—'Take us the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines: for our vines *have* tender grapes'—makes clear that Elizabeth was the one responsible for defending the 'garden of England from what sounded suspiciously like the Spanish fleet.'⁸³ A version of the pamphlet had previously been published in early 1602 (it was entered into the Stationers' Register on 12 February). On the title page of his new pamphlet, Clapham claimed that 'The first part [was] printed before: but now reprinted and enlarged. The second and third partes never printed before. All which parts are here expounded and applied for the readers good'.⁸⁴ The dating of his preface to the reader as April 1603 suggests that the interest in James's accession provided Clapham an opportunity to capitalise on the succession of a monarch who was already hailed as a new Solomon—a point made clear in the dedication of the pamphlet to James.

In the dedicatory epistle, Clapham emphasised the validity of Protestant theology, and sought to praise James's godliness. He also stressed to James the importance of England's monarch being 'a Defendour of the Gospell and an Extirper of Romanisme'. He recounted the various attempts at reform instigated by his English predecessors, and in doing so, presented James as the latest monarch in a line of reforming monarchs:

Henrie the eight (like a sacramentall eight-day) did cut off the fore-skin of our Corruption. Edward succeeding, reformed much. Then (the firie Paren-thesis of Mary past over) our late Deborah Eli-shebet, added to the Father and Brothers blessing. It

⁸¹ Alexandra Walsham, 'Clapham, Henoah (fl. 1585–1614)', ODNB.

⁸² J. Cheryl Exum, 'Song of Songs', in *The Oxford Handbook of English Literature and Theology*, ed. by Andrew W. Hass, David Jasper, and Elisabeth Jay (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 259, 272.

⁸³ Elizabeth Clarke, *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 52.

⁸⁴ Henoah Clapham, *Three Partes of Salomon his Song of Songs, expounded* (London, 1603; STC 2772), sig. A1r.

remayneth, that your Highnesse double our Happinesse, as the great GOD of Heaven and Earth hath doubled your King-ship.⁸⁵

Clapham used an unusual image to describe Henry VIII's break from Rome. That Henry is lauded for 'cutting of the foreskin' is certainly a highly evocative—and suggestive—visualisation of England's separation from the Catholic fold. Circumcision was, moreover, a distinctly Jewish (and Islamic) custom.⁸⁶ It was, however, understood to be a figurative practice: Jeremiah 4:4 exhorts believers to 'be circumcised to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your hearts'. The 'sacramentall eight-day' refers to the fact that a baby's circumcision—*Brit milah*—is performed on the boy's eighth day, which was reflected in the sixteenth-century belief that a newborn should be baptised by the time they were eight days old.⁸⁷ The initial 'cut' having been made, Edward VI, who 'reformed much', succeeded his father. Mary I's reign is then dismissed as a mere interruption, albeit a fiery one. Clapham—relying on the more common meaning in early modern England of 'parenthesis' as 'An interval, an interlude, a hiatus'—offered the hindsight-infused view that the brief return to Catholicism was an aberration, for rather than having to restore Protestantism, Elizabeth simply 'adds' to the work done by her father and half-brother.⁸⁸ Given Clapham's puritan leanings, this 'adding' hinted at his disappointment that the Elizabethan Reformation did not go far enough.

In turning to James, Clapham described how England is doubly happy, and that James is doubly blessed: a pun on the fact that James had gained a second kingdom.⁸⁹ In return for these double blessings, Clapham claimed it 'remayneth' for James to build on the Reformations of his predecessors, and to continue to rule as a godly king. The double blessing England received by James's succession is also visible: James was married, and had not *one*, but *two* male heirs—England's Protestant succession was thus secured, and will be continued.

The link between James and his Tudor predecessors here is far more implicit than in the other texts analysed in this chapter, but Clapham made clear both that James's accession was the work of divine providence, and that he needed to continue the work of, most especially, England's Deborah. The typology perpetuates the idea that Elizabeth had defended

⁸⁵ Clapham, *Three Partes of Salomon*, sig. A2v.

⁸⁶ 'Circumcision was seen by English writers as first and foremost a specifically Jewish ceremony, even if there were other peoples who also circumcised their children'. Eva Johanna Holmberg, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination: A Scattered Nation* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), p. 82.

⁸⁷ William H. Propp, 'The Origins of Infant Circumcision in Israel', *Hebrew Annual Review*, 11 (1987), p. 355; Will Coster, *Baptism and Spiritual Kinship in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), p. 57.

⁸⁸ *OED*, s.v. 'parenthesis', n.3⁷.

⁸⁹ While James had been King of Scotland, his accession to the English throne actually added three 'kingdoms' to his titles. As the dedication of the Epistle stated, James was 'By the Grace of God, King of England, Scotland, Fraunce, and Ireland' (sig. A2r).

England from Catholicism, but also emphasised James's need to extirpate Catholicism—something that Clapham suggests Elizabeth had not done. This point is even alluded to by the use of the Deborah typology: after Deborah's death, the Hebrews fell back into idolatry and God allowed them to be subjugated by their perennial enemies, the Baal-worshipping Midianites. That Clapham was drawing on this typology is suggested by the highly unusual rendering of 'Elizabeth' as 'Eli-shebet'. In Hebrew, Elizabeth is 'Eli-sheba', or sometimes 'Elisheva' (which means 'God is her oath' or 'oath of my God'). 'Eli-shebet' is certainly closer to the English pronunciation of the Queen's name, but it may be intended to emphasise Elizabeth's role in England's Protestantism, and her defence of the Reformation: 'Eli' means 'my God', and 'shebet' means 'staff, sceptre'—Elizabeth was thus God's sceptre in England.⁹⁰ According to Clapham, however, Elizabeth had only 'added' to the reforming work done by Henry and Edward, rather than actively 'defeating' popery. It was therefore up to James to complete the extirpation of popery in England, and to finally complete the Reformation begun when Henry VIII 'cut off the fore-skin of our Corruption'.

The 1603 Succession

According to a document compiled in July 1603 for Sir Thomas Hesketh, a Justice of the Council in the North, in Elizabeth's final days her councillors named several potential claimants to the English throne in the hope that she would indicate whom she wanted to succeed her. Her councillors asked 'that (if she would have the king of Scots to succeed hir) she should hold up hir hand in token of assent, she forthwith lifted up hir hand to hir head, & turned it round in the forme of a circle: discovering thereby (as it was sayd) what she had long before concealed'.⁹¹ It is a rather fanciful story: despite being unable to speak or even properly move, Elizabeth had apparently been able to indicate that she wished James to be her successor through a somewhat complicated gesture.

This story was not unique, and the many similar stories of Elizabeth's councillors attempting to force the dying Queen to name her successor demonstrate a level of unease about whether James's hereditary claim was strong enough to ensure that he would succeed to the throne unopposed. James was undoubtedly Elizabeth's closest living relative, and even if Elizabeth had, in her dying days, suggested she would have preferred an alternative candidate—such as Arbella Stuart or Lord Beauchamp—James's relationship with Robert Cecil, as well as the knowledge of the Stuart claim in the upper echelons of the Elizabethan

⁹⁰ 'Eli-shebet' does not appear in any other source transcribed in *EEBO*.

⁹¹ BL Add MS 22925, fol. 44v.

regime, would almost certainly have ensured James's succession regardless.⁹² Nevertheless, the desire to have James publicly named by Elizabeth as her successor speaks to the general awareness that Elizabeth's forbidding of any discussion concerning the succession seems to have left people unaware of the details of James's hereditary claim to the throne.⁹³

This chapter has shown that a variety of writers and commentators used biblical analogies to conceptualise the 1603 succession, and argued that in doing so, they sought to legitimise James's accession (irrespective of any potential legal impediments), and to elide the longstanding anxieties over the succession in the latter years of Elizabeth's reign. In using the example of the biblical past to understand what was happening in the present, writers were able to make sense of the non-ideal succession, and instead present it as a providentially handled *quasi*-ideal succession. Using biblical analogies allowed pamphleteers to exhort James to continue Elizabeth's campaign against Catholicism, suggesting that popery had yet to be fully eradicated by the time of Elizabeth's death. The use of the David/Elizabeth and Solomon/James analogies—in addition to Lane's Deborah/Elizabeth and Gideon/James, and Thorne's Elizabeth/Deborah and James/David analogies—also allowed commentators to grapple with the various complications presented by James's claim to the throne, and to argue that any and all issues were largely irrelevant, as God had shown that it was His will for James to succeed.

Commentators had been quick to use biblical analogies to explain the succession, and to argue for James's legitimacy as Elizabeth's successor. As James's reign continued, however, Elizabeth analogies were increasingly used to point out the first Stuart King's perceived inadequacies. The hope that the Solomonic James would complete what the Davidic Elizabeth had left incomplete largely proved to be a disappointed one, and a range of commentators began to first criticise, then rebuke, James for failing to live up to the (imagined) standards of England's Deborah.

⁹² Indeed, Elizabeth Southwell—one of Elizabeth's maids-of-honour who had attended the dying Queen—claimed that Elizabeth named Beauchamp as her heir instead of James. According her account, written in 1607 and after her conversion to Catholicism, the Privy Council wanted Elizabeth to tell them 'whom she would have king but they seeing her thro[a]t troubled her so much desired her to hold up her finger when they named whom liked her whereupon they named the K[ing] of france the K[ing] of Scotland at which she never stirred, they named my lord Beauchamp whereto she said I will have no raskalls son in my seat but one worthy to be a king: Hereupon yntantlie she died: Then the Councell went forth and reported she meant the K[ing] of Scots.' What made Beauchamp 'worthy to be a king' is unclear, but according to Southwell's story, James became king *against* Elizabeth's wishes. Loomis, 'Elizabeth Southwell's Manuscript', p. 486.

⁹³ Doran, *Elizabeth I and Her Circle*, pp. 301–302. On the slippery nature of hereditary succession in premodern England, see: Nenner, *The Right to be King*, pp. 1–12.

Chapter 2

Elizabeth I and James VI & I: Providence and Protestantism

In 1624, *Vox Coeli, or Neves from Heaven*, was published. Generally attributed to pamphleteer John Reynolds, it served as a *quasi*-sequel to the hugely popular *Vox Populi*, published in 1620, and attributed to radical preacher Thomas Scott.¹ *Vox Coeli* purports to be an account of a conversation in heaven involving Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary I, Elizabeth I, Prince Henry, and Queen Anna on the relative merits of the Spanish match, a project in which James sought to have Prince Charles married to Infanta Maria Anna, daughter of Philip III. The figures, with the exception of Mary, claim to be ‘against the Match’ at the end of the conversation, with the implication being that the opinion of this resounding majority should be emulated in present-day England. This purported present-day relevance is emphasised by the dedication of the pamphlet to parliament, in which Reynolds seeks to ‘bring the truth neerer to your knowledge, or rather home to your understanding’.

Elizabeth, who speaks the most in the pamphlet, summed up her reasons for opposing the Spanish match by claiming it would ‘give fire to England, and make her welter in her miseries, and flame in her calamities and afflictions.’² This opinion was based on Elizabeth’s own experiences with Catholics. She reminded her companions that

Almost every yeare Spaine hatched me a new Treason ... [seeking] to lay violent hands on my Person and Life, but ... God in his infinite mercie and providence still protected and defended me ... God was so gracious to England, and so mercifull to me, as not onely my Ships and People, but the Windes and Waves fought for my defence, and that of my Countrey, against the pride and malice of Spaine.³

These examples of providential favour demonstrated that God did not want England to have anything to do with Catholicism, and in Elizabeth’s view, England risked ruin by embarking on the marriage. Such views may have been attributed to an imagined Elizabeth, but they were widely shared in Jacobean England.

By 1624, it had become relatively commonplace to criticise the Jacobean regime by invoking the example of Elizabeth, especially when it came to expounding anti-Catholic, anti-

¹ On these two pamphlets, see: Carole Levin, ‘Elizabeth’s Ghost: The Afterlife of the Queen in Stuart England’, *Royal Studies Journal*, 1.1 (2014), pp. 1–16; Leticia Álvarez Recio, ‘Pamphlet Literature the Anglo-Spanish Match: Thomas Scott’s *Vox Populi* (1620)’, *SEDERI: Yearbook of the Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance Studies*, 19 (2009), pp. 5–22; and David Colclough, *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 104–111.

² [John Reynolds], *Vox Coeli, or Neves from Heaven* ([London], 1624; *STC* 20946.4), p. 72.

³ [Reynolds], *Vox Coeli*, p. 51.

Spanish, and triumphal Protestant views.⁴ *Vox Coeli* is merely one of hundreds of tracts printed between March 1603 and March 1625 that exhorted James to follow the precedent of his monarchical predecessor.⁵ Many of these pamphlets include Elizabeth analogies, and despite their absence from the scholarship, these analogies, as this chapter shows, functioned as a potent tool of counsel and rebuke in Jacobean England.

Expanding the scope of the previous chapter, this chapter analyses Elizabeth analogies that were invoked throughout the reign of James VI & I, arguing that the commentators who employed an Elizabeth analogy did so to counsel the King to emulate the example of England's Deborah, and increasingly to reprove James for failing to live up to the (imagined) standard of providentially favoured militant Protestantism that Elizabeth represented. In depicting Elizabeth as the latter-day embodiment of a variety of Old Testament figures, writers demonstrated how the recent past and present were read in an instinctively typological fashion, and argued that the past—both the recent past of Elizabeth's reign and the ancient past of the Old Testament—was relevant to the present, and should be emulated in order to solve contemporary crises and to arrest any potential decline.

Many of the examples analysed in this chapter were written in response to, or were influenced by, contemporary crises. The foiling of the Gunpowder Plot in 1605, the death of Prince Henry in 1612, the Palatinate marriage of 1613, the Bohemian Revolt in 1618, and the failure of the Spanish match in 1623 were all topics of great discussion in a multitude of printed tracts. In their discussions of these events, pamphleteers often turned to the example of Elizabeth to suggest a solution or a course of action. For instance, James's deliverance from the Gunpowder Plot was linked to Elizabeth's preservation during Mary I's reign, which itself was conflated with God's protection of Daniel in the lions' den; likewise, the English Deborah was deployed to argue in favour of sending troops to defend Protestants in Bohemia and the Palatinate. In addition to turning to the past to recommend action in the present, these analogies claimed to offer a providentially sanctioned course of action, with the various typologies contained in the Elizabeth analogies offered as examples of God's plan for England—an England that was favoured because of its Protestantism.

As much of the more recent scholarship has shown, James's accession was generally greeted enthusiastically. Rather than this celebration being the result of frustration at Elizabeth and her government, as the older scholarship claimed, the English seem to have been relieved

⁴ Alexandra Walsham, "A Very Deborah?" The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 159.

⁵ Michael Dobson and Nicola J. Watson, *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 44.

at the succession of an adult man who was married and already had children.⁶ These ‘benefits’ are alluded to—both implicitly and explicitly—in some of the examples analysed here. However, many of the analogies take a different approach, claiming that the Queen’s death provided the ideal opportunity to re-open the Elizabethan religious settlement. Hotter Protestants could exhort the new King to embrace further reformation that had up until this point been stymied, and, for their part, Catholics could press for some form of toleration, or even more optimistically hope that James himself would convert to Catholicism. Many of the Elizabeth analogies analysed in this chapter were deployed to suggest that James should engage in some kind of religious reformation, but there seems to be limited agreement on what this reformation should actually look like. Nevertheless, a key thread that winds its way through the pamphlets analysed here is a virulent strain of anti-Catholicism, with the vast majority of Elizabeth analogies used to argue for stronger crackdowns on Catholicism (whether this be through a further purging of the vestiges of popery in the English church, or by engaging in battle with Catholics abroad), and to assert the importance of England’s Protestantism, especially in terms of the blessings the country was believed to have received because of its commitment to the reformed faith.

The New Regime and Elizabeth’s Legacy

Elizabeth’s death seems to have been met with genuine sorrow in England. As Catherine Loomis has shown, however, the response to Elizabeth’s death ‘reveals not only a terrible sense of loss, but also a concerted effort ... to reconstruct a new and improved version of the Queen’.⁷ This ‘new and improved’ Queen is visible in the many Elizabeth analogies drawn throughout the seventeenth century. At the same time, however, many eulogies for the dead Queen praised her successor, suggesting that a *king* would be able to definitively settle issues on which Elizabeth had merely obfuscated, or outright ignored. As the examples analysed in Chapter 1 show, elegies that included both Elizabeth and James generally presented the King as the legitimate successor to Elizabeth(an policies), and expressed a hope that Catholicism and the Spanish would be defeated more definitively. Very few published commemorations of

⁶ The relative levels of celebration and relief continue to be debated. See: John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 14–25; Louis Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006); 249–252; Catherine Loomis, *The Death of Elizabeth I: Remembering and Reconstructing the Virgin Queen* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 1–6; 47–83; Julia M. Walker, *The Elizabeth Icon, 1603–2003* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 6–9; Richard A. McCabe, ‘Panegyric and Its Discontents: The First Stuart Succession’, in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 25–28; Levin, ‘Elizabeth’s Ghost’, pp. 1–16; Daniel R. Woolf, ‘Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen’s Famous Memory’, *Canadian Journal of History* 20.2 (1985), pp. 167–192; and J.E. Neale, ‘November 17th’, in *Essays in Elizabethan History* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1958), pp. 9–19.

⁷ Loomis, *The Death of Elizabeth I*, p. 6.

Elizabeth were negative about her reign, but some, like that of Radford Mavericke, used James's accession to urge the King to use his inherent 'masculinity' to overcome the (perceived) deficiencies brought upon England by Elizabeth's 'femininity'.

Mavericke was a clergyman and pamphleteer about whom very little is known, although his published works demonstrate a virulent anti-Catholicism.⁸ In 1603, he published *Three Treatises Religiously Handled*, which, as its title suggests, was divided into three parts—'The Mourning Weede', 'The Mornings Joy' and 'The Kings Rejoycing'. The pamphlet was entered into the Stationers' Register on 12 May 1603 (although the dedicatory epistle to the Countess of Derby is dated 20 May) and, given that it mentions that England will 'shortly with joy ... have him crowned', it was likely published before James's coronation on 25 July.

The *Three Treatises* contain both praise and criticism of Elizabeth. Mavericke's rather confused depiction of the Queen's reign is compounded by the variety of biblical analogies he employed. A thread that runs through the whole pamphlet, however, is Mavericke's belief that a *male* king was inherently better for England than a *female* king, and that the accession of James would allow England to realise its heretofore unfulfilled potential.

The first treatise, 'The Mourning Weede', mourns Elizabeth's death, and depicts her as a latter-day Josiah. In an extended section that detailed the two monarchs' many similarities, Mavericke addressed the King, and told him that,

Josiah never was more zealous for the law, then our late beloved Queene was ... for the Law and the Gospel: Josiah carefully purged his land from Idolatry, and our Queene with as great care from Idolatry & other rags of popery; Josiah pulled down the Idols which his people worshipped, & our Queen pulled down the Idols in churches, but specially that great Idoll of the Masse.⁹

Elizabeth's returning of England to Protestantism was equated with Josiah's restoration of proper Jewish worship in Judah, with the 'idolatry' of Catholicism equated with Baal-worship. As the comparison continued, Mavericke emphasised the two monarchs' providential favour:

Josiah had none ... that resisted him in his work ... but private subjects, & some of the Priests; our Queene had not only her private subjects, and the most part of her Priests & Bishops, but also many and mightie forraine enemies, as the Pope a petty God on earth, and many other great Princes in the world of his confederacie, that ... sought continually the ruine of her selfe, subjects and country; from whose malice and might, the Lord did ever protect her grace most miraculously.¹⁰

⁸ Elizabeth French, 'Genealogical Research in England: Maverick', *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, 69 (April 1915), p. 152; Radford Mavericke, *The Practice of Repentance. Or, A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse, the fifteenth of September last passed* (London, 1617; STC 17682).

⁹ Radford Mavericke, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled and named according to the severall subject of each Treatise* (London, 1603; STC 17683a.5), pp. 4r–4v. The marginal note states 'Queene Elizabeth compared with King Josias'.

¹⁰ Mavericke, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled*, p. 4v.

According to Mavericke, Elizabeth had actually had a more difficult reign than Josiah (even though the Hebrew king had been fatally wounded in battle and died at only 39), which underscored the pronounced providential favour Elizabeth, and England, had received during her reign. Mavericke then reiterated the similarities between the monarchs' religious reforms, as well as the affection with which their subjects held them:

Josiah erected, [e]stablished and continued all his daies true religion, and the true service of God in his land; the world knoweth, our Queen hath done the like in this land of ours: Josiah caused the law to be read & published to the people in his time; & her Majesty hath caused both the law and the Gospel, to be purely preached all her dayes ... In a word, Josiah king of Judah, never loved his subjects better then our late most gracious Queen Elizabeth ... hath loved us, her people & loyal subjects.¹¹

This is a particularly detailed explanation for making an analogy, with Mavericke aiming to leave his readers in no doubt of the parallels between the two monarchs. It is, however, an unusual analogy, especially as Josiah was more commonly associated with Edward VI. Nevertheless, it seems that Mavericke was primarily interested in the typology of proper religious worship that Josiah represented, which also meant that gender was of limited concern in its application.

As this treatise was a 'mourning' for Elizabeth's death it was, unsurprisingly, quite positive about the memory of 'our late most dearest beloved Queene'. The second treatise, 'The Mornings Joy', shifted this narrative. It was addressed to James, and included the explicit subtitle, 'Wherein the Causes Of All Our rejoycings for the happie proclaiming, and present enjoying of our royall king, are briefly and plainly described'. After explaining how 'Gods speciall providence and appoyntment' had allowed James to succeed, Mavericke described how the precedent of the Hebrews was relevant in the present. He first linked Elizabeth and James implicitly through metonymic analogies: 'when the Judges rules, none but godly Debora could bring peace and rest to the Church and common weale forty yeares: So after the kings were crowned, none but Salomon must builde the Temple of the Lord'.¹² Given that Mavericke would go on to explicitly link Elizabeth with Deborah (although he does not do the same with James and Solomon), it seems he was hoping his readers would understand the association between Deborah and Elizabeth, and James and Solomon. Mavericke seems to depict Deborah as the pre-eminent of the judges, but the distinction between Deborah the judge and Solomon the king is made clearer later in the pamphlet.

¹¹ Mavericke, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled*, p. 4v.

¹² Mavericke, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled*, p. 7r.

Despite lamenting the death of ‘our late peerelesse Prince’, Mavericke was under no illusions concerning the benefits that came from having a (male) king, rather than a (female) judge. In a particularly explicit application of analogy, he noted that:

the Jewes a long time had Judges to rule over them, though some of them, wise as Debora, and holy as Samuell, yet they still cryed out, Give us a King to raigne over us, as all other Nations have. So long as our Debora raigned (which was foure yeares longer then Debora judged Israel) and thereby all peace and prosperitie heaped upon us, and our land, yet there were that cried out, Give us a king to raigne over us, as all other Nations have. Nowe God in his mercie hath given us a king.¹³

Even though Elizabeth had reigned as *both* a Deborah and Samuel, and had been responsible for England’s ‘prosperitie’, Mavericke turned the Israelites’ ungrateful plea to God in 1 Samuel 8:6 to ‘Give us a king’ into a positive. God (and Samuel) had warned that a king would bring misery to the Israelites, but they were unperturbed, telling Samuel that having a king would mean that we ‘may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles.’¹⁴ This seems to be the crux of Mavericke’s point: even though God told Samuel that the request for a king meant that the Israelites had ‘rejected me, that I should not reign over them’, having a king on the English throne now meant that the country could go on the offensive, and defeat the evils of Catholicism. Mavericke then went on to spell out his hopes for James’s kingship:

wee shall have such a blessing, as this land hath not enjoyed in that respect, this fiftie yeares; ... A King God bee thanked wee have ... peaceably established in his kingdome; ... which for his prowess (if he bee provoked) dare to looke any King of Christendome in the face; ... his sexe is able By the helpe of his God, to leape over a Wall.¹⁵

It was thus a blessing that England could now commit to a more militant form of Protestantism. Mavericke, does not, however, explain how Elizabeth’s gender had hampered England: her intervention in the Netherlands on behalf of Dutch Protestants, for instance, suggests a commitment to militant Protestantism. Mavericke even seems to acknowledge this when he described Elizabeth as the ‘defender of our whole Countrie’.¹⁶ In fact, Elizabeth’s various military interventions stand in stark contrast to the preferences of a king who had already made clear his intention to reign as the *rex pacificus*.¹⁷ Implicit here, of course, is a recourse to the Aristotelian understanding of sex, with Mavericke assuming that James’s

¹³ Mavericke, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled*, pp. 20r–20v.

¹⁴ 1 Samuel 6:20.

¹⁵ Mavericke, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled*, pp. 20v–21r. Psalm 18:29: ‘For by thee I have run through a troop; and by my God have I leaped over a wall.’

¹⁶ Mavericke, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled*, p. 6v.

¹⁷ Malcolm Smuts, ‘The Making of *Rex Pacificus*: James VI and I and the Problem of Peace in an Age of Religious War’, in *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*, ed. by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), pp. 371–373.

maleness meant that he would inherently be better able to defend England against Catholicism than Elizabeth had. According to Mavericke, Elizabeth had not done enough to advance the Protestant cause, both at home and abroad, which he attributed to the Queen's gender. Indeed, the claim that Elizabeth 'was the most mildest & mercifullest Queene, [(l)if not too mercifull) that ever ruled or raigned in christendome' emphasises the perceived drawbacks of Elizabeth's gender.¹⁸

Despite these negative views, Mavericke also took the opportunity to offer a warning to his readers. Emphasising that James's gender alone was not a panacea, Mavericke exhorted his readers to remain obedient to the new king, and to continue to pray that England would 'continue the light of his gospell longer among us'.¹⁹ In Mavericke's view, even though Elizabeth had reigned as a contemporary Josiah, Deborah, and Samuel, she had not done enough to root out 'Popish tyranny' at home, and had not expanded Protestantism abroad as she should have. The accession of the Solomon James was therefore the ideal opportunity to rectify these mistakes, with Mavericke believing that God had allowed James to succeed to the English throne for this express purpose.

Scholars continue to debate whether the English truly were 'weary of an old woman's government' as the oft-quoted anecdote by Bishop Godfrey Goodman suggests.²⁰ Regardless, as the examples analysed here and in the previous chapter show, the Jacobean regime was immediately exhorted to continue—and more crucially, improve upon—the policies of Elizabeth. According to Andrew Willet, James's accession was the ideal moment for the reformation of England's Church to be 'perfected & accomplished'.

Willet's *Ecclesia Triumphans: That is, The Joy of the English Church*, dedicated to Queen Anna, was published to commemorate the 'happie Coronation of the most vertuous and pious Prince, James'. A clergyman whose many works often contained virulent expressions of anti-popery, Willet held a variety of lucrative rectories under both Elizabeth and James, and he spent several years as chaplain-in-ordinary and tutor to Prince Henry.²¹ It is therefore unsurprising that he was complimentary of his royal patrons.

Ecclesia Triumphans contains twenty meditations on Psalm 122, with each meditation emphasising God's blessings and favour towards the English.²² Willet reflected on several

¹⁸ Mavericke, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled*, pp. 25r–25v.

¹⁹ Mavericke, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled*, p. 28v.

²⁰ Godfrey Goodman, *The Court of King James the First*, ed. by John S. Brewer, 2 vols (London, 1839), I, p. 97. It is seldom noted that this comment was expressed in the 1640s or early 1650s.

²¹ Anthony Milton, 'Willet, Andrew (1561/2–1621)', *ODNB*.

²² Willet's choice of psalm is appropriate: Psalm 122 was adapted into *I Was Glad*, the introit, and later anthem, commonly sung at the coronation of English monarchs. Douglas Maclean, *The Great Solemnity of the Coronation of a King and Queen According to the Use of the Church of England* (London: George Allen, 1911), p. 69.

important deliverances from Elizabeth's reign—especially the victory over the Armada. To Willet's mind, England's favour was a direct result of the country's Protestantism. This view was emphasised in the fifteenth meditation:

But God would have this worke to be undertaken by his annointed to whome it belongeth ... he stirred up the heart of king Henrie the 8. that beganne; king Edward followed, Queene Elizabeth happely proceeded, and what is yet wanting either in Church or commonwealth, we trust that by the hands of our dread Sovereigne, that now is, it may in good time be perfected & accomplished.²³

England had been blessed for embracing the Reformation, but Willet made clear that James needed to perfect this reformation. England's Protestantism could therefore be viewed as an ongoing project: Elizabeth 'proceeded' what had already begun under her father and half-brother (completely ignoring Mary I's reign), but she died with the reformation incomplete.

Despite this incompleteness, Elizabeth provided a clear example for James to emulate. In the eighteenth meditation, which is based on verse seven of Psalm 122, Willet celebrated England's preservation from Catholic expansionism under Elizabeth:²⁴

We are taught to acknowledge another singular favour of God toward us: that hath heard the praier of his servants, and graunted peace unto his Church. Domesticall peace and quietnes this land (thanks be to God) hath enjoyed more then these 40. yeares under the conduct of our worthy Deborah our late Sovereigne Q. Elizabeth.²⁵

Elizabeth defended England as Deborah did the Israelites. Nevertheless, and in spite of this 'singular favour', there was still work to be done to ensure England's 'peace and quietnes', and Willet believed that James would be the one to ensure it. He first recounted the

forren busines [that] hath happened in this time in Ireland, the low countries, and in other places: ... divers assaults and invasions have beene intended against this realme, and one furiously attempted by the Spanyards, [in] ann. 88. But now we trust that the English nation may have peace abroad, and there is great hope, that our peaceable Salomon and princely Ecclesiastes, will bring unto this land a generall peace and quietnes both at home and abroad.²⁶

In addition to the repelling of the Spanish Armada, Willet touched on the 'forren busines' that was responsible for the wars England was embroiled in. Rather than describing the protracted military campaigns in Ireland and the Low Countries as resulting from Elizabeth's reticence about committing the necessary resources, and the inexperience of her military commanders,

²³ Andrew Willet, *Ecclesia Triumphans: That is, The Joy of the English Church, for the happie Coronation of the most vertuous and pious Prince, James* (Cambridge, 1603; STC 25676), p. 86.

²⁴ Psalm 122:7: 'peace be within thy walls, and plenteousnes within thy palaces'.

²⁵ Willet, *Ecclesia Triumphans*, p. 103.

²⁶ Willet, *Ecclesia Triumphans*, pp. 103–104.

Willet blames foreign interference—that is, *Catholic* interference—for these wars.²⁷ Nevertheless, the crux of this meditation—and indeed of the analogy—is to present James, the ‘peaceable Salomon’, as the successor of Elizabeth, England’s ‘worthy Deborah’. Like Mavericke, Willet may here be praising the presumed benefit of James’s maleness, and his ability to put an end to the devastating ‘forren busines’; the emphasis on James as the ‘peaceable Salomon’, however, undercuts this somewhat—especially as the King had already made clear his intention to come to terms with Spain.²⁸ According to Willet, should James continue Elizabeth’s godly behaviour, and ensure that the reformation of England’s Church is ‘perfected & accomplished’, England would be rewarded with ‘generall peace and quietnes both at home and abroad’—as verse eighteen of Psalm 122 promises.

That James’s accession provided an opportunity to revisit the Elizabethan settlement seems to have been widely understood—and not merely by godly agitators. For instance, Lewis Bennett, a clerk in Barkham, Sussex, was indicted at the East Grinstead assize on 3 October 1603 for saying, ‘if our new king should alter the religion that now is, that it would be as good or better; and that the Catholicks were the true protestants and that the Puritans and the Brownists were butt dissemblers’.²⁹ The expression of opinions like Bennett’s was concerning to a variety of commentators, many of whom were worried about a resurgence of Catholicism in England following James’s accession. Some warned that the Church of England required further reformation to ensure that the final vestiges of popery were stripped away, and others expressed concerns that James’s lenient treatment of Catholics would embolden them (both at home and abroad). These warnings were often played out through pamphlet wars, in which Catholics and Protestants attacked the stances of their confessional enemies.³⁰ Some of these ‘wars’ straddled both sides of March 1603. In 1598, Sir Francis Hastings, a puritan-leaning MP, published a tract against popery called *A Watch-Word to all Religious and True Hearted Englishmen*.³¹ Robert Parsons, the (in)famous author of *A Conference about the Next Succession for the Crown of England*, responded to Hastings in 1599; in 1600, both Hastings and Matthew Sutcliffe replied to Parsons; Parsons issued a combined response in 1602; and in 1604, Sutcliffe issued the final instalment of the dispute, *A Ful and Round*

²⁷ Paul E.J. Hammer, *Elizabeth’s Wars: War, Government, and Society in Tudor England, 1544–1604* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 1–8.

²⁸ For instance, Marin Cavalli, the Venetian ambassador in France, wrote to the Doge and Senate on 20 April 1603 that ‘Peace with Spain will probably follow’ now that James was King of England. *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, Volume 10: 1603–1607*, ed. by Horatio F. Brown (London: HMSO, 1900), p. 7 (no. 16).

²⁹ *Calendar of Assize Records: Surrey Indictments, James I*, ed. by J.S. Cockburn (London: HMSO, 1982), p. 1 (no. 2).

³⁰ Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *All Hail to the Archbishop: Confessional Conflict, Toleration, and the Politics of Publicity in Post-Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 236–238; Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 119.

³¹ Francis Hastings, *A Watch-Word to all Religious and True Hearted English-men* (London, 1598; STC 12927).

Answer.³² Sutcliffe, who had been Dean of Exeter since 1588, was a well-known apologist for the Church of England.³³ His second intervention in the dispute was intended, according to the pamphlet's subtitles, to both defend 'Queene Elizabeths most pious and happie government' and expose 'the miserable estate of Papists, under the Popes irreligious and unhappy tyrannie'.

A Ful and Round Answer was entered into the Stationers' Register on 27 June 1604, during the first session of James's first English parliament, and was dedicated to the new King. In the dedicatory epistle, Sutcliffe counselled James to emulate Elizabeth's example in ensuring that God was 'worshipped according to the prescript rule of his sacred word'. This counsel, however, contained a warning for the new King. According to Sutcliffe, in Elizabeth's final years, she was convinced that being lenient to Catholics 'would assure her life ... and her State'. This lenience had given Catholics the opportunity 'to make a strong partie against Religion and the State'.³⁴ Sutcliffe thus stressed that it was imperative that James crack down on popery in England.

Despite this criticism of Elizabeth's latter years, Sutcliffe celebrated Elizabeth's returning of England to Protestantism, and was effusive in his praise of her policies, suggesting that they should be emulated in the present. Indeed, these policies meant that England received the 'great favor of God', which meant that 'the government of Queene Elizabeth ... [was] happily delivered from the Popes manifold exactions'.³⁵ Elizabeth and England's many deliverances from Catholics was a recurring theme throughout the pamphlet, but one of the most evocative used a biblical analogy. Sutcliffe asked his readers to consider the providential favour evident in 'our deliverance by the Queene from the captivitie of the Pope, as the Israelites were delivered from the captivitie of Jabin, and the Cananites by Deborah'.³⁶ Of the many references to Elizabeth in the pamphlet, this is the only one to use a biblical analogy. However, this (perhaps deceptively simple) analogy is evidence both of the belief in the interchangeability of past and present, and of the way that the events of the

³² [Robert Persons], *A Temperate Ward-Word to the Turbulent and Seditious Wach-Word of Sir Francis Hastings* ([Antwerp], 1599; *STC* 19415); Francis Hastings, *An Apologie or Defence of the Watch-Word, against the Virulent and Seditious Ward-Word published by an English-Spaniard, lurking under the title of N.D.* (London, 1600; *STC* 12928); [Matthew Sutcliffe], *A Briefe Replie to a certaine odious and slanderous libel, lately published by a seditious Jesuite, calling himselfe N.D. in defence both of publike enemies, and disloyall subjects, and entitled A temperate wardword, to Sir Francis Hastings turbulent Watchword* (London, 1600; *STC* 23453); [Robert Parsons], *The Warn-Word to Sir Francis Hastings Wast-Word* ([Antwerp], 1602; *STC* 19418); Matthew Sutcliffe, *A Ful and Round Answer to N.D. alias Robert Parsons the Noddie his foolish and rude Warne-word* (London, 1604; *STC* 23465). See: M.C. Cross, 'An Example of Lay Intervention in the Elizabethan Church', *Studies in Church History*, 2 (1965), pp. 280–281; and Douglas J. Mullin, 'The English Writings of Matthew Sutcliffe' (MA thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1998).

³³ Nicholas W.S. Cranfield, 'Sutcliffe, Matthew (1549/50–1629)', *ODNB*.

³⁴ Sutcliffe, *A Ful and Round Answer*, sig. A4r.

³⁵ Sutcliffe, *A Ful and Round Answer*, p. 52.

³⁶ Sutcliffe, *A Ful and Round Answer*, p. 344.

recent past were read typologically. According to Sutcliffe, the various deliverances of Elizabeth were no different to the victory of the Israelites over the Canaanites under Deborah. Not only had Elizabeth reigned as a contemporary Deborah, but the English were also blessed like the Israelites, with Sutcliffe suggesting that the English were God's new chosen people.³⁷ These associations, of course, had contemporary resonances, with Sutcliffe hoping that James would take a firmer stance against Catholics. The biblical analogy in particular was likely intended to show that England had been providentially favoured for its militant Protestantism in order to bolster James. It is possible to read the pamphlet as an endorsement of the actions James had already taken against Catholics: on 22 February 1604, the King had issued a proclamation 'command[ing] all maner of Jesuites, Seminaries, and other Priests whatsoever, having Ordination from any authoritie by the Lawes of this Realme prohibited, to ... depart forth of our Realme and Dominions'.³⁸ At the same time, however, Sutcliffe seems to be advocating that further action be taken against those not covered by the proclamation, especially given the Israelites' fall into idolatry after Deborah's death, which led to their subjugation by the Midianites.

In the final instalment of this long-running pamphlet war, Sutcliffe was clearly drawing on what he saw as the indisputable proof that God had favoured the English under Elizabeth because of the country's staunch Protestantism. This pamphlet, however, does suggest that he was concerned over the apparent spread of popery in England, and he therefore hoped that James would follow Elizabeth's (early) example so that the King 'may both triumph over all your enemies, and also long sit in the royall seate of these kingdomes'.³⁹

Elizabeth Analogies and the Catholic Threat

Sutcliffe's dedication to James also included a warning about the dangers of Catholicism that proved painfully prescient. He told the King that the increase in popery was 'to the hazard of your royall person, and the indangering of the State: and God knoweth whether those that have intended mischief against your royall Majestie'.⁴⁰ Less than eighteen months later, James was delivered from the Gunpowder Plot. This deliverance—of not only James, but also his family and MPs—was immediately deployed as propaganda in support of both James and

³⁷ This trope, which stretched back to the medieval period, became particularly pronounced during Charles's Personal Rule and the Civil War. In addition to the discussion in Chapter 3, see: John W. McKenna, 'How God became an Englishman', in *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends*, ed. by DeLloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 25–43.

³⁸ *A Proclamation Commanding all Jesuits, Seminaries, and other Priests, to Depart the Realme by a Day Appointed* (London, 1604; STC 8343), p. 1.

³⁹ Sutcliffe, *A Ful and Round Answer*, sigs. A4r–A4v.

⁴⁰ Sutcliffe, *A Ful and Round Answer*, sig. A4r.

England's Protestantism.⁴¹ In the aftermath of the Plot's foiling, polemicists linked James and Elizabeth through their providential deliveries, and argued that such deliveries were irrefutable proof that God wanted England to remain a Protestant nation. As the frontispiece of George Carleton's *A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercie* shows (Appendix 1), the Gunpowder Plot was used as a kind of shorthand for James's providential favour, in much the same way that the defeat of the Spanish Armada was associated with Elizabeth's favour. The miraculous deliveries of James and Elizabeth therefore offered writers the opportunity to counsel the King to emulate his predecessor, while celebrating England's Protestantism.⁴²

An overt example of the way the Gunpowder Plot's foiling combined a triumphalist Protestant discourse with a call for more punitive actions to be taken against Catholics is Christopher Lever's 1607 tract, *Queene Elizabeths Teares*. Other than what little can be gleaned from the many religious tracts he published, very little is known of Lever.⁴³ Nevertheless, he seems to always have been on the lookout for new and influential patrons: *Queene Elizabeths Teares* is dedicated to Robert Cecil, by then Earl of Salisbury and James's *de facto* chief minister. The pamphlet was entered into the Stationers' Register on 2 May 1607—sixteen months after the last Gunpowder conspirator had been executed, and less than a year after the Oath of Allegiance had been instituted. Lever seems to have approved of the Oath and its contents, as echoes of it can be found throughout the pamphlet.

Queene Elizabeths Teares contains a section that provides an extended comparison between Elizabeth and Daniel. This analogy depicted Elizabeth as a providential monarch, and suggested that James had inherited the same protection because he had defended England's Protestantism. The pamphlet is written in verse, and the 'story' alternates between a narrator and Elizabeth herself. Lever set the scene with Elizabeth left in a cell, where she prayed to God, comparing herself to Daniel:

⁴¹ See: Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England*, pp. 25–35; Anne James, *Poets, Players, and Preachers: Remembering the Gunpowder Plot in Seventeenth-Century England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), esp. Chapter 2, "like Sampsons Foxes": Creating a Jacobean Myth of Deliverance' (pp. 28–70); Richard F. Hardin, 'The Early Poetry of the Gunpowder Plot: Myth in the Making', *English Literary Renaissance*, 22.1 (1992), pp. 62–79; David Cressy, 'The Fifth of November Remembered', in *The Myths of the English*, ed. by Roy Porter (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), pp. 68–90; and Thomas S. Nowak, 'Propaganda and the Pulpit: Robert Cecil, William Barlow and the Essex and Gunpowder Plots', in *The Witness of Times: Manifestations of Ideology in Seventeenth Century England*, ed. by Katherine Z. Keller and Gerald J. Schiffhorst (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1993), pp. 34–52. As Frances E. Dolan has explained, 'Retelling this story became the fastest way, throughout the seventeenth century, to explain why Catholics should not be tolerated and exactly what kind of threat they offered.' Frances E. Dolan, *Whore of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), p. 46.

⁴² As Alexandra Walsham has shown, 'the special providences ... enshrined in the mythology of English nationhood, above all [were] the defeat of the Spanish Armada and the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot' (p. 251). On the links between providentialism and the commemorations of both the Armada and the Gunpowder Plot, see: Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 245–266.

⁴³ Vivienne Larminie, 'Lever, Christopher (fl. 1598–1627)', ODNB.

O thou eternall eie,
 That sees the very secrets of my hart:
 ... Thou art my comfort, and my Judge thou art.
 Sith heere on earth no justice will be given,
 I for my justice will resort to heaven
 ... For Daniel and the Lyons be with us.⁴⁴

Elizabeth's protection during the reign of Mary I was analogous to Daniel's from the lions, because like the prophet, Elizabeth had committed no crime. The reference to 'justice' probably alludes to Daniel's response to King Darius when he was released unharmed: 'the lions ... have not hurt me: forasmuch as before him innocency [sic] was found in me; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt.'⁴⁵ Likewise, because God knows all the 'secrets of my hart', Elizabeth will be preserved through this ordeal, which will definitively prove her innocence.

Elizabeth then continued in prayer:
 As I, so Daniel was of noble blood,
 Both I, and Daniel have like holy cause;
 As I my selfe, so Daniel hath withstood
 To yeelde obedience unto wicked Lawes.⁴⁶

Daniel was subjected to a law that required him to pray to King Darius instead of God, just as Elizabeth was subjected to the laws of a Catholic Church of England that required her to attend Mass under Mary. The reality of these laws is expanded on later in the story:

Daniel and I are envied both, because
 We give that honour to the King of heaven,
 Which other unto Images have given.⁴⁷

This goes beyond the 'wicked Lawes'—it accuses the Catholics of worshipping idols, and not God. Lever continued:

God sends his Angells to this holy man,
 And bindes the force of Lions for his sake;
 If God restraine, what envie is there than,
 That can from any any [sic] little take?
 The eie of providence doth ever wake.
 Then sith that we so like to Daniel are,
 God will as well for us as Daniel care.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Christopher Lever, *Queen Elizabeths Teares: Or, Her resolute bearing the Christian Crosse, inflicted on her by the persecuting hands of Steven Gardner Bishop of Winchester, in the bloodie time of Queen Marie* (London, 1607; STC 15540), sigs. F3r–F3v.

⁴⁵ Daniel 6:22.

⁴⁶ Lever, *Queen Elizabeths Teares*, sig. G1r.

⁴⁷ Lever, *Queen Elizabeths Teares*, sig. G1r.

⁴⁸ Lever, *Queen Elizabeths Teares*, sig. G1r.

As Daniel said to Darius in the Lion's Den, 'My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me', Elizabeth prays too that she will be spared from Mary in the same way.⁴⁹ This section then concludes with a return to the narrator, who speaks with the full benefit of hindsight. Elizabeth

from Daniel can receive reliefe,
Because to him such favour God had shovne:
She knowes that God hath all her sorrowes knowne.
And He that could the furious Lions tame,
Will favour her that suffers for his name.⁵⁰

Lever's message was clear: God had blessed Elizabeth because of her devotion to the Protestant faith, and James would likewise experience the same blessings if he followed his predecessor's example.

Lever's pamphlet has a performative quality, which may indicate the broader context into which it was tapping.⁵¹ Indeed, by writing the pamphlet in verse, with the 'story' alternating between a narrator and Elizabeth herself, Lever may have been encouraging 'group' readings of the story to increase his audience, with parents potentially reading the story with their children.⁵² It is possible, then, that Elizabeth's story—as an example of what Alexandra Walsham has described as the way that 'God's judgements ... could become part of the culture and experience of the unlettered'—was being retold through a Bible story by Lever to educate a younger generation who may not have known (or could not remember) life under the reign of 'Queen Elizabeth of famous memory'.⁵³

The foiling of the Gunpowder Plot was a key theme in English drama almost immediately after November 1605, with scholars noting the existence of a genre of plays generally called 'Gunpowder plays'.⁵⁴ Of these plays, Thomas Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon*

⁴⁹ Daniel 6:20.

⁵⁰ Lever, *Queen Elizabeths Teares*, sig. G1r.

⁵¹ As Michael Dobson and Nicola Watson have observed, Lever draws on the same events as Thomas Heywood's wildly popular play, *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part I*, with both texts presenting the Queen as a quasi-martyr who deserved praise and emulation in the present. Dobson and Watson, *England's Elizabeth*, pp. 52–54. On Heywood's play, see: Teresa Grant, 'Drama Queen: Staging Elizabeth in *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 120–142.

⁵² As Adam Fox has noted, 'It was the duty of all Christian heads of households to read aloud to their families', because doing so ensured 'that the written word permeated the fabric of popular culture'. Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500–1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 38, 39.

⁵³ Alexandra Walsham, 'Reformed Folklore? Cautionary Tales and Oral Tradition in Early Modern England', in *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500–1850*, ed. by Adam Fox and Daniel Woolf (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 184.

⁵⁴ Andrew Hadfield argues that Shakespeare's *King Lear* (December 1605–January 1606), *All's Well That Ends Well* (1605–1606), *Macbeth* (late 1606), *Coriolanus* (c.1608), and *Cymbeline* (1610) are all 'directly concerned with the complex problem of the enemy within', and are thus influenced—to varying degrees—by James's accession, and the Gunpowder Plot. Richard Dutton argues that Ben Jonson's *Volpone* (which was written in just five weeks and performed in early 1606) and *Cataline* (1611) both allude to the Plot as openly as the censor would allow. Heather

(1606) is of particular significance, as *Queen Elizabeths Teares* employs many of the themes dramatised in Dekker's play.⁵⁵ The play, which begins with the unlamented death of a queen who ruled for 'Five Summers' (thus clearly evoking Mary I), details the many assassination attempts on the Queen of Fairyland, Titania (Elizabeth), undertaken by agents of the Whore of Babylon (the pope and Catholicism).⁵⁶ Throughout the play, Dekker exploits the triumphal Protestant propaganda of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* to make clear the providential favour that Elizabeth and England had received.⁵⁷ The link is unusually overt: both the *dramatis personae* and the *lector* from the 1607 quarto explicitly state that Titania 'is figured our late Queene Elizabeth'.⁵⁸ As Lever would do a year later, Dekker saw James's preservation from the Gunpowder Plot as proof of the King's providential favour: favour that not only linked him to his Tudor predecessor, but also emphasised the active and malignant machinations of Catholics that needed to be dealt with properly. Lever's pamphlet, it seems, was therefore tapping into broader cultural interest in the Elizabeth-like providential favour James experienced, as well as contributing to the political debates concerning Catholic recusants fuelled by the Plot.

Of all the Elizabeth analogies invoked after the Queen's death, this draws most explicitly on Elizabeth's own invocation of the analogy. In the first recorded analogy of her reign, Elizabeth prayed outside the Tower of London at the beginning of her coronation procession:

O Lord, almighty and everlasting God, I geve thee most hearty thanks, that thou hast beene so mercifull unto me, as to spare me to behold this joyful day. And I acknowledge, that thou hast dealt as wonderfully, and as mercifully with me, as thou didst with thy true and faythful servant Daniel thy Prophet, who thou deliveredst out of

Hirschfeld adds Thomas Middleton's *The Revenger's Tragedy* (1606), John Marston's *Sophonisba* (1606), and Barnabe Barnes's *The Devil's Charter* (1607) to the list. Andrew Hadfield, 'Shakespeare and Politics in the Time of the Gunpowder Plot', *The Review of Politics*, 78 (2016), p. 573; Richard Dutton, *Ben Jonson, 'Volpone' and the Gunpowder Plot* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 1–8, 135–141; Heather Hirschfeld, "'Wildfire at Midnight': *The Revenger's Tragedy* and The Gunpowder Plot", *The Review of English Studies*, 68.283 (2017), pp. 60–61.

⁵⁵ *The Whore of Babylon* revolves around the conflict between Titania, Queen of Fairyland (Elizabeth) and the Empress of Babylon ('the Purple Whore of Roome'); conflict that is centred on the opposing empires and religions they represent (and sometimes personify). Their opposition, however, is rather unbalanced: the events in the play consist of the Empress attempting to regain the power she once had in Fairyland by sending kingly suitors to seduce Titania, and various assassins and priests, before launching an invasion with a flotilla of galleons (i.e., the Spanish Armada). All of the plots fail, and Titania is victorious, although the play's ending suggests that the Empress is not completely defeated, and will attack again; Dekker here perhaps glancing at the continued Catholic plots against James. On the literary history of the Whore of Babylon motif, see: Victoria Brownlee, 'Imagining the Enemy: Protestant Readings of the Whore of Babylon in Early Modern England, c.1580–1625', in *Biblical Women in Early Modern Literary Culture, 1550–1700*, ed. by Victoria Brownlee and Laura Gallagher (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), pp. 213–233.

⁵⁶ Susan E. Krantz, 'Thomas Dekker's Political Commentary in *The Whore of Babylon*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900*, 35.2 (1995), p. 271.

⁵⁷ Julia Gasper, *The Dragon and the Dove: The Plays of Thomas Dekker* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 69–72.

⁵⁸ Thomas Dekker, *The Whore of Babylon* (London, 1607; STC 6532), sig. A1v.

the denne from the cruelty of the greedy and raging Lyons: even so was I overwhelmed, and onely [sic] by thee delivered.⁵⁹

This invocation of Daniel in such a public way served a dual purpose. The Tower of London had been a central location in Elizabeth's life, for only five years earlier—in 1554—she had been imprisoned there because of her suspected involvement in the Wyatt Rebellion. Now, she emerged from the royal apartments as England's new monarch. Her providential favour was indisputable. Lever is almost certainly drawing on this prayer here, but he has taken the analogy a step further.⁶⁰ Elizabeth had focused on the divine favour evident in her preservation, whereas Lever emphasised from what Elizabeth had to be preserved from: unjust and wicked Catholics. Echoes of Elizabeth's claim that God treated her 'wonderfully' and 'mercifully' abound in Lever's story. Likewise, while Elizabeth mentions the divine intervention in her preservation—she claims that she was 'onely by thee delivered'—Lever explicitly invokes providence: 'the eie of providence doth ever wake', so 'He that could the furious Lions tame, / Will favour her that suffers for his name.' Lever thus made explicit his belief that Elizabeth was a providentially blessed monarch, and that her tribulations were the fault of Catholics.⁶¹

The Elizabeth of Lever's story is quite some way removed from the 'real' Elizabeth. Unlike Daniel, who had refused to worship Darius in any way, Elizabeth had attended Catholic Mass and had professed Catholicism when required during Mary's reign. Unlike Daniel, Elizabeth was no willing martyr. In using this analogy, Lever was able to re-invent Elizabeth, and like many of the other writers in the chapter, he used the analogy to create an idealised version of Elizabeth whose example should be emulated in the present. In depicting Elizabeth as a latter-day Daniel, *Queen Elizabeths Teares* served as a rallying call for the English to stand firm behind their (Protestant) monarch, while also implicitly agitating for further crackdowns on Catholics. Through his retelling, Lever was able to show that Elizabeth had been preserved from Catholics in order to install Protestantism in England, and by drawing on the sustained Catholic condemnation of the Oath of Allegiance, he emphasised the hostility of Catholics to England and its Protestantism.⁶² Elizabeth, whom God had favoured, had

⁵⁹ [Richard Mulcaster], *The Quenes Majesties Passage through the Citie of London to Westminster the Day before her Coronacion* (London, 1558/9; STC 7589.5), sigs. E4r–E4v.

⁶⁰ In addition to the two accounts of Elizabeth's coronation procession that were published in January 1559, two further editions were printed in 1604 (STC 7592 and 7593)—probably to capitalise on James's coronation procession. Elizabeth's prayer was also included in the account of the coronation procession recounted in both the 1577 and 1587 editions of Holinshed's *Chronicles*.

⁶¹ This point is made overt by the pamphlet's subtitle, 'Inflicted on her by the persecuting hands of Steven Gardner Bishop of Winchester, in the bloodie time of Queen Marie'.

⁶² On the various Catholic responses to the Oath, see: W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 77–85.

instituted increasingly harsh measures against Catholics as her reign progressed, and by linking Daniel and Elizabeth through their respective misfortunes, Lever was asking James to do the same.

Opposition to the Oath of Allegiance continued to foment in England and abroad.⁶³ In February 1608, James anonymously published *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance*, which was revised and published with his authorship attested in 1609.⁶⁴ James was clearly affected by the Gunpowder Plot: he opened the pamphlet by reminding his readers of the ‘monstrous, rare, nay never heard of treacherous attempt, [which] was plotted within these few yeeres here in England, for the destruction of his Majestie, the Queene, their Posteritie, [and] the whole house of Parliament’.⁶⁵ In addition to implicitly reiterating the favour he and England had received in the failure of the Plot, James, like Lever, emphasised the inherent cruelty of Catholics, writing that ‘the onely reason they gave for plotting so heinous an attempt, was the zeale they caried to the Romish Religion’.⁶⁶ James, like many of his contemporaries, viewed Catholicism as inherently evil, and believed it was incompatible with the English nation.

The ‘danger’ of Catholicism was made overt when, on 14 May 1610, Europe was rocked by the assassination of Henri IV of France. Henri, like Elizabeth, had been the subject of a variety of assassination attempts, although they largely ceased after his conversion to Catholicism in July 1593. With Henri’s reign stable, and the succession secured, his wife, Marie de’ Medici, was finally crowned Queen of France on 13 May 1610. Her coronation had been delayed for a variety of (mostly political) reasons, but its staging in 1610 was partially in anticipation of her role in the regency government France would require given Henri’s plans to shortly join the War of the Jülich Succession. On 14 May, Henry’s carriage was held up by congestion caused by the influx of visitors to Paris for the coronation. While stopped on the Rue de la Ferronnerie, Henri was stabbed twice by radical Catholic François Ravailac, and died almost immediately. Ravailac did not resist arrest, and during his interrogations made clear that the murder was motivated by his frustration that the King had failed to convert the Huguenots to Catholicism, and because he was planning to fight in the War of the Jülich Succession in favour of the Calvinist candidate, John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg.⁶⁷

⁶³ See: Michael C. Questier, ‘Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance’, *The Historical Journal*, 40.2 (1997), pp. 311–329.

⁶⁴ Marcy L. North, ‘Anonymity’s Subject: James I and the Debate over the Oath of Allegiance’, *New Literary History*, 33.2 (2002), pp. 215–232.

⁶⁵ [James VI & I], *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus. Or, An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1607; STC 14400), p. 1.

⁶⁶ *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance*, p. 2.

⁶⁷ Vincent J. Pitts, *Henri IV of France: His Reign and Age* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), pp. 317–329. Henri’s support of John Sigismund reflected his desire to curb Habsburg power, rather than being an endorsement of the Elector’s Protestantism.

Henri's death served as a potent reminder of the dangers of popery, and it is perhaps unsurprising that in the aftermath of the assassination a number of pamphlets were published in England that decried Catholicism and celebrated the deliveries of both Elizabeth and James from Catholic plots.⁶⁸

Given both the tense religio-political climate, and the celebrated deliverances of Elizabeth from Catholic plots, pamphleteers saw Elizabeth's legacy as a useful tool to comment upon current issues. Entered into the Stationers' Register on 30 May 1610—only two weeks after Henri IV's assassination—Thomas Gainsford's *The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seventh, Concerning the Unitie of Great Brittain* used the example of the past to critique the present. Known as Captain Gainsford by his contemporaries, on account of his military service in Ireland and the Low Countries, Gainsford is most famous for his role as London's first news editor, working on the newsbooks published by Nathaniel Butter.⁶⁹

At the time that the pamphlet was published, only Catholic marriages were being suggested for Prince Henry. Queen Anna was advocating for a Spanish marriage; James favoured a marriage with the second daughter of Henri IV, Christine; Cecil and Sir Henry Wotton, the English ambassador in Venice, pushed for a match with one of the daughters of Charles Emmanuel I, Duke of Savoy, who would provide a large dowry; and according to the Venetian resident in Florence, Giacomo Vendramin, the Florentines were upbeat about the prospect of a marriage between Henry and Eleonora de' Medici, the eldest daughter of Grand Duke Ferdinando I—a woman who was later suggested as a bride for Philip III of Spain.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ See, for instance: George Carleton, *Jurisdiction Regall, Episcopall, Papall: Wherein is Declared how the Pope hath intruded Upon the Jurisdiction of Temporall Princes, and of the Church* (London, 1610; STC 4637); Alexander Cooke, *Pope Joane. A Dialogue Betweene a Protestant and a Papist* (London, 1610; STC 5659); Francis Herring, *Popish Pietie, or The first part of the Historie of that horrible and barbarous conspiracie, commonly called the Powder-treason: nefariously plotted against James King of great Britaine, Prince Henrie, and the whole state of that Realme assembled in Parliament; and happily discovered, disappointed, and frustrated by the powerfull and sole arme of the Almighty, the fifth of November, Anno 1605* (London, 1610; STC 13246); John Milward, *Jacobs Great Day of Trouble, and Deliverance. A Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse, the fifth of August 1607 upon his Majesties deliverance from the Earle Gowries Treason and Conspiracie* (London, 1610; STC 17942); *Prayers and Thankesgiving to bee used by all the Kings Majesties loving Subjects, for the happy deliverance of His Majestie, the Queene, Prince, and States of Parliament, from the most Traiterous and bloody intended Massacre by Gunpowder, the fift of November 1605* (London, 1610; STC 16495); *The Fierie Tryall of Gods Saints ... and The Detestable Ends of Popish Traytors* (London, 1611; STC 24269); as well as another edition of Thomas Heywood's ever-popular *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody; or The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth* (STC 13331). See also: Sara Barker, 'Translating Treason: Printed Accounts of Conspiracies Against Henri IV in France and England', in *Negotiating Conflict and Controversy in the Early Modern Book World*, ed. by Alexander S. Wilkinson and Graeme J. Kemp (Leiden: Brill, 2019), pp. 178–202.

⁶⁹ Jayne E.E. Boys, *London's News Press and the Thirty Years War* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011), pp. 129–137; S.A. Baron, 'Gainsford, Thomas (bap. 1566, d. 1624)', ODNB.

⁷⁰ TNA SP 14/67, fols. 109r–110r; *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, Volume 11: 1607–1610*, ed. and trans. by Horatio F. Brown (London: HMSO, 1904), p. 407 (no. 754); Roy Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales, and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986), pp. 58–60; 'Medici, Eleonora de (1591–1617)', in *Women in World History: A Biographical Encyclopedia*, ed. by Anne Commire (Waterford, CT: Yorkin Publications, 2001), p. 840; and 'A Discourse: Touchinge a Marriage Between Prince Henry of England and a daughter of Savoye', possibly by Sir Walter Raleigh, which in addition to being against the potential marriage (mainly because of the

Given the anti-Catholic sentiments that pervade his works, it seems highly likely that Gainsford would have disapproved of any such match.

As its title suggests, the pamphlet is first and foremost an argument in favour of permanent political union between England and Scotland—even though by the time it was published James had conceded that the Union project was essentially dead.⁷¹ Gainsford's contribution to the Union debates is the only real scholarly attention the pamphlet has received, even though it is an important example of the way that the more recent past was offered as precedent for the present.⁷² According to Gainsford, the reign of Henry VII (and the Union of the Roses) showed that providence used such political events to ensure peace and stability in nations, meaning that it was the will of God that James succeeded to the English throne, and that a permanent political union was the next step in God's plan to assure peace in Britain. In addition, Gainsford also made clear that Elizabeth provided an example for the present, and indeed exhorted James to emulate her behaviour:

Yet must I not forget Elisa's name,
 ... her proudest foes which did her vex:
 Who often did attempt her life to spill,
 Yet had not powre so good a Prince to kil.
 Like Debora she did the truth maintaine,
 No Prince atchiv'd more warlike acts then shee,
 ... Meane while all England thriv'd & prospered well,
 And now her blisse no earthly tongue can tell.⁷³

The use of the analogy here makes explicit the providential favour Elizabeth and England had received, with the Deborah typology not only adding a level of divine support to Elizabeth's 'warlike acts', but also suggesting that by not similarly engaging in such acts, James was not maintaining the 'truth' that England's Deborah had fought so hard to preserve. The death of Henri IV was merely the culmination of multiple attempts by Catholics 'so good a Prince to kil'—a point that applied equally to James as it did Elizabeth.

closeness between Savoy and Spain), advocates for a French marriage. Cambridge Additional MS 9276, item 15 (no foliation). See also: Roy Strong, 'England and Italy: The Marriage of Henry Prince of Wales', in *For Veronica Wedgwood These: Studies in Seventeenth-Century History*, ed. by Richard Ollard and Pamela Tudor-Craig (London: Collins, 1986), pp. 59–87; and Jason C. White, 'Militant Protestants: British Identity in the Jacobean Period, 1603–1625', *History*, 94.314 (2009), pp. 169–172.

⁷¹ Bruce Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603–1608* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1986), p. 137.

⁷² See: Alison Findlay, 'Reshaping Athens in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in *Shakespeare and Greece*, ed. by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), p. 197; Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), pp. 52–53; Sydney Anglo, 'Ill of the dead. The posthumous reputation of Henry VII', *Renaissance Studies*, 1.1 (1987), pp. 33–34; Mark Eccles, 'Thomas Gainsford, "Captain Pamphlet"', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 45.4 (1982), pp. 262–263; and Louis B. Wright, 'The Elizabethan Middle-Class Taste for History', *The Journal of Modern History*, 3.2, (1931), p. 188 n. 28.

⁷³ Thomas Gainsford, *The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seventh, Concerning the Unitie of Great Brittain* (London, 1610; STC 11526), pp. 3–4.

The association between Deborah and Elizabeth seems, at first glance, to have been made in passing. The typology, however, is essential to Gainsford's meaning, as it links the ancient past of the Old Testament to the recent past of Elizabeth's reign, suggesting that these examples from history had ongoing relevance in the present. It also imbued Elizabeth's life with the seal of divine approval, meaning that it was paramount that James maintain England's Protestantism so that the country would continue to thrive and prosper. In dedicating the pamphlet to 'the truly religious and resolute Gentlemen of England', Gainsford was not only exhorting his fellow countrymen to pray that England would not lose the prosperity it had received as a result of a marriage between Prince Henry and a Catholic, but was also emphasising that Elizabeth's providential favour meant that she was an example to be emulated in the present.

The belief that England's Protestant church was under attack, and needed to be defended 'against Satans assaults', is the central message of Thomas Draxe's 1611 treatise, *The Christian Armorie*. A clergyman and sometime Latin translator, Draxe's publications both emphasise the importance of godly, Protestant worship, and exhort his readers to steel themselves to not be 'overtaken with a kinde of spirituall slumber'.⁷⁴ Draxe's desire to educate his readers about the dangers of spiritual slumber—and the effects such slumber had on the state—is made explicit in his *Christian Armorie*. Importantly, these readers encompassed all echelons of society: *The Christian Armorie* is dedicated to 'The Most Gracious and Right Vertuous Princess, the Lady Elizabeth, Daughter to the Kings most Excellent Majestie', perhaps anticipating his recourse to the last Tudor monarch.

The pamphlet, which takes the form of a catechism, is divided into two books. The title page of the second book announced that it contained 'consolations, directions, and remedies against such inward or outward evils, crosses, afflictions, which properly and peculiarly concerne Gods Church and Children'. The sixth chapter of this book is concerned with the temptations of 'tyrants, wicked men, Heretickes, Apostates, Schismatickes, prophane Protestants, [and] false Brethren', showing that he was criticising both Catholics and non-conformist Protestants.⁷⁵ Draxe used the various answers to the questions he posed to offer advice on how to avoid both the offences of, and scandals caused by, such temptations. The chapter increasingly turned to emphasise how such temptations damaged the secular world, especially when non-conformity and non-uniformity led to subversive behaviour, as is made

⁷⁴ Thomas Draxe, *The Churches Securitie, Together with the Antidote or preservative of ever waking Faith* (London, 1608; STC 7183), p. 3; Stephen Wright, 'Draxe, Thomas (d. 1618/19)', ODNB.

⁷⁵ Thomas Draxe, *The Christian Armorie: Wherein Is Contained All manner of spirituall munition, fit for secure Christians to arme themselves withall against Satans assaults, and all other kind of crosses, temptations, troubles, and afflictions* (London, 1611; STC 7182), p. 68 (sig. S2v). What Draxe deems 'profane', however, remains unclear.

clear in the question that asked, ‘How shall good and religious Princes, Peeres, and Potentates comfort themselves, that are grieved at, and troubled with disobedient and disloyall subjects and people?’ The first part of the answer demonstrated the Bible’s use as a guide for the present, with Draxe suggesting that ‘the most rare and renowned kinges and princes, such as were Moses, David, Salomon, and many in our late memory’ provided example for how rulers should deal with disloyalty and disobedience.⁷⁶ Even though Moses was not a monarch, he, like David and Solomon, faced a variety of rebellions and revolts—rebellions that were never successful, thanks to God’s intervention.⁷⁷ That these Old Testament rulers were interchangeable with England’s monarchs is made clear by Draxe’s inclusion of the shorthand, ‘many in our late memory’. Without listing anyone more recent than Solomon, Draxe was implying that the kings of the Old Testament were a part of England’s historical past, meaning that their reigns were just as relevant to the present as they had been to the Israelites.

Draxe then immediately turned to the recent past of Elizabeth’s reign, and depicted the Queen as the embodiment of several Old Testament figures: ‘Queen Elizabeth, our Deborah, our Hester, our Judith ... of incomparable learning & vertues, was as the Moon amongst the lesser starres, had wofull experience.’⁷⁸ Elizabeth may have suffered from the effects of disloyal subjects, but Draxe was keen to emphasise that she was preserved by God, and reigned not only as England’s Deborah, but also as a latter-day Judith and Esther. This triple analogy explains why Elizabeth was ‘the Moon amongst the lesser starres’—that is, she far surpassed her fellow monarchs, as she was the contemporary embodiment of all three of these celebrated biblical figures. The comment on her intellect also recalls a number of important biblical persons, as learning and wisdom, as well as virtue and piety, were associated with godliness and God’s favour.

The message of this question and its answer was clear: if rulers, like James, wanted to have obedient and loyal subjects, they needed to emulate the ‘incomparable’ Elizabeth. James may have been preserved from rebellion and revolt like David and Solomon, but according to Draxe he was still a ‘lesser star’ compared to Elizabeth. Such an implication might be based on the contemporary political situation. In 1610, the fourth session of James’s first English parliament assembled to debate Cecil’s masterpiece of royal fiscal administration, the Great Contract.⁷⁹ After some intense negotiations, MPs largely agreed to the deal, and the summer

⁷⁶ Draxe, *The Christian Armorie*, pp. 92–93 (sigs. T6v–T7r).

⁷⁷ For instance, the revolt of Korah against Moses, which was averted when God sent fire from heaven to consume Korah and all 249 of his co-conspirators. Those who sympathised with Korah, along with the families, were killed when God caused the ground to open to swallow them up. Numbers 16:1–40.

⁷⁸ Draxe, *The Christian Armorie*, p. 93 (sig. T7r).

⁷⁹ Eric Lindquist, ‘The Failure of the Great Contract’, *The Journal of Modern History*, 57.4 (1985), pp. 619–622.

recess began with James feeling more secure in his financial future.⁸⁰ The fifth and final session of the parliament opened in October, and very quickly ran into issues over taxes James was imposing on trade. The Commons were angered by this apparent breach to the agreed terms of the Great Contract, and so declined to continue to support the deal.⁸¹ In frustration, James prorogued parliament on 6 December until 9 February 1611.⁸² He quickly realised that MPs would continue to debate grievances instead of agreeing to grant him supply, so he decided ‘for [the] preventing of further trouble’ to dissolve parliament on 31 December.⁸³ Whether or not the failure of the Great Contract constituted disloyalty or disobedience according to Draxe is unclear, but given that the pamphlet was entered into the Stationers’ Register on 30 March 1611 (which is the same day that the dedication is dated), he would certainly have been aware that its failure was another example of parliament and sovereign coming into conflict.

Draxe’s recourse to Elizabeth here demonstrates the utility of using the past to comprehend the present, but it also suggests that Elizabeth was special or unique, and consequently that her legacy in particular should be emulated. The typologies also hint at the message Draxe wanted his readers to take away: Deborah, Judith, and Esther—like Elizabeth—had defended their people from attack. This was one of the most central roles of any premodern monarch. The failure of the Great Contract saw James largely abandon plans to modernise England’s navy.⁸⁴ As Kevin Sharpe has observed, Elizabeth’s memory served as a ‘nostalgic evocation of English naval prowess and victory’—and no victory was more famous than that of 1588, under England’s Deborah.⁸⁵ Draxe did not conflate James with any biblical figures, and this omission stands in stark contrast to the three typologies he employed to describe Elizabeth’s reign. It seems, therefore, that this section was intended to suggest that the King was a ‘lesser star’ who had yet to outshine the example provided by England’s Deborah.

The Death of Prince Henry and the Palatinate Marriage

On 6 November 1612, Prince Henry, heir to the thrones of the Stuart composite monarchy, died at the age of eighteen—most likely of typhoid fever. Henry was widely regarded as a

⁸⁰ Conrad Russell, *King James VI and I and his English Parliaments: The Trevelyan Lectures Delivered at the University of Cambridge 1995*, ed. by Richard Cust and Andrew Thrush (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 85.

⁸¹ *Proceedings in Parliament, 1610: Volume 2, House of Commons*, ed. by Elizabeth Read Foster (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), pp. 302–305, 327; John Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance under James VI and I, 1603–1625* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2002), p. 108.

⁸² *Proceedings in Parliament, 1610*, pp. 347, 391.

⁸³ *A Proclamation Signifying His Majesties Pleasure for Dissolving the Parliament* (London, 1610; STC 8452), one sheet.

⁸⁴ TNA SP 14/67, fol. 126r.

⁸⁵ Sharpe, *Image Wars*, p. 273.

leader for those who supported a policy of militant Protestantism (in contrast to his father), and his death was seen as a devastating blow to the cause in both England and on the continent.⁸⁶ The Prince was widely mourned, and his death led to an outpouring of lamentatory verses, sermons, and poems.⁸⁷ In addition to causing his younger brother, Charles, to become the new heir, his death also overshadowed the celebrations leading up to what was seen to be the crowning achievement in James's plans for ensuring confessional harmony in Europe: the wedding of his daughter, Princess Elizabeth, to Frederick V, Elector Palatinate of the Rhine.

Elizabeth and Frederick's wedding was 'an occasion of unique cultural importance', and the accompanying celebrations were the most significant and spectacular of James's reign.⁸⁸ James had sought to use the marriages of his children to secure his place as a peacemaker in European confessional conflicts: Henry, and then Charles, were intended for a Catholic princess, with Elizabeth married to a Protestant. Choosing a Protestant husband for Elizabeth was difficult, given both the limited number of Protestant princes of high enough status for the daughter of a king, as well as Anna's own widespread familial connections (marriages with both Denmark-Norway and Sweden, the main Protestant kingdoms outside Britain, were ruled out). On the Palatinate side, interest in a marriage with Elizabeth had begun almost immediately upon James's accession to the English throne, and it became formal Palatinate policy in 1608.⁸⁹ James was less convinced of the merits of the marriage, but his stance changed after the announcement of the double marriage between the French and Spanish monarchies in 1611.⁹⁰ He became convinced of the benefits of Elizabeth marrying the nominal head of the continental Protestant league, and the marriage contract was agreed on 26 May 1612—in spite of Queen Anna's disapproval.⁹¹

⁸⁶ See: Timothy Wilks, 'The Pike Charged: Henry as Militant Prince', in *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England*, ed. by Timothy Wilks (London: Paul Holberton and Southampton Solent University, 2007), pp. 180–211.

⁸⁷ See: Adrian Streete, 'Elegy, Prophecy, and Politics: Literary Responses to the Death of Prince Henry Stuart, 1612–1614', *Renaissance Studies*, 31.1 (2017), pp. 87–106; J.W. Williamson, *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart: A Study of 17th Century Personation* (New York: AMS Press, 1978), pp. 149–193; and Elkin Calhoun Wilson, *Prince Henry and English Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1946), pp. 128–176.

⁸⁸ Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, 'The Palatinate Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival. An Introduction', in *The Palatinate Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival*, ed. by Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013), p. 13.

⁸⁹ Smart and Wade, 'The Palatinate Wedding of 1613', p. 42.

⁹⁰ Louis XIII was betrothed to Infanta Anne of Austria (daughter of Philip III), and the future Philip IV was betrothed to Princess Elisabeth, daughter of Henri IV. Smart and Wade, 'The Palatinate Wedding of 1613', pp. 42–44.

⁹¹ Some of Anna's disapproval has been attributed to her displeasure at her daughter not marrying a king (or a future king). However, as the sovereign ruler of an important territory with his own royal pedigree, as well as being the most senior of the prince-electors of the Empire, he was certainly an eligible prospect. Upon meeting Frederick, however, Anna forgot her previous reticence and 'looked favourably on him'. *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of*

Frederick arrived in England on 16 October, and was welcomed by a variety of lavish entertainments. Following Henry's death on 6 November, the court went into mourning, but the wedding could not be postponed for too long. Elizabeth and Frederick were eventually married on 14 February 1613 in the royal chapel at Whitehall.⁹² The wedding was a splendid display of the power and prestige of the Stuart regime, which was particularly visible in the large number of European royals who attended the wedding and visited the court. The marriage was very popular in England, especially as it was viewed as evidence of James's preparing to intervene in wars on the continent on behalf of Protestants, and it too led to the publication of numerous tracts celebrating the match.⁹³

Between Prince Henry's death and the dissolution of the short-lived 'Addled' Parliament in June 1614, a variety of commentators used Elizabeth analogies critique the present religio-political situation. These tracts, which were undoubtedly influenced by both Henry's death and the Palatinate wedding, used the example of Elizabeth's reign to advise on how England's contemporary religio-political situation should be remedied.

Prince Henry's death, coupled with a fear of the growing threat of Catholicism, was evidently at the forefront of Daniel Price's mind when he preached *David His Oath of Allegiance to Jerusalem* in Oxford in July 1613.⁹⁴ Price, who was one of Prince Henry's chaplains and the future Dean of Hereford, used Psalm 137:5—'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning'—to lament that the English had forgotten God's many blessings towards them, meaning they would be punished unless immediate action was taken.⁹⁵ That this warning was intended for all levels of English society is made clear in the dedication to Prince Charles, especially as Price was concerned that Charles's marriage to a Catholic might bring God's punishment upon England.

Northern Italy, Volume 12: 1610–1613, ed. and trans. by Horatio F. Brown (London: HMSO, 1905), p. 443 (no. 680).

⁹² Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603–42* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1981), pp. 95, 97.

⁹³ See: Lee Piepho, 'Making the Impossible Dream: Latin, Print, and the Marriage of Frederick V and the Princess Elizabeth', *Reformation*, 14.1 (2009), pp. 127–159; Kevin Curran, 'James I and Fictional Authority at the Palatine Wedding Celebrations', *Renaissance Studies*, 20.1 (2006), pp. 51–67; Kevin Chovanec, 'The British Pharaoh?: James I and VI and Internationalist Religious Writing at the Wedding of Friedrich V and Elizabeth Stuart', *The Seventeenth Century*, 30.4 (2015), pp. 391–409; Rebecca Calcagno, 'A Matter of Precedence: Britain, Germany, and the Palatinate Match', in *The Palatinate Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival*, ed. by Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013), pp. 243–266; Francis A. Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), pp. 1–23; and Adam Marks, 'Recognizing Friends from Foes: Stuart Politics, English Military Networks and Alliances with Denmark and the Palatinate', in *Stuart Marriage Diplomacy: Dynastic Politics in the European Context, 1604–1630* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2018), pp. 180–181.

⁹⁴ It was preached on Act Sunday, and the dedication is dated 27 July.

⁹⁵ P.E. McCullough, 'Price, Daniel (1581–1631)', *ODNB*.

The sermon is essentially a diatribe against Catholicism, and had a twofold purpose: to defend the Oath of Allegiance, and to warn of the increasing threat of Catholicism. The ungratefulness for God's blessings about which Price was worried would be especially evident if Charles were to abandon the fight against popery and marry a Catholic. He exhorted the Prince in the dedicatory epistle to 'Let no Popish Philistin come neere the chaire, much lesse, the eare of your greatnesse, to disgrace truth, or wrong faith'.⁹⁶

In order to emphasise what England stood to lose if God withdrew His favour, Price turned to the recent past of Elizabeth's reign, seeking to underscore both the providential nature of England's deliverances, and to link England with the Israelites. In doing so, Price depicted Elizabeth as a latter-day Deborah. He recalled how

the Paragon of mortall Princes, Debora the woman after Gods own heart,⁹⁷ the virgin Queene of the earth ... like unto whom wee never had king or Queene before her; Elizabeth lived, & like a gracious mother daily blessed us: ... all of us [were] blessed by Peace within her wals ... by that noble Progresse of Religion, within all her kingdome, all her time. But we forgot this, and therefore when Nature had given her fulnesse of daies ... Debora deceased, and how soone was shee forgotten!⁹⁸

Elizabeth, England's Deborah, had both ensured the peace of the realm, and had been responsible for England's Reformation. In spite of this indisputable evidence of God's favour, and her unparalleled tenure as queen, Price believed that in the years since Elizabeth's death, the English—seemingly out of complacency—had forgotten to continue the fight that Elizabeth had begun. To Price's mind, God sent a wake-up call to England, with this forgetting of England's blessings blamed for Prince Henry's untimely death: 'we forgot to be thankfull to God, that had given such a Prince to men: our unthankfulnes slew him, ... Religion wept, vertue bled at his death & the Christian world was ready to expire'.⁹⁹ Emphasising Henry's (perceived) role at the head of the European militant Protestants, Price interpreted the Prince's death as punishment for the failure of the English to continue the example of Elizabeth—which perhaps also explains his emphasis on the proper administering of the Oath of Allegiance.

Henry's death may have been devastating for both England and the Protestant cause, but all was not yet lost. The deaths of 'renowned Q. Elizabeth, and blessed P. Henry' were a clear warning: 'not a worm or moath upon us, but a viper hanging on our hand, an embleme

⁹⁶ Daniel Price, *David His Oath of Allegiance to Jerusalem. The Sermon Preached on Act Sunday last in the morning, in St. Maries in Oxford* (Oxford, 1613; STC 20291), sig. *2v.

⁹⁷ A reference to 1 Samuel 13:14 and Acts 13:22, where David is described as 'a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfil all my will.'

⁹⁸ Price, *David His Oath of Allegiance*, p. 15.

⁹⁹ Price, *David His Oath of Allegiance*, p. 16.

of our destruction'.¹⁰⁰ It was therefore possible for England to avoid its potential destruction by emulating the example of England's Deborah: for Price, this meant Charles not marrying a Catholic and the Oath of Allegiance being properly administered. The Deborah typology emphasised the providential favour England had received under Elizabeth: like Deborah, Elizabeth had been sent by God to the English to defend against 'the Divell and the Pope', and it was imperative that the English continue the work of England's Deborah, 'the Paragon of mortall Princes'.

Daniel Price's associating of Prince Henry's death and the growing threat of Catholicism was shared by his brother Sampson Price, who was concerned that the Prince's death had all but stopped England's advancement of the Protestant cause. Like Daniel, Sampson was one of Prince Henry's chaplains, and he had been the almoner at Henry's funeral.¹⁰¹ He preached *Londons Warning by Laodicea's Luke-warmnesse* at St Paul's Cross on Sunday 10 October 1613. The sermon was entered into the Stationers' Register only four days later—on 14 October—suggesting that Price was keen to have his warning disseminated quickly and widely. The sermon was against Catholic toleration, and called for the adoption of a more militant Protestantism by James.

To illustrate his point, Price turned to the warnings to the seven churches of Asia in Revelation 3. The Laodicean Church is the last of the seven discussed, and it was castigated for being 'neither cold nor hot', with God declaring 'I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.'¹⁰² The exact meaning of this injunction has been long debated, but it is generally agreed that the 'lukewarmnesse' critiqued the Laodiceans' lacklustre or complacent faith, and was thus a call for them to 'wake up' lest Christ abandon them because of their lack of zeal. Indeed, in the 1610s and 1620s, a variety of preachers and commentators warned that England's lukewarm response to the plight of Protestantism in Europe risked incurring the same fate as the Laodiceans.¹⁰³ Revelation 3 also warned against the city's focus on monetary wealth at the

¹⁰⁰ Price, *David His Oath of Allegiance*, p. 17.

¹⁰¹ Nicholas W.S. Cranfield, 'Price, Sampson (1585/6–1630)', ODNB.

¹⁰² Revelation 3:15–16.

¹⁰³ See, for instance: John Fowler, *A Shield of Defence Against the Arrows of Schisme Shot abroad by Jean de L'escluse in his advertisement against Mr. Brightman* (Amsterdam, 1612; STC 11212); Daniel Dyke, *The Mystery of Selfe-deceiving. Or A Discourse and discovery of the deceitfullnesse of Mans Heart* (London, 1614; STC 7398); Samuel Ward, *A Coal from the Altar, to Kindle the holy fire of Zeale. In a Sermon preached at a generall Visitation at Ipswich* (London, 1615; STC 25039); Thomas Sutton, *Englands First and Second Summons* (London, 1616; STC 23502); and Robert Whittle, *The Way to the Celestiall Paradise. Declaring how a Sinner may be saved, and come to life everlasting* (London, 1620; STC 25441). It was also, however, an older trope used by hotter Protestants who were unhappy with the Elizabethan settlement. See: Alexandra Walsham, 'History, Memory, and the English Reformation', *The Historical Journal*, 55.4 (2012), pp. 923–925.

expense of spiritual wealth—an apt parallel for England's financial centre.¹⁰⁴ The warning to Laodicea ends with the injunction, 'I rebuke and chasten: be zealous therefore, and repent', and this message is central to Price's sermon.¹⁰⁵

To Price's mind, God had blessed the English for their Protestantism, and he used part of the sermon to offer examples from the past (both recent and biblical) to shake the English out of their 'lukewarmnesse'. One such example was the reign of Elizabeth, which Price believed had been forgotten:

What damnable slanders have they not put upon our late Sovereigne, blessed Queene Elizabeth: they have it from their Father, Parsons, I had almost said, the Divell; for who else could breathe out such impostumate detractions against her, who was the ... Myrrour of Majestie, whom all Protestant Generations shall ever call blessed.¹⁰⁶

Even though Parsons had died in 1610, Price was convinced that Parsons's besmirching of Elizabeth's legacy undermined England's Protestantism. Parsons, in Price's mind, was the devil incarnate, and thus needed to be refuted. Nevertheless, in spite of Parsons's hope that Elizabeth would be overthrown, the Catholics failed, because Elizabeth was blessed by God:

In Israel, untill 1 Deborah came up, they chose new Gods, under whose government all this Kingdome ... lived in such peace and plenty, in such obedience to God and her, and in such love one to another. She was a woman after Gods owne heart, shee led his people like a Flocke 45. yeeres through a Wildernesse of many distressfull dangers; ... and notwithstanding all the roarings of the Bulls ... [and their] conspiracies, [and] rebellions ... she lived to out-live the malice of her enemies, and dyed in peace.¹⁰⁷

Price has conflated Elizabeth and Deborah—the two are interchangeable. Elizabeth, like Deborah, had led her people through many different dangers, but was favoured by God for her faith, and was protected from any and all attempts to overthrow or kill her. The transition from biblical history to recent history is seamless, with the typology viewed as being a perfect fit for Elizabeth. England's Deborah had been responsible for the nation's 'peace and plenty', and was consequently an example to be emulated in the present. Price therefore exhorted his audience to

Let the zeale of these provoke us, least they get ground of us in their bad cause: it is good to be zealous in a good cause ... There is none that reproacheth thee for zeale in Religion, but brandeth himselfe with the sinne of luke-warmnesse, and here hee may see his punishment.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ Revelation 3:17: 'Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked'.

¹⁰⁵ Revelation 3:19.

¹⁰⁶ Sampson Price, *London's Warning by Laodicea's Luke-warmnesse. Or A Sermon Preached at Pauls-crosse, the 10. of October, 1613* (London, 1613; STC 20333), p. 48.

¹⁰⁷ Price, *London's Warning by Laodicea's Luke-warmnesse*, pp. 48–49.

¹⁰⁸ Price, *London's Warning by Laodicea's Luke-warmnesse*, p. 49.

Embracing the zeal of England's Deborah was therefore the only way to avoid the sin of 'luke-warmnesse'. In a warning that would have been alarming to the Jacobean regime, Price claimed that a Protestant could never be too zealous, and that it was indeed better to be overly zealous in order to avert any potential punishment from God for religious complacency.

That the need to defend Protestantism was an ongoing requirement—especially by rebuffing calls for Catholic toleration—is made clear near the end of the sermon. According to Price:

It was the defence of Religion, that made David, Salomon, Josias, Constantine, Edward the 6, Queene Elizabeth, and our late blessed Prince Henry so honoured, that their names amongst all true hearted Protestants, are like a precious oyntment ... It is this that must honour you all. Remember, that to whom much is given, of them much shall be required. Wee of this Land have beene a long time the trees of the Lords Vineyard, ... [and] we must bring forth good fruit to benefit others.¹⁰⁹

In addition to the conspicuous absence of James here, Price emphasised the interchangeability of past and present, depicting Elizabeth and Prince Henry as the most recent incarnations in a linked chain of providentially favoured biblical and historical reforming figures. This connection made explicit that the warning to the Laodiceans was written not just for them, but also for the English, while at the same time offering a clear example for how to rectify the issue of England's lacklustre commitment to Protestantism. For Price, James needed to take up the mantle of his son, and emulate the example of England's Deborah to defend and advance Protestantism at home (by refusing calls for Catholic toleration) and abroad—a point all the more prescient given the outbreak again of fighting as part of the War of the Jülich Succession, which pitted Protestants against Catholics.¹¹⁰ In the conclusion of his sermon, Price declared, 'Defend Religion, and the Lord will fight for you, and defend you all'. In order for England to continue to enjoy the peace it had become so accustomed to, James needed to go on the offensive on behalf of Protestantism—just as England's Deborah had.

The fear of Catholicism, especially in the form of a Spanish marriage, was a staple of tracts published after Henry's death. Like Sampson Price, commentators continued to claim that the most effective way to address this 'threat' was to return to the policies of Elizabeth, which were viewed as an example of true godliness. This claim is a theme of John Norden's *A Load-Starre to Spirituall Life*, which contains thirty-seven chapters on the duty of the English to pray faithfully to God. Norden is most famous for his cartographic and surveying works, but

¹⁰⁹ Price, *Londons Warning by Laodicea's Luke-warmnesse*, pp. 55–56. Sirach/Ecclesiasticus 49:1: 'The remembrance of Josias is like the composition of the perfume that is made by the art of the apothecary: it is sweet as honey in all mouths, and as musick at a banquet of wine.'

¹¹⁰ See: Calvin F. Senning, *Spain, Rumor, and Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Jacobean England: The Palatine Match, Cleves, and the Armada Scares of 1612–1613 and 1614* (New York: Routledge, 2019), pp. 240–241, 245–247.

he also wrote a number of devotional tracts. Norden received preferment from a variety of members of both the Elizabethan and Jacobean regimes, including Burghley, Cecil, Sir Robert Carr (the future Earl of Somerset), and Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex. As Frank Kitchen has observed, the income from Norden's surveying work was patchy, so his devotional texts were written with an eye to marketability and contemporary relevance.¹¹¹ In 1596, for example, in the aftermath of the failed second Spanish Armada and the Spanish raid on Cornwall in August 1595 that had resulted in the celebration of a Catholic mass on English soil, Norden had emphasised England's providential favour, and had compared Elizabeth to Judith for her defence of England.¹¹² *A Load-Starre to Spirituall Life* also seems to be intended to capture the religio-political moment. The dedication is dated 24 June 1614, meaning that it was penned just over two weeks after James dissolved the so-called Addled Parliament for refusing to impose new taxes—it had only assembled on 5 April, and no bills were passed. With no taxes passed, James needed to find a new way to service his debt, and he quickly reopened marriage negotiations with the Spanish, anticipating that the Infanta's dowry of £600,000 would almost make the crown solvent.¹¹³ In addition, the death of Prince Henry still loomed over Norden: perhaps spurred on by the possibility that Prince Charles would marry a Catholic, one of Norden's chapters is called 'The death of the late Prince is not lightly to bee forgotten, nor our general praiera for his Maiestie and royall issue to bee neglected publicquely and in private'.

Chapter twenty-one of *A Load-Starre to Spirituall Life* is titled 'Englands many blessings and deliveries are not so duely considered, nor so thankfully embraced as they ought, being too much ascribed to humane & carnall meanes, which breedes ingratitude and securitie.'¹¹⁴ Perhaps unsurprisingly, this is the chapter in which Elizabeth features most prominently. For Norden, the many deliveries of England under Elizabeth were proof of God's favour:

Queene Elizabeths many and strange deliveries ... [including the] admirable overthrow of the Spanish invincible-reputed Navie; [and] the discovery of so many plots and complotments of treasons and conspiracies; were they by chance, or was God the Author of them? Indeed some have endeavoured to ascribe the praise to carnall meanes, and to rob God of the honor thereof, by attributing ... the overthrow of the Spanish Navie to our owne arme, ... [but] it was God that gave the means, and blessed them for our safetie.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ Frank Kitchen, 'Norden, John (c.1547–1625)', ODNB.

¹¹² John Norden, *A Christian Familiar Comfort and Incouragement unto all English Subjects, not to dismaie at the Spanish threats* (London, 1596; STC 18604), pp. 37–38; Aidan Norrie, 'Elizabeth I as Judith: Reassessing the Apocryphal Widow's Appearance in Elizabethan Royal Iconography', *Renaissance Studies*, 31.5 (2017), pp. 719–721.

¹¹³ Andrew Thrush, 'The Parliaments of 1604–1629', in *The House of Commons, 1604–1629*, ed. by Andrew Thrush (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. xl–xliii.

¹¹⁴ John Norden, *A Load-Starre to Spirituall Life. Or, A Christian Familiar motive to the most sweet and heavenly exercise of Divine Prayer. With Prayers for Morning and Evening. Written to stir up all men to watchfulnesse and reformation of their carnall and corrupt lives* (London, 1614; STC 18612), p. 149.

¹¹⁵ Norden, *A Load-Starre to Spirituall Life*, pp. 150–151.

As Elizabeth's reign showed, the English needed to be constantly thankful to God for their many preservations. After all, as Norden reminded his readers, 'nothing cometh to passe by chance, or at adventure, but by God, who worketh all.'¹¹⁶

Norden, however, did not leave his warning there, and he concluded the chapter by invoking two biblical analogies:

Are the mercies of God rightly considered, and duly weighed in giving us our good Josiah, worthiest King James, for establishing him in the steed of our deceased Deborah, & with and in him the use and continuance of true religion, and that without bloud?¹¹⁷

The use of the Josiah typology to describe James's reign is rather unusual: a boy-king, Josiah restored the proper worship of Yahweh and the Temple at Jerusalem, which is why the typology was more commonly associated with Edward VI. Norden may have been utilising the alliterative connection between Josiah and James, but it seems more likely that he was seeking to warn James against disobeying God. Josiah was killed after engaging the Egyptian pharaoh Necho II in battle. Necho had intended to 'fight against Charchemish by Euphrates'—probably the Hittites—and so marched his army past Judah.¹¹⁸ Josiah sent out troops to meet Necho, but Necho sent ambassadors to Josiah to tell him, 'I come not against thee this day, but against the house wherewith I have war: for God commanded me to make haste: forbear thee from meddling with God, who is with me, that he destroy thee not.'¹¹⁹ Josiah, however, 'would not turn his face from him, but disguised himself, that he might fight with him, and hearkened not unto the words of Necho from the mouth of God'.¹²⁰ While fighting, Josiah was mortally wounded by arrows, and he was taken back to Jerusalem where he died. Given this story, Josiah's death was generally understood as being the result of his failure to listen to the word of God. Making full use of the Josiah typology seems to have served Norden's didactic purpose: James was at present ensuring the true worship of God, and was thus in receipt of His blessings, but he must continue to listen to God's word (which included not marrying Charles to a Catholic princess), lest he lose the providential favour that had thus far kept him safe. This reading of the Josiah typology is complemented by Norden's use of the Deborah typology for Elizabeth: after Deborah's death, the Hebrews fell into idolatry and were subjugated by the Midianites. In a tense religio-political climate, in both England and Europe more widely, Norden, like both Daniel and Sampson Price the year

¹¹⁶ Norden, *A Load-Starre to Spirituall Life*, p. 154.

¹¹⁷ Norden, *A Load-Starre to Spirituall Life*, pp. 156–157.

¹¹⁸ 2 Chronicles 35:20.

¹¹⁹ 2 Chronicles 35:21.

¹²⁰ 2 Chronicles 35:22.

before, was attempting to warn the English of the great danger that came from forgetting God's mercy, declaring that it is 'impious ... to affirme that these dangers have beene prevented, and our deliveries wrought by chaunce, without Gods providence and working.'¹²¹ That this warning was intended for everyone in England is underscored by the pamphlet's second dedication to 'the Christian Reader'.¹²²

The remedy for the situation Norden has described was clear, however. He exhorted his readers to 'repent, let us turn unto God and humble our selves ... in a true and religious conversion, in faith & prayer unfained.'¹²³ To illustrate this point, Norden relied heavily on the memory of Elizabeth's many providential deliveries. Indeed, the pamphlet's title may have been a deliberate attempt to suggest a connection to Elizabeth: as Peter McClure and Robin Headlam Wells have shown, Elizabeth was frequently described as a star both during and after her reign, and in a lamentation published at her death, she is directly called 'our Load-starre'.¹²⁴ In acknowledging that the Queen had been a Deborah, Norden emphasised both the way that Elizabeth had been sent to the English to protect them against expansionist Catholics, and the importance of using the Bible as a tool for understanding the present. The Josiah typology for James hints at Norden's fears for the future, but his recourse to the English Deborah typology suggests that like many commentators discussed in this chapter, he had a clear vision for how the situation could be remedied.

Elizabeth, The Bohemian Crisis, and the Thirty Years' War

On 23 May 1618, Jaroslav Martinitz and Wilhelm Slavata, regents of Ferdinand of Styria, the Bohemian king-elect and future Emperor Ferdinand II, and their secretary, Philip Fabricus, were thrown out of the windows of the Bohemian Chancellery by Protestant lords in what is now the most famous Defenestration of Prague.¹²⁵ This event ignited the Bohemian Revolt, which itself culminated in the outbreak of the 'Thirty Years' War. In 1618, the King of Bohemia was the elderly and childless Matthias of Austria. Matthias was generally tolerant of Protestantism, and had been behind Emperor Rudolf II's granting of religious tolerance in Bohemia in the 1609 Letter of Majesty.¹²⁶ In contrast, Matthias's cousin Ferdinand of Styria—

¹²¹ Norden, *A Load-Starre to Spirituall Life*, p. 165.

¹²² The first dedication is to Sir Julius Caesar, James's Chancellor of the Exchequer and a Privy Councillor.

¹²³ Norden, *A Load-Starre to Spirituall Life*, p. 166.

¹²⁴ Peter McClure and Robin Headlam Wells, 'Elizabeth I as a Second Virgin Mary', *Renaissance Studies*, 4.1 (1990), pp. 48–49; *The Poore Lamentation for the Death of our late dread Sovereigne the High and Mightie Princesse Elizabeth, late Queene of England, France and Ireland* (London, 1603; STC 7594), sig. B2r.

¹²⁵ Geoff Mortimer, *The Origins of the Thirty Years War and the Revolt in Bohemia, 1618* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 140–142.

¹²⁶ Zdenek V. David, 'Utraquists, Lutherans, and the Bohemian Confession of 1575', *Church History*, 68.2 (1999), p. 336.

who was designated as his successor, and duly elected crown prince of Bohemia (meaning he would automatically succeed Matthias) by the Bohemian estates in 1617—was a staunch supporter of the Counter-Reformation.¹²⁷ The Revolt spread to all of the Bohemian lands, and continued after Matthias's death in March 1619. Ferdinand was elected Holy Roman Emperor as his cousin's successor, and was therefore able to call on the assistance of Philip III of Spain to help defeat the Protestant rebels.¹²⁸ The Bohemians, desperate for assistance against the superior military might of the Emperor, turned to Frederick V, Elector Palatine, for help. In return for his help, the Bohemians promised to elect him king in place of Ferdinand, doing so in August 1619.¹²⁹ Turning to Frederick had the effect of drawing England into the Bohemian cause, given that Frederick's father-in-law was James VI & I.

It was widely believed that the outcome of the Bohemian Revolt would determine the fate of Protestantism in Europe. Against this backdrop, and given the links between England and Bohemia, James was increasingly pressured into supporting the Bohemian Protestants. Commentators quickly associated the Bohemian Crisis with Elizabeth's support of Dutch Protestants against the Spanish, with Elizabeth's intervention on behalf of the Dutch offered as precedent for the contemporary crisis. The interchangeability of the two situations can be found in a variety of tracts, but is neatly suggested by Dabridgcourt Belchier's neglected play, *Hans Beer-Pot*. First performed c.1616, *Hans Beer-Pot* was entered into the Stationers' Register on 3 June 1618.¹³⁰ The play, first and foremost, was written largely to entertain the soldiers stationed in Utrecht who were tasked with keeping the peace in the area after violence had recently erupted between the Calvinists and Arminians.¹³¹ Reflecting contemporary religious-political concerns, however, many characters in the play express nostalgic longing for the 'glory days' of Anglo-Dutch relations during Elizabeth's reign.¹³² Like Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon*, much of this nostalgia is tied up with ideas of militant (and triumphal) Protestantism—a point made all the more overt by the inclusion of the character Abnidaraes Quixot, who describes himself as 'A Spaniard, Moore, halfe Turke, halfe Christian', and who serves little purpose except to remind the audience of the looming Spanish threat.¹³³ That past

¹²⁷ Mortimer, *The Origins of the Thirty Years War*, pp. 127–128.

¹²⁸ Mortimer, *The Origins of the Thirty Years War*, pp. 178–179.

¹²⁹ Mortimer, *The Origins of the Thirty Years War*, pp. 165–166.

¹³⁰ Matthew Steggle, 'Belchier, Dabridgcourt (*bap.* 1581, *d.* 1621)', *ODNB*. The dedication to Sir John Ogle, the Governor of Utrecht, is dated 14 November 1617.

¹³¹ Scott Oldenburg, *Alien Albion: Literature and Immigration in Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), p. 173.

¹³² George Evans Light, 'All Hopped Up: Beer, Cultivated National Identity, and Anglo-Dutch Relations, 1524–1625', *Journal x*, 2.2 (1998), p. 169; Oldenburg, *Alien Albion*, p. 174.

¹³³ Oldenburg, *Alien Albion*, p. 174; Lisa Hopkins, *Greeks and Trojans on the Early Modern English Stage* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020), p. 53.

and present are interchangeable is emphasised by the fact that despite the decades that had elapsed, the Catholic threat remained.

One aspect of the past that remains especially relevant for the characters of *Hans Beer-Pot* is Elizabeth's reign. Early in the play Cornelius, one of the main characters, tells his wife, Hanneke:

To thinke upon the times forepast, I saw
In Englands Court so famous and renownde [sic]
Of great Elizaes blessed memory.
That ayded so these troubled Netherlands
With men and money.¹³⁴

Cornelius's comment here emphasises the way that Elizabeth's 'blessed memory' was increasingly conflated with militant Protestantism, and it neatly encapsulates the logic behind pushing James to intervene in Bohemia: just as Elizabeth had been favoured by providence for helping defend Dutch Protestants from Spanish Catholics, so should James assure his favour by helping Bohemian Protestants against Spanish-supported Catholics. The Bohemian Revolt and the 'Thirty Years' War would dominate religio-political discourse for the rest of James's reign, and many of the Elizabeth analogies drawn during this period seem to be acutely conscious of this contemporary relevance.

Hans Beer-Pot's depiction of the relationship between England and Dutch Protestants sought to advocate for militaristic intervention on behalf of continental Protestantism; likewise, the links between the Palatinate, Bohemia, and England were accentuated in the lead up to, and the aftermath of, Frederick's election as the King of Bohemia. These links, Lisa Hopkins has argued, meant that writers and dramatists sought to depict the Palatinate (and also Bohemia) as a *quasi*-colony of England, an exclave that England needed to support and defend.¹³⁵ If Protestants in the Palatinate and Bohemia needed defending from the threat of Catholicism, it is perhaps unsurprising that the crisis revived memories of England's most recent deliverance from the machinations of Catholics: the Gunpowder Plot.¹³⁶

¹³⁴ Dabridgcourt Belchier, *Hans Beer-Pot, His Invisible Comedie, Of See me, and See me not* (London, 1618; STC 1803), sig. B4r.

¹³⁵ Hopkins, *Greeks and Trojans*, pp. 17, 81, 91–92.

¹³⁶ A variety of pamphlets, mainly sermons, from 1618 and 1619 dwelt on the foiling of the Gunpowder Plot. See, for instance: Richard Fowns, *Trisagion. Or, The Three Holy Offices of Jesus Christ, the Sonne of God, Priestly, Prophetically, and Regall, how they ought of all his Church to be received* (London, 1618; STC 11216); Samuel Garey, *Great Britains little Calendar: Or, Triple Diarie, In remembrance of three daies. Divided into three Treatises. ... 3. Amphitheatrum Scelerum: or, The Transcendent of Rreason: the day of a most admirable deliverance of our King ... from that most horrible and bellish project of the Gun-Powder Treason* (London, 1618; STC 11597); Thomas Adams, *The Happines of the Church. Or, A Description of those Spirituall Prerogatives wherewith Christ hath endowed her* (London, 1619; STC 121); Stephen Denison, *The New Creature. A Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse, January 17. 1619* (London, 1619; STC 6607); and John King, *A Sermon of Publicke Thanks-giving for the happie recoverie of his Majestie from his late dangerous sicknesse* (London, 1619; STC 14983).

Thomas Taylor, a non-separating puritan, had preached five sermons ‘on occasion of the Gunpowder Treason’—possibly in Watford or Reading, where he often preached between 1608 and 1625.¹³⁷ It is unclear how soon after the Plot that the sermons were preached, but as Taylor references the ‘Catholike crueltie ... as his Majestie calles it, in his speech, 1605’, he evidently had access to the printed version of James’s speech to parliament delivered on 9 November 1605.¹³⁸ It is possible that the sermons were preached in consecutive years on the anniversary of the Plot, but Taylor makes clear that by 1619, the sermons had been ‘preached many yeares asunder’.¹³⁹ Taylor, however, had finally been convinced by Reading publisher and clergyman William Jemmat to allow the sermons to be printed.¹⁴⁰ The memory of the Gunpowder Plot seems to have been relevant to the crisis in Bohemia, with Taylor implying that recent events were what ‘drew out at last my consent’ for the sermons to be published. The pamphlet’s preface is dated 12 October 1619, and it was entered into the Stationers’ Register on 27 October—less than two months after Frederick’s election as King of Bohemia on 26 August, and only weeks after he accepted the crown on 28 September.¹⁴¹ Frederick, and the members of the Protestant Union, knew that this course of action would lead to war with the Habsburgs, but Frederick believed that his election was ‘the special providence and predestination of God’, and that it was his duty to defend the Bohemians against the evils of Catholicism.¹⁴² For many Jacobean, few things exemplified the evils of Catholicism like the Gunpowder Plot, and the memory of the event was clearly being repurposed to create support for the Protestant cause in Bohemia.

In addition to the crisis in Bohemia, the sermons may also have been intended to capitalise on the frustration surrounding James’s order for the non-enforcement of English anti-Catholic penal laws in order to appease the Spanish during the marriage negotiations.¹⁴³ The pamphlet’s epistle reminded readers ‘how insatiable’ the ‘pompous Harlot, the Church of

¹³⁷ J. Sears McGee, ‘Taylor, Thomas (1576–1632)’, ODNB; James, *Poets, Players, and Preachers*, p. 337 n. 93.

¹³⁸ Thomas Taylor, *A Mappe of Rome: Lively Exhibiting Her Mercilesse Meeknesse, and cruell mercies to the Church of God: Preached in five Sermons, on occasion of the Gunpowder Treason* (London, 1619; STC 23837), p. 36. For instance, in his speech, James decried ‘the crueltie of the Plot it selfe’, the ‘fearefull crueltie of their Device’, and ‘the cruell fourme of that practise’. James VI & I, *His Majesties Speech in this last Session of Parliament as neere his very words as could be gathered at the instant* (London, 1605; STC 14392), sig. B2v.

¹³⁹ Taylor, *A Mappe of Rome*, sig. A4v. James claims that the sermons were preached in 1612, but provides no evidence for such a dating. James, *Poets, Players, and Preachers*, p. 202.

¹⁴⁰ In his ‘Authors Apologie’, Taylor claimed ‘But the opportunity of the Publisher, who hath taken paines in them, and of some others desirous of them, drew out at last my consent to their request’ to have them printed (sig. A4v).

¹⁴¹ Brennan C. Pursell, *The Winter King: Frederick V of the Palatinate and the Coming of the Thirty Years’ War* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 80.

¹⁴² Letter of Frederick to the Bohemian Estates, 14/24 September 1619, quoted in Pursell, *The Winter King*, p. 79. As Geoff Mortimer has observed, Frederick’s acceptance of his election ‘was the key turning point, the step which meant that there was truly no way back.’ Mortimer, *The Origins of the Thirty Years War*, p. 165.

¹⁴³ Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 58.

Rome ... hath alwaies beene of ... English blood', which meant that it was inconceivable that the English would 'dreame of any toleration, much lesse any sound reconciliation with so implacable an enemye.'¹⁴⁴ These views are a clear background to the sermons, although the epistle was written by the publisher, William Jemmat—not Taylor, as scholars have incorrectly claimed.¹⁴⁵ It therefore seems that the intersection of the Bohemian crisis, the ongoing negotiations for the Spanish match, and the general non-enforcement of anti-Catholic penal laws were the catalyst for the publication of Taylor's sermons. The contemporary relevance of the sermons is also attested in their evident popularity: they were reprinted in 1620, 1634, and 1659.

The fifth of Taylor's sermons, called 'The English Gratulation', emphasised the recent English past. The biblical text for the sermon was Psalm 126:3 ('The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we rejoyce'), which Taylor used in order to assess the blessings England had received because of its Protestantism.¹⁴⁶ In turning to sixteenth-century England, Taylor claimed that because of 'the unthankfulnesse of this land', 'in the daies of Queene Mary this great work of God was interrupted'.¹⁴⁷ Nevertheless, and despite the burning of many martyrs, 'God had no delight in that bloody Religion: It is as great a worke of mercie ... that he made it as short as bloody'. God, who had already 'done great things for us', now performed 'a greater worke' and raised up

our ancient Deborah of England, never-dying Elizabeth, the wonder of the world ... who quickly quenched those hot and furious fires, and her selfe being brought from a prisoner to a mightie Prince ... What great workes God did for her, and us in her time, were too long to recite: how she out-stood the curses and Bulls of the Romish Nebuchadnezzar ... how wonderfull her many deliverances were, from many hellish treasons.¹⁴⁸

Taylor was not content simply to claim that Elizabeth reigned as a second Deborah, and he immediately further explained the significance of the typology, reminding his readers how

the Lord went out before our Armies, and as in the daies of Israels Deborah, so of Englands Deborah, hee made the sea and windes fight for us, and by his owne right hand got us the victorie: that memorable yeere and overthrow of 88, shall be a perpetuall witnesse so long as the world standeth, how God himselfe fights against that Religion, which so furiously fights against him.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁴ Taylor, *A Mappe of Rome*, sig. A2v.

¹⁴⁵ See, for instance: Thomas Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 30; Rebecca A. Bailey, *Staging the Old Faith: Queen Henrietta Maria and the Theatre of Caroline England, 1625–1642* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), p. 151; and McGee, 'Taylor, Thomas'.

¹⁴⁶ In the KJV, Psalm 126:3 reads, 'The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad.'

¹⁴⁷ Taylor, *A Mappe of Rome*, p. 93.

¹⁴⁸ Taylor, *A Mappe of Rome*, p. 93.

¹⁴⁹ Taylor, *A Mappe of Rome*, p. 94.

Not only had God providentially restored England to Protestantism by raising Elizabeth to the throne, He had also used her as a Deborah to defend England and to thwart the expansionist plans of the ‘Romish Captaines of that great Nebuchadnezzar’.¹⁵⁰ Elizabeth, who was ‘never-dying’, was portrayed as an example to be perpetually emulated, with hers and England’s many deliveries offered as proof of the providential favour true Protestant worship granted.

The use of these analogies emphasises the belief in the interchangeability of past and present, with ‘Englands Deborah’ one and the same as ‘Israels Deborah’. Likewise, the depiction of Elizabeth as a Deborah is presented as being just as relevant in 1619 (and 1620) as it was in 1605: then, as now, James needed to support Protestants in the fight against Catholics, and he needed to defend England’s Protestantism, which by extension included Bohemia, given that its new queen was James’s daughter. In the context of the Bohemian crisis, the claim that ‘God himselfe fights against that Religion’ surely served to encourage James to support his son-in-law and the Bohemian Protestants, because once again, God would go ‘before our Armies’ to get ‘us the victorie’. Not only did England’s Deborah provide a clear example for dealing decisively with the Catholic threat, but her reign also allowed Taylor to criticise James for the *quasi* toleration of Catholicism in England he had enacted through the suspending of the anti-Catholic penal laws, as well as the planned marriage between Charles and the Infanta. Elizabeth, ‘the wonder of the world, and mirrour of nations’ would, according to Taylor, never have countenanced Catholic toleration or marrying a child to a Catholic—although he glosses over the fact that one of Elizabeth’s most serious suitors, the Duke of Anjou, was Catholic.

The memory of England’s famous victory in 1588 remained a powerful touchstone for those who disagreed with James’s pacifism, and in the context of both the Bohemian crisis and the Thirty Years’ War, the ‘memorable 88’ ensured that Elizabeth remained a potent device of religio-political counsel.¹⁵¹ Invocations of the past—such as a reference to Elizabeth or the defeat of the Armada—generally had a didactic purpose. As the examples in this chapter show, an invocation of an Elizabeth analogy was generally made with the intention of making a didactic point, either explicitly or implicitly, and readers were certainly aware that references to Deborah carried a variety of potent meanings. This habit of reading biblical

¹⁵⁰ Taylor, *A Mappe of Rome*, p. 94.

¹⁵¹ David Cressy, ‘The Spanish Armada: Celebration, Myth and Memory’, in *England and the Spanish Armada*, ed. by Jeff Doyle and Bruce Moore (Canberra: Australian Defence Force Academy, 1990), pp. 157–176. Likewise, as Geoffrey Parker has argued, the Armada invasion may have been unsuccessful, but its deep engraining in the English psyche constituted a profound ‘psychological success’. Geoffrey Parker, *Philip II*, 3rd edn (Chicago: Open Court, 1995), p. 157.

references typologically could, however, result in typological meanings being taken from a text when no such meaning was intended, as John King, Bishop of London, discovered.

On Sunday 26 March 1620, Bishop King preached a sermon at St Paul's Cathedral before James and the royal court. The sermon took as its text Psalm 102:13–14—a Prayer of the Afflicted—which was chosen by James himself.¹⁵² St Paul's had been in a rather dilapidated state since it had been struck by lightning in 1561, and James had recently become fixated on having the cathedral repaired; he thus attended the service in order to give force to the message he had chosen.¹⁵³ With this royal imperative, King used the sermon to stress the importance of donating to the renovation fund and the urgent need to repair the cathedral. The sermon is rambling and in places incoherent, and King indulged himself in various asides. After mentioning the almost-fatal illness James had recovered from in March 1619,¹⁵⁴ King digressed and harked back to the failed invasion of the Spanish Armada, and Elizabeth's Deborah-like saving of the English:

since that of that ever-admired 88, when the honor was done to this Land, that the Lord sold Jabin and his strength into the hands of a woman ... [who] called up hir selfe and hir people to a solemne and publicke thanksgiving, Up Deborah, arise and sing, I my selfe will sing, (Shee did it at the Church dore, as also did our gracious Sovereigne) up Barak: and they offered their joynt sacrifice of praise to God, upon this the most eminent and conspicuous Altar of the Kingdome.¹⁵⁵

This very brief mention of 'that ever-admired 88' emphasises the potency of the victory over the Armada to the collective memory of the English—this mention was all that was needed to evoke all of the triumphal Protestant and providential discourses that were bound up with the victory. The analogy between Deborah and Elizabeth is more implicit than overt, but the typology is underscored by the way Philip II is equated with Jabin, King of the Canaanites, who, according to the Book of Judges, had for 'twenty years ... mightily oppressed the children of Israel.'¹⁵⁶ God, however, 'sold Jabin and his strength into the hands of a woman'—Elizabeth, England's Deborah. King also makes a reference to the song Deborah and Barak sing after their victory (a marginal note references Judges 5), which was an uncommon basis

¹⁵² Psalm 102:13–14: 'Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion: for the time to favour her, yea, the set time, is come. For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favour the dust thereof.'

¹⁵³ Roze Hentschell, "'Paul's Work': Repair and Renovation of St Paul's Cathedral, 1561–1625", in *Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1520–1640*, ed. by Torrance Kirby and P.G. Stanwood (Leiden: Brill, 2014), p. 381.

¹⁵⁴ King had even preached, and subsequently published, a sermon of thanksgiving for the King's recovery: John King, *A Sermon of Publicke Thanks-giving for the happie recoverie of his Majestie from his late dangerous sicknesse* (London, 1619; STC 14983).

¹⁵⁵ John King, *A Sermon at Paules Crosse, on behalfe of Paules Church, March 26. 1620* (London, 1620; STC 14982), pp. 33–34.

¹⁵⁶ Judges 4:3. The reference may also allude to the almost twenty-year gap between the Northern Rebellion of 1569 and the events of 1588.

for the Deborah typology. This choice suggests a focus on the actual Armada victory celebrations. Multiple thanksgivings were held to commemorate the victory at St Paul's: a service of thanksgiving was held on 20 August 1588 and presided over by Dean Alexander Nowell; a further service of thanksgiving was held on 8 September (which included a display of the banners captured from the Spanish ships); and finally, the royal service of thanksgiving was held on 24 November.¹⁵⁷ The royal thanksgiving service is of particular relevance here, because like Deborah, Elizabeth composed songs of thanksgiving for the victory. While the Queen did not sing them, they were sung in the service, and were also published: immediately, in 1588 (although no version is extant), and at least twice after her death—in 1605, and again in 1637.¹⁵⁸ King viewed Elizabeth as a contemporary Deborah because, like her biblical antecedent, she had thanked God for his mercy by composing a song.

The focus on the Armada was particularly fitting because 26 March was the closest Sunday to the anniversary of Elizabeth's death on 24 March, which likely explains why Elizabeth did not need to be explicitly named in the sermon. Nevertheless, it is an interesting way of emphasising the providential nature of England's victory over the Armada, as well as demonstrating the allusions King was sure his audiences would understand. King may have avoided making an overt comparison between Deborah and Elizabeth, but his central point—that Elizabeth was providentially favoured, which is why the Spanish Armada was defeated—was still unmistakably made.

Given that the sermon was intended to drum up support for the St Paul's restoration, and was 'preached and published by his Majesties commandment', King made no attempt either to counsel James overtly, or to offer a didactic point beyond supporting the restoration work. Nevertheless, given that early modern English society was so steeped in the habit of reading biblical references and allusions typologically with contemporary relevance in mind, even before it was preached, the sermon was understood as being a commentary on contemporary issues. For instance, on 20 March, John Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton, the English Ambassador to the United Provinces, about the upcoming sermon:

Here is great speach and expectation of the kings comming to Paules crosse on Sunday next, where the bishop of London shold preach his court sermon in the afternoone: some surmise that the k[ing] will there deliver somewhat touching the matters of Bohemia, others, concerning this intended match with Spaine, but if it so fall out that he

¹⁵⁷ 'Thanksgivings for the Defeat of the Spaniards', ed. by Lawrence Green and Alexander Samson, in *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources, Volume 3: 1579 to 1595*, ed. by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 424.

¹⁵⁸ Arthur F. Marotti and Steven W. May, 'Two Lost Ballads of the Armada Thanksgiving Celebration', *English Literary Renaissance*, 41.1 (2011), pp. 46–48. For the poems, which were set to music, see: *Selected Works*, pp. 19–23.

come I rather beleve it is about the repairing of Paules which indeed growes very ruinous.¹⁵⁹

People were clearly assuming that politics lay behind the sermon, even if Chamberlain expressed doubt. Attendees at the service likewise assumed that the sermon had a religio-political purpose. Sir Richard Young, who heard the sermon, wrote to his patron Edward la Zouche, 11th Baron Zouche, claiming that while King did not touch directly on politics, his impassioned pleas for the English to spread the Protestant gospel, coupled with James's choice of scriptural text, meant that Young believed the Bishop's 'heart was then at Bohemia.'¹⁶⁰ James may have been in attendance purely to drum up support for his project to repair the cathedral, but the religio-political climate was such that people *assumed* this was King's intended meaning. Even more importantly, however, the sermon was entered into the Stationers' Register on 12 May 1620. This means that it was published soon after James acceded to Spanish demands that for the Spanish Match to go ahead, laws punishing Catholics and Catholicism would be relaxed. In a letter to Philip III dated 27 April 1620—the contents of which was quickly made public—James promised that the future Princess of Wales and her servants would be allowed freedom of religion within the walls of their palace, and while he admitted he could not order the repeal of existing laws, he promised to not enforce them, and crucially, he agreed to stop Catholics being executed for their religion.¹⁶¹ This sermon, then, which relied on the widely understood conflation of Elizabeth with Deborah, not only suggested that England had been providentially favoured (especially under Elizabeth) owing to its Protestantism, but was also read typologically by its contemporary audience, with contemporaries acknowledging that the Bishop, either intentionally or unintentionally, was pressing for further English intervention in Bohemia, and that he was criticising the toleration that would accompany the Spanish match.

The sheer number of tracts that commented on both the situation in Bohemia and the Spanish match began first to alarm, and then frustrate, James. In late December 1620, he issued a strongly worded proclamation against the 'excesse of lavish and licentious speech of matters of state', which made clear that the King was unable to overlook such public commentary on 'matters of state' any more:

¹⁵⁹ TNA SP 14/113, fol. 65r.

¹⁶⁰ TNA SP 14/113, fol. 88r.

¹⁶¹ Glyn Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta: The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), p. 46. The letter from James to Philip only survives as it was reproduced in a pamphlet written by William Prynne concerning the trial of William Laud, the Archbishop of Canterbury: William Prynne, *Hidden workes of darkenes brought to publike light, or, A necessary introduction to the history of the Archbishop of Canterburie's triall* (London, 1645; Wing P3973), pp. 8–9. On the same day that the letter to Philip was written, notes were drawn up concerning the Infanta's dowry, and how and when it would be paid, further emphasising the seriousness of the discussions: TNA SP 94/23, fols. 339–340.

there is at this time a more licentious passage of lavish discourse, and bold Censure in matters of State, then hath been heretofore, or is fit to be suffered, Wee have thought it necessary ... to give forewarning unto Our loving Subjects, of this excesse and presumption; And straitly to command them and every of them ... to take heede, how they intermeddle by Penne, or Speech, with causes of State, and secrets of Empire, either at home, or abroad, ... [remaining] good and dutifull Subjects.¹⁶²

James's command went largely unheeded—the proclamation was reissued in July 1621, to no avail—and the calling of a parliament only worsened matters.

After the dissolution of the 'Addled' Parliament in 1614, James hoped that he could live out his reign without needing to call another English parliament. This period of personal rule came to an end in January 1621. The onset of the 'Thirty Years' War had forced James's hand: Spanish troops invaded the Lower Palatinate in August 1620, and Frederick was deposed as King of Bohemia in November 1620.¹⁶³ While James could justify his decision not to help Frederick in Bohemia because he had usurped the previously elected king, Ferdinand II, he could not, in the words of Lord Chancellor Francis Bacon, ignore the loss of his son-in-law's 'ancient patrimony'.¹⁶⁴ In order to underscore the seriousness of his threat to commit troops to war in the Palatinate should negotiations fail, the King needed to have the money ready.¹⁶⁵ When James's third parliament assembled, he sent a message to the Commons, telling MPs that 'he would seek it [the return of the Palatinate] by a treaty ... And if he cannot get it upon fair terms, he will win it by war'.¹⁶⁶ MPs, many of whom had previously called for military intervention in both Bohemia and the Palatinate, were pleased that James seemed to be abandoning his *rex pacificus* image, and quickly voted in favour of the required subsidies.¹⁶⁷

Given the speed with which the subsidies were agreed, parliament quickly found itself without any royal-directed business—a situation compounded by the pause in negotiations brought about by the death of Philip III on 31 March. Parliament thus busied itself with reforming the Court of Chancery and debating the abuses of monopolies.¹⁶⁸ The investigation into the Chancery revealed that Lord Chancellor Bacon had been accepting bribes. Bacon was impeached, stripped of his office, fined, and imprisoned.¹⁶⁹ This same investigation also implicated James's favourite, the Marquess (and future Duke) of Buckingham. James

¹⁶² *A Proclamation against excesse of Lavish and Licentious Speech of matters of State* (London, 1620; STC 8649), one sheet.

¹⁶³ Pursell, *The Winter King*, pp. 115–116.

¹⁶⁴ James Spedding, *An Account of the Life and Times of Francis Bacon*, 2 vols (London, 1878), II, p. 584.

¹⁶⁵ Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), pp. 87–88.

¹⁶⁶ *Commons Debates, 1621*, ed. by Wallace Notestein, Frances Helen Relf, and Hartley Simpson, 7 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), II, p. 87.

¹⁶⁷ Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics*, p. 89. See also: Robert Zaller, "'Interest of State': James I and the Palatinate", *Albion*, 6.2 (1974), pp. 144–175.

¹⁶⁸ Thrush, 'The Parliaments of 1604–1629', p. xlv.

¹⁶⁹ Damian X. Powell, 'Why Was Sir Francis Bacon Impeached? The Common Lawyers and the Chancery Revisited: 1621', *History*, 81.264 (1996), pp. 511–526.

attempted to quash the investigation by seeking to dissolve parliament, but after an outcry from MPs, combined with the fact that the second subsidy bill had yet to finish its full passage through both Houses, parliament was only adjourned.¹⁷⁰ When parliament re-assembled, James asked for another subsidy, which MPs were reluctant to grant. They did, however, suggest that they would be more likely to vote for another subsidy if James would abandon the Spanish match and instead have Charles ‘timely and happily married to one of our own religion’.¹⁷¹ James was enraged by this blatant encroachment on the royal prerogative, and he attempted to silence the MPs; the angry MPs responded by drafting a protestation, and James adjourned the session. After the adjournment, James tore the protestation out of the Commons’ journal, and had its principal architect, Sir Edward Coke, imprisoned.¹⁷² In frustration, James adjourned parliament, before dissolving it by proclamation on 6 January 1622.¹⁷³

The negotiations to have the Palatinate returned to Frederick that James had placed his faith in proved futile, and by November 1622, Frederick’s lands were all over-run.¹⁷⁴ Frederick was forced to retreat to The Hague to set up a government-in-exile. On 23 February 1623, Ferdinand deprived Frederick of his electoral title, granting it to Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria.¹⁷⁵ The loss of Bohemia, and then the Palatinate, was a devastating blow to Protestants across Europe, not least in England.

The devastation over these crushing losses was compounded by James’s continued attempts to arrange a marriage between Charles and Infanta Maria Anna of Spain. Certainly, James had always sought to use the marriage of his children to balance European confessional rivalries, but a large part of James’s support for the Spanish match came from the substantial dowry the Infanta would provide, which would have covered the greater part of the crown’s debt. Negotiations for the marriage dragged on, and the accession of Philip IV after the death of his father saw Spanish interest in the union cool further. Exasperated by the delays, Charles and Buckingham made the unexpected decision to travel to Spain incognito, arriving at the home of the astonished English ambassador, John Digby, Earl of Bristol, on 7 March 1623.¹⁷⁶ Being on the ground in Spain made no material difference to the negotiations, especially when Charles and Buckingham discovered that the Spanish had largely given up on the match, and were instead stringing James along in order to prevent English troops being sent to the

¹⁷⁰ Thrush, ‘The Parliaments of 1604–1629’, pp. xlv–xlv.

¹⁷¹ *Proceedings and Debates of the House of Commons in 1620 and 1621*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1766), II, p. 265.

¹⁷² Colclough, *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England*, p. 184.

¹⁷³ Thrush, ‘The Parliaments of 1604–1629’, p. xlv.

¹⁷⁴ Pursell, *The Winter King*, pp. 186, 198–199.

¹⁷⁵ Pursell, *The Winter King*, p. 187; Redworth, *The Prince and The Infanta*, pp. 57, 73.

¹⁷⁶ Redworth, *The Prince and The Infanta*, pp. 74–75, 82.

Palatinate, and in the hopes of securing the complete repeal of anti-Catholic penal laws in England. The negotiations were abandoned, and Charles and Buckingham returned to England on 5 October 1623.¹⁷⁷ The failure of the Spanish match was met with widespread celebration—celebrations in lavishness and vigour that would only be rivalled by the Restoration of Charles II in 1660.¹⁷⁸ For his part, Charles would never again enjoy such popular affection.

Sometime in 1623, before Charles returned home without a Spanish bride, Nehemiah Rogers published a commentary on Isaiah 5 called *A Strange Vineyard in Palaestina*.¹⁷⁹ The pamphlet was one of the most vocal tirades against Catholic toleration that entered into print during the unfolding of the Spanish match, with Thomas Cogswell noting the unparalleled ‘audacity’ of Rogers’s tract.¹⁸⁰ *A Strange Vineyard* does not seem to have had any long-term detrimental impacts on his relationship with Charles, however: in May 1636, Charles granted Rogers one of Ely Cathedral’s prebendal stalls.¹⁸¹

As Kevin Killeen has noted, the commentary often reads like sermon notes, suggesting that Rogers was hoping to spread his message against Catholic toleration through the reuse of parts of the pamphlet in sermons.¹⁸² The pamphlet’s message also reflected the contemporary religio-political climate: not only did Rogers seek to stir up support for military interventions on behalf of Protestants on the continent (‘Our brethren in France and Germany are whirled about in these bloudie tumults ... while we lye upon beds of Ivory’), but he also decried Catholic toleration and made clear that he wanted England’s anti-Catholic penal laws to be properly enforced (‘Good lawes are made against the wicked and prophane ... Let neither young nor old bee spared’).¹⁸³ According to Rogers, there was an easy solution to these dilemmas. In order to substantiate his claims concerning the dangers of Catholic toleration and the need to advance Protestantism militarily, Rogers turned to the reign of Elizabeth to emphasise the blessings England had received due to its Protestantism—blessings that would be lost should his warnings go unheeded. He reminded his readers that

our Land in generall ... seeme[s] to out vie the felicitie of all other Nations in high and rich prerogatives. Of all the trees in the Garden, wee may seeme to be the Vine that

¹⁷⁷ Redworth, *The Prince and The Infanta*, p. 138.

¹⁷⁸ David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989), p. 93.

¹⁷⁹ The pamphlet was entered into the Stationer’s Register on 30 November 1622, suggesting the pamphlet was printed in the early part of 1623.

¹⁸⁰ Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution*, p. 45.

¹⁸¹ A.R. Pennie, ‘Rogers, Nehemiah (bap. 1594, d. 1660)’, ODNB.

¹⁸² Kevin Killeen, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 60.

¹⁸³ Nehemiah Rogers, *A Strange Vineyard in Palaestina: In An R^xposition of Isaiahs Parabolical Song of the Beloved, discovered, to which Gods Vineyard in this our Land is Paralleld* (London, 1623; STC 21199), pp. 265, 116. ‘Lie upon beds of ivory’ is from Amos 6:4.

God hath set his heart upon. ... Amongst all the Princes we have had a Deborah, and have a David.¹⁸⁴

This providential favour, however, would cease should Catholic toleration be enacted: 'But will these priviledges beare us out if wee take libertie to sinne against the Lord? Alas! they cannot; nay, so farre are they from stopping Gods wrath, as that they will rather make way for it.' These warnings were directly applied to James, with the example of the past used to foreshadow the not-too-distant future: 'When Saul behaved himselfe not so well in his Kingdome as he ought, it was taken from him and given unto David. Hold that thou hast, O England, lest misery come upon thee.'¹⁸⁵ Here, Rogers emphasised the interchangeability of past and present: this was foreshadowed in the pamphlet's subtitle, 'Gods vineyard in this our land is paralleld', but was made overt in the use of Deborah as a metonym for Elizabeth, and in the warning that what happened to Saul would happen to James if he did not advance England's Protestantism. That Elizabeth was a Deborah who had defended England's Protestantism is a clear inference from the typology, but the double analogy for James is particularly interesting. While David was more commonly associated with war-like endeavours than his son, Rogers's description of David here does seem to be a pointed choice, given the King's widespread association with Solomon. At the same time, he warns that James may cease to be a David and instead become a Saul, and lose his kingdom(s) to someone outside his family. Rogers's use of these typologies suggests that he was alarmed by the state of England's Protestantism, but in addition to warning James, he offered the example of England's Deborah as something James should emulate to avert that which he warned against.

Later, Rogers returned to the English Deborah analogy, while addressing James in a new way:

[Let us] be heartily and unfainedly thankfull for the long peace and prosperitie that we have enjoyed under the conduct of our worthy Deborah, our late Sovereigne Queene Elizabeth, and still doe enjoy under the government of our peaceable Solomon.¹⁸⁶

This 'peace and prosperitie', however, was in contrast to 'Our neighbours round about us', who 'are at this day whirled about in tumultuous broiles'. According to Rogers, this contrast showed that the peace England enjoyed was neither guaranteed nor permanent, and with the troubles in Bohemia clearly in mind, he warned that England was on the path to destruction:

by our sinnes wee have broken our truce with God, and given an Alarum to the King of heaven, by our Pride, and contempt of the Gospell, two usuall fore-runners of the Sword. And therefore in the midst of this our peace, let us not grow secure: we have not

¹⁸⁴ Rogers, *A Strange Vineyard*, p. 189.

¹⁸⁵ Rogers, *A Strange Vineyard*, p. 189.

¹⁸⁶ Rogers, *A Strange Vineyard*, p. 262.

so many blessings, but we may forfeit them all by our disobedience. When wee most feared warre, God sent us peace: Now we most bragge of our peace, we may well feare that God will send us warre.¹⁸⁷

The ‘contempt of the Gospell’ almost certainly referred to the increasing toleration of Catholicism, which is something that—at least in Rogers’s mind—England’s Deborah would never have allowed. James often touted his *rex pacificus* credentials as evidence of his and his kingdoms’ providential favour, but Rogers was almost certainly using this iconography to undermine James’s stance.¹⁸⁸ To Rogers’s mind, such complacency, which was particularly evident in the limited help offered to Protestants on the continent despite repeated calls from both MPs and those in the Palatinate and Bohemia, meant that unless regime policy changed quickly, ‘God will send us warre’—a not entirely unrealistic conclusion to draw from the series of defeats that Protestant states were currently experiencing.

Rogers saw history offering clear precedent as to how situations in the present would unfold. Not only was the biblical past interchangeable with contemporary England, but the various downfalls of the Hebrews also served as ominous portents for England’s future. This ‘feare’ that England would ‘forfeit’ its blessings is also tied up in the two analogies. After Deborah’s death, the Israelites fell into idolatry and were delivered into the hands of the Midianites, a common type for Catholics. James, who was already warned against becoming another Saul, was also a Solomon—a man who had fallen into idolatry and worshiped pagan gods in his latter years, and whom God punished by declaring that most of his kingdom will be lost after his death.¹⁸⁹ Rogers may have been hinting that the conclusion of a Spanish match could be the catalyst for such a break-up of the Stuart lands, given that according to 1 Kings 12, the ten tribes who rebelled and formed the separate Kingdom of Israel did so because Rehoboam, Solomon’s son and successor, failed to follow God’s commands. If James was a Solomon, it was not hard to see Charles as a Rehoboam who lost most of his father’s lands. Rogers, however, saw a simple solution to this crisis: emulate the example of England’s

¹⁸⁷ Rogers, *A Strange Vineyard*, p. 263.

¹⁸⁸ Even James himself seemed to be aware of the untenable nature of his stance. In a speech delivered on 11 December 1621 in response to the Commons’ Protestation, James conceded that military action might be necessary: ‘We confess, we rather expect you should have given us thanks for the so long maintaining a settled Peace in all our Dominions, when as all our Neighbours about are in miserable combustion of War; but, *dulce bellum inexpertis* [war is sweet to those who have never experienced it]. And we indeed find by experience, that a number of our Subjects are so pamper’d with Peace, as they are desirous of change’. However, ‘It is true, that we have ever professed ... that we will labour by all means possible, either by Treaty or by Force, to restore our Children to their ancient Dignity and Inheritance’. John Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighy Matters in Law, Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments, Volume 1* (London, 1721), p. 48.

¹⁸⁹ 1 Kings 11:12–12: ‘the Lord said unto Solomon, Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and will give it to thy servant. Notwithstanding in thy days I will not do it for David thy father’s sake: but I will rend it out of the hand of they son.’

Deborah and defend and uphold Protestantism—both at home and abroad—to ensure that ‘the long peace and prosperitie’ England had enjoyed since the Reformation would continue.

England’s Deborah and Great Britain’s Solomon

When Charles and Buckingham returned from Madrid in October 1623, their fury at the duplicity of the Spanish resulted in a stunning about-face in English foreign policy: James was convinced to abandon a Spanish marriage, and he began to entertain thoughts of going to war against Spain (especially to help retake the Palatinate for Frederick).¹⁹⁰ Despite balking at the costs associated with such military endeavours, parliament voted initial subsidies, and promised to grant more money, with MPs telling the King that he could ‘rest confidently assured, [knowing] that, if You shall be engaged in a real War, we Your loyal and loving Subjects will never fail to assist Your Majesty, in a Parliamentary Way’.¹⁹¹

The general relief that the Spanish match had failed, and that the regime had finally adopted an anti-Spanish policy, is exemplified in Thomas Middleton’s widely popular satirical comedy, *A Game at Chess* (1624). The play dramatised the conflict between England and Spain through a chess game, was virulently anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish, and celebrated the failure of the Spanish match by depicting Charles and Buckingham as heroes in the mould of Protestant luminaries like the Earl of Leicester.¹⁹² The equivalences of many of the characters with real-life people in the Jacobean regime and from Spain (the characters from the ‘white’ house represent England, and the ‘black’ house Spain) was part of the play’s appeal. These equivalences, however, may have accorded with deeper feelings about England’s Protestant past, especially if we credit Middleton with not only alluding to Elizabeth of Bohemia with the characters of the White Queen and the White Queen’s (virgin) pawn, but also Elizabeth I herself. Nevertheless, *A Game at Chess* broadly accorded with the feelings of the English public, and even though it was shut down after only nine performances, it has been described (justly), as the greatest box-office hit of early modern London.¹⁹³

The failure of the Spanish match was, in a way, a realisation of much of the counsel imparted by Elizabeth analogies throughout James’s reign: without a Catholic Princess of Wales, there was no need to prevent the enforcement of anti-Catholic penal laws, or to enact

¹⁹⁰ Robert E. Ruigh, *The Parliament of 1624: Politics and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 25–42; Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution*, pp. 53, 166–168; Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta*, 136–139.

¹⁹¹ *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 3, 1620–1628* (London, 1802), p. 275.

¹⁹² Christina Marie Carlson, ‘The Rhetoric of Providence: Thomas Middleton’s *A Game at Chess* (1624) and Seventeenth-Century Political Engraving’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 67.4 (2014), pp. 1226–1228; and Thomas Cogswell, ‘Thomas Middleton and the Court, 1624: *A Game at Chess* in Context’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 47.4 (1984), pp. 273–288.

¹⁹³ See: Adrian Streete, ‘Polemical Laughter in Thomas Middleton’s *A Game at Chess* (1624)’, *English Literary Renaissance*, 50.2 (2020), pp. 296–333.

toleration. Likewise, abandoning the match demonstrated a commitment to England's Protestantism that many believed had been missing throughout James's reign. Of course, these 'celebrations' were short-lived, and jubilation turned to dismay when Charles married the French Catholic princess, Henrietta Maria, very soon after his accession in 1625.

By the time of James's death on 27 March 1625, Elizabeth analogies were firmly established as an effective and potent device to counsel, critique, and warn both the King and the nation more generally. Despite the shifting religio-political circumstances of James's reign, commentators saw the reign of England's Deborah as a blueprint of God's plan for the English, and they were thus employed as a tool to advise on how situations in the present should be handled—whether this be dealing with Catholics in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot, advancing the cause of Protestantism (especially in the aftermath of the Bohemian Revolt), or avoiding a Spanish marriage for one of James's sons.

This chapter has shown that Elizabeth analogies were regularly invoked to counsel and critique James, with events from Elizabeth's reign conflated with relevant examples from the Old Testament in order to advise James how various political or religious matters should be handled—especially at moments of crisis. When writers perceived that James was diverging from Elizabeth's 'style' of government (or how her style of government was sentimentally conceived), they used Elizabeth analogies to criticise James, and the various typologies invoked demonstrate both the close association between Elizabeth and the figures of the Old Testament, and the potent mix of providential expectation and practical counsel that analogies evoked. In addition to being repeatedly described as England's Deborah, Elizabeth was depicted as a latter-day Daniel, Esther, Josiah, Judith, and Samuel, emphasising not only the interchangeability of past and present, but also the way that the present and the recent past were habitually read typologically. Like Deborah, who had been sent to the Israelites in their time of need, Elizabeth had been sent to the English. This meant that no matter the crisis England faced, Elizabeth's example should be emulated, because she was indisputably responsible for much of the providential favour the English had received.

Commentators had been quick to extol the (imagined) benefits that accompanied the accession of a *male* king in March 1603, and these benefits continued to be alluded to throughout James's reign. Nevertheless, as the examples analysed here show, Elizabeth's memory remained a standard that James was constantly exhorted to meet. Even in the most critical of the pamphlets here (Mavericke, in particular), Elizabeth was depicted as a providentially favoured monarch who was responsible for the 'peace and plenty' England enjoyed, as Sampson Price claimed. All of the pamphlets analysed here used Elizabeth

analogies to argue that it was imperative that James emulate this example, and ideally, exceed it.

At the same time, however, many of the Elizabeth analogies provide a contrast between the recent past of Elizabeth's reign and the present. Some of this comes from a privileging of the past, with the present 'decline' blamed on an abandonment of past practices and habits. Such views pervade the pamphlets analysed here. There is noticeable thread through a number of the pamphlets that claim that the 'unthankfulness' of the English in the years after Elizabeth's death had led the country into its current predicament. This reproof goes beyond an exhortation to emulate the past, however. Elizabeth had been favoured by providence for her actions—most especially for her defence of Protestantism at home and abroad. England and the English had been blessed because of this favour, enjoying years of 'peace and prosperitie', as Nehemiah Rogers declared. At various points in James's reign, this peace and prosperity was seriously threatened (or at least believed to be), and for many of the writers discussed here, these crises were the result of complacency—both in the regime and the populace more generally. By not continuing Elizabeth's work in defending Protestantism and battling Catholicism, England risked losing the many blessings it had received, and had become accustomed to having. All of the Elizabeth analogies discussed here alluded to this in some form, and they all offered the same solution: emulate the example of England's Deborah, and God will continue to bless and protect England.

Nevertheless, as many of the examples analysed here show, commentators were undeniably presenting a highly idealised version of Elizabeth and her reign. This version of Elizabeth was both created and sustained by the biblical figures with whom she was compared. Like Lever, who ignored Elizabeth's Nicodemianism (her outward Catholic conformity) during Mary's reign, and Sampson Price, who claimed that the contemporary 'lukewarm' attitude to Protestantism represented a departure from Elizabethan policies, writers used analogies to re-invent Elizabeth, and in doing so, they created an even more potent example for emulation in the present.

The idea that England was a new Israel, with the English God's new chosen people, is touched on in several of the pamphlets analysed in this chapter. Such a view was not new, but it would become a powerful trope during Charles's reign. During the Personal Rule in particular, the conflation between England and Israel became a significant tool to read the present typologically. This conflation also allowed commentators to exhort Charles to emulate Elizabeth, the Deborah of the English Israel.

Chapter 3

Charles I, Elizabeth Analogies, and the English Israel

On 23 July 1626, during the height of the 1625–1626 plague, William Hampton, a chaplain to the Earl of Nottingham, preached a sermon at St Paul's Cross. In the sermon, which was published in early 1627 with the subtitle 'Englands warning by Israels ruine', Hampton noted several links between Israel and England.¹ He admitted that 'God hath beene as gracious to this Vineyard of England, as ever hee was to the Vineyard of Israell', but he also observed that God 'sent a Plague in Israel, whereof died more then [sic] threescore thousand, in lesse then three dayes. So ... the finger of God hath beene lately seene in our Land, especially in this Citie, scourging us for our sinns'. God, Hampton continued, 'menaceth his owne chosen people, deare Israel: (and we may apply it to our selves, if we walke in their steps;) if they will not amend by his former punishments, then he will stirre up a forraigne foe to invade them.'² Then, near the end of the sermon, Hampton ominously offered a warning concerning England's fate: 'Perditio tua ex te [Thy Destruction is thine own] O Israel: Thy destruction, O England, will come from thy selfe'.³ The current plague, therefore, was punishment from God, just like those of the Old Testament.

The parallel between England and Israel was also emphasised at the other end of Charles's reign, after the parliamentary victory in the First English Civil War in 1646. In the posthumously published collection of sermons, *Englands Face in Israels Glasse*, Thomas Westfield, a member of the Westminster Assembly and the Bishop of Bristol from 1642 until his death in 1644, reminded his readers that nations 'imitate others', and that any biblical events he recounted 'certainly hold' with England.⁴ Likewise, *Magnalia Dei Anglicana*, written by parliamentarian poet John Vicars, provided a 'chronicle' of the many 'mercies' God had shown to the parliamentarians in the Civil War. On the second title page of the pamphlet, Vicars inserted England into Isaiah 63:7, acknowledging 'all the rich Mercies which the Lord hath bestowed upon us; And his great goodnesse toward us (his English-Israel) which hee hath conferred on us, according to his great Mercies'.⁵ For both Westfield and Vicars, the

¹ The sermon was entered into the Stationers' Register on 12 February 1627.

² William Hampton, *A Proclamation of Warre from the Lord of Hosts. Or Englands warning by Israels ruine: Shewing the miseries like to ensue upon us by reason of Sinne and Securitie* (London, 1627; STC 12741), pp. 12, 6, 3. The plague Hampton references is described in 2 Samuel 24:15 and 1 Chronicles 21:14, although in both places the Bible records that 70,000 people died.

³ Hampton, *A Proclamation of Warre*, p. 19.

⁴ Thomas Westfield, *Englands Face In Israels Glasse: Or, The Sinnes of both Nations, The Mercies of both Nations, The Judgements of both Nations; Delivered in eight Sermons* (London, 1646; Wing W1416), sig. A2v.

⁵ John Vicars, *Magnalia Dei Anglicana. Or, Englands Parliamentary Chronicle* (London, 1646; Wing V319), sig. A2r.

connection between the Israel of the Old Testament and contemporary England was indisputable, with the English God's new chosen people.

These parallels between England and Israel, invoked at the opposite ends of Charles I's reign, in completely different contexts, by authors from varying confessional identities, demonstrate the strength of the widely held view that England was a contemporary Israel. Indeed, scholars have long noted that much of the rhetoric employed during the Civil War and the Commonwealth equated England with the Exodus more specifically, and Israel more generally.⁶ As the example from Hampton's sermon shows, however, the parallels between the two nations were more deeply held and much more widely understood than studies of the Civil War and Commonwealth periods would suggest.

Elizabeth analogies—especially the typology of the English Deborah—are a significant, yet overlooked, component of this conceptualisation of the English Israel. This chapter analyses the way that commentators used Elizabeth analogies between 1625 and 1649 to counsel, warn, and exhort the King. Throughout the Caroline period, writers, parliamentarians, clergymen, and even the King himself, turned to the example of the last Tudor monarch to offer a critique on the present, and/or a precedent on how a contemporary issue or conflict should be resolved. As David Cressy has noted, Elizabeth's reign was certainly very selectively remembered, with the 'idea' of Elizabeth more often commemorated or remembered than the actual, historical Elizabeth.⁷ Nonetheless, the use of Elizabeth analogies to counsel and reprove both Charles and the Caroline regime emphasises the important link Elizabeth analogies provided to the biblical past, with the recent past of Elizabethan England offering indisputable proof of a providentially sanctioned course of action.

The counsel of Elizabeth analogies especially focused on Elizabeth's example of 'good' parliamentary government, which Charles (like his father before him) seemed to eschew. I show that Elizabeth analogies were an important tool of exhortation and critique throughout the various stages of Charles's reign, encompassing the disagreements with parliament in the first years of his reign, the crises concerning the 'Thirty Years' War, the period of the Personal Rule, and the Civil War. Writers counselled Charles to heed the

⁶ In addition to the discussion in Chapter 4, see: Blair Worden, *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 13–15, 33–34, 51–62; John Coffey, *Exodus and Liberation: Deliverance Politics from John Calvin to Martin Luther King Jr.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 4–6, 26, 42; John Morrill, 'A Liberation Theology? Aspects of Puritanism in the English Revolution', in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. by Laura Lunger Knoppers (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003), pp. 27–48; and John Coffey, 'Religion', in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, ed. by Laura Lunger Knoppers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 98–117.

⁷ David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989), pp. 130–131.

example of Elizabeth and defend England's Protestant Church from both internal attack and expansionist Catholics, while also criticising Charles's personal (and increasingly autocratic) rule, drawing on the close links between Elizabeth, Deborah, and parliamentary governance.

Elizabeth analogies, which could be invoked in virtually any situation, were not, however, merely commemorations of the last Tudor monarch. Instead, they should be seen as an expression of the wider belief that England was a new Israel. As Alexandra Walsham has argued, during Elizabeth's life, comparing the Queen 'with Deborah, Judith, Josiah, Solomon and Hezekiah was a didactic device: preachers were not so much saluting her achievements as outlining a set of ideals to be aspired to.'⁸ After 1603, however, these aspirational 'ideals' took on a renewed, and perhaps an even more potent, function. Invoking the example of the English Deborah (for instance) not only provided a biblical example for the King to aspire to, but also, and most crucially, provided an example from England's recent past, with Elizabeth's 'achievements' serving as an aspirational benchmark for Charles. The use of these analogies showed that the English, just like the Israelites, had to work continually to ensure that they were worthy of God's favour. Contemporaries believed that God had 'withdrawn' his favour from the Israelites and had instead granted it to the English—and many Elizabeth analogies warn that if the example and precedent of the Bible was not heeded, God could withdraw this favour, and bestow it upon another nation.⁹

The use of Elizabeth analogies in the Caroline period also highlights the shifting views concerning the 'threat' Catholicism posed, and helped bolster calls for England to undergo a further, godly reformation. During Charles's reign, the form the threat of Catholicism took underwent a profound shift. As John Morrill, Julia Igrave, and Peter Lake (among others) have argued, during the Elizabethan and most of the Jacobean period, Catholicism was

⁸ Alexandra Walsham, "'A Very Deborah?'" The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 147.

⁹ This belief has its basis in the claim that by repudiating Christ, the Jews had 'renounced' their position as God's chosen people, and was stoked by centuries of anti-Semitic thought. The idea that England was the new Israel, and that the English were God's new chosen people, had its roots in the rhetoric of the Hundred Years' War. In a marginal note in his *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjects*, John Aylmer simply declared 'God is English', and by the seventeenth century, the belief had largely reached the level of orthodoxy. John Aylmer, *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjects, agaynst the late blowne Blaste, concerninge the Government of Wemen* (London, 1559; STC 1005), sig. P4v. See: John W. McKenna, 'How God became an Englishman', in *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends*, ed. by DeLloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 25–43; Michael McGiffert, 'God's Controversy with Jacobean England', *The American Historical Review*, 88.5 (1983), pp. 1152–1153; Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988), pp. 1–7, 20–27; Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 281–325; Achsah Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 7–15; Patrick Collinson, 'Biblical Rhetoric: The English Nation and National Sentiment in the Prophetic Mode', in *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 167–192; and Kevin Chovanec, *Pan-Protestantism Heroism in Early Modern Europe* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), pp. 25–28. This argument was first made in: William Haller, *Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs' and the Elect Nation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963).

generally viewed as an external threat that had to be combated to prevent it taking root again in England. By the late Jacobean period, however, Catholicism was no longer viewed as only an external threat, but as one that had already infected the heart of the state, and was threatening to infect the entire country.¹⁰ This shift was intensified in the aftermath of the death of Prince Henry in November 1612. Widely regarded as the antithesis of his anti-war father, Henry was held up as the hope for those advocating militant and expansionist English Protestantism, and his death was seen as a blow both to English anti-Catholicism and the cause of European Protestantism.¹¹ Upon his death, however, his mantle as the focus of militant Protestantism was considered by many to have passed to his sister Elizabeth (and her husband, Frederick, the Elector Palatine and deposed King of Bohemia), rather than to his brother, Charles.¹² While many writers compared Princess Elizabeth to her godmother and namesake, the turn to Elizabeth at Charles's expense reveals that the new heir to the throne was not viewed as seriously wishing to defend England's Protestantism.¹³ This was an image that Charles was never able to escape, and it only intensified as his reign progressed.¹⁴

¹⁰ John Morrill, 'The Causes and Course of the British Civil Wars', in *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution*, ed. by N.H. Keeble (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 13–31; John Morrill, 'The Religious Context of the English Civil War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 34 (1984), p. 172; Julia Ipgrave, *Adam in Seventeenth Century Political Writing in England and New England* (New York: Routledge, 2017), pp. 29–32; and Peter Lake, 'Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603–1642*, ed. by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), pp. 72–106. See also: Andrew Hopper, "'The Popish Army of the North': Anti-Catholicism and Parliamentary Allegiance in Civil War Yorkshire, 1642–46", *British Catholic History*, 25.1 (2000), pp. 12–28; and Alexandra Walsham, "'The Fatall Vesper': Providentialism and Anti-Popery in Late Jacobean London", *Past and Present*, no. 144 (1994), pp. 36–87.

¹¹ Adrian Streete, 'Elegy, Prophecy, and Politics: Literary Responses to the Death of Prince Henry Stuart, 1612–1614', *Renaissance Studies*, 31.1 (2017), pp. 87–88; and C.A. Patrides, "'The Greatest of the Kingly Race": The Death of Henry Stuart', *The Historian*, 47.3 (1985), pp. 402–408. This 'expectation' was commented upon in the Commonwealth. According to a satire written by the parliamentarian Sir Edward Peyton, Henry was 'A Prince, whom all Europe expected to be the promoter of some great and famous action, because his inclination was bent to the Martial art above his yeers, and also excelled in matters of State, both in discourse, and choice of ablest company; which he much delighted in, for advice and counsel', as well as a 'ripeness in judgement, and dexterity in Souldiery'. Edward Peyton, *The Divine Catastrophe of The Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts: Or, A Short History of the Rise, Reign, and Ruine Thereof* (London, 1652; Wing P1952), pp. 27–28.

¹² See: Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), pp. 45–65; Jaroslav Miller, 'Between Nationalism and European Pan-Protestantism: Palatine Propaganda in Jacobean England and the Holy Roman Empire', in *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival*, ed. by Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013), pp. 61–82; John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 34; and Streete, 'Elegy, Prophecy, and Politics', pp. 87–106.

¹³ See: Kevin Chovanec, 'The British Pharaoh?: James I and VI and Internationalist Religious Writing at the Wedding of Friedrich V and Elizabeth Stuart', *The Seventeenth Century*, 30.4 (2015), pp. 391–409; and Nadine Akkerman, 'Semper Eadem: Elizabeth Stuart and the Legacy of Queen Elizabeth I', in *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival*, ed. by Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013), pp. 145–168.

¹⁴ Writers were of course careful not to explicitly state their wish that Henry had lived and become king instead of Charles, but the image of Henry did overshadow Charles. A libel written during the course of the Spanish match and dated to 1623 lamented, 'The nyth shall dye and then the first, / perhaps shall raigne' because it meant that 'Much Alteration, / shall happen in Religion / Believe this true when that you see / The Spanyard protestant to bee', (inaccurately) suggesting that Henry would never have countenanced marrying a Catholic, and

As this chapter shows, Elizabeth analogies were an important part of this shifting discourse around the threat of Catholicism, despite being overlooked in the scholarship. This discourse was fanned by Charles's marriage to the French Catholic princess Henrietta Maria, as well as the growing influence of the 'popish' bishop (later archbishop) William Laud; after all, the royal court was viewed as a microcosm of the English state, and given that Henrietta Maria and her Catholic attendants had infiltrated it, it stood to reason that Catholicism had infiltrated—or was in the process of infiltrating—the state as well. Godly writers certainly played up the last Tudor monarch's defence of England from external, Catholic threats—most obviously through what was seen as her central role in the defeat of the Spanish Armada. By the late 1620s, however, and in a departure from many earlier tracts, such critics began to emphasise the way that Elizabeth had defended England from *internal* threats, focusing especially on her survival in the face of many assassination plots that sought to place the Catholic Mary, Queen of Scots, on the throne in her stead. As polemicists increasingly turned their attention to this 'threat from within', Elizabeth's reign, viewed conceptually and actuated by analogies, offered clear precedent for divinely sanctioned courses of action that could—and should—be emulated in the present.

that Charles was willing to 'alter' England's Protestantism. It took two decades after his death for biographies of Henry to be published, and their publication was likely intended to provide a contrast to Charles. In 1634, during the Personal Rule, William Haydon published a biography of Henry that was intended to recount 'his great and unspeakable vertues, and of his nature good in all perfection (if any such was ever found in any Prince)', which provided an almost explicit contrast to Charles. Then, in 1641, during the turbulent period of the Short Parliament, and the calling of its successor the Long Parliament, two biographies of Henry were published, both of which were dedicated to Prince Charles (the future Charles II). The first had been written by Charles Cornwallis, treasurer of Henry's household; the biography was circulated in manuscript form, but Cornwallis died in 1629, suggesting that the publisher saw a commercial opportunity in publishing the text. The dedication tells Charles that 'there is a naturall interest in this ensuing Discourse to your Highnesse, as being the hopefull heyre of this Kingdome of Great Britaine, and the true inheritour of your Noble Uncles vertues, (Prince Henry) as of his fortunes. The eyes of all men are upon you, in full view of those sweet graces of Nature and ingenuous disposition to goodnesse which all admire.' The other biography from 1641, *The Life and Death of Our Late most Incomparable and Heroique Prince, Henry Prince of Wales*, claimed also to be Cornwallis's, but was more likely by John Hawkins, a steward at the Tower of London. In addition to the pamphlet's subtitle, 'A prince (for valour and vertue) fit to be imitated in succeeding times', the pamphlet's dedication is even blunter in exhorting the Prince to emulate his uncle, rather than his father: 'The subject thereof being so rare a Prince, as it may seeme worthy Your Highnes perusall: In reading Him You may read Your self: His Titles of Honour were the same with Yours: Your titles of Vertues the same with His: He was, as You are the Mirror of the Age; which, that You may still continue, shall ever be the prayer of [the author]'. As these examples suggest, the Prince of Wales needed to emulate his virtuous and lamented uncle, rather than his unfit 'to be imitated' father, which further emphasised the continued—albeit implicit—unfavourable comparisons between the brothers. BL Add MS 34217, fol. 41v; W[illiam] H[aydon], *The True Picture and Relation of Prince Henry His Noble and Vertuous disposition, Containing Certaine Observations and Prooves of his towardly and notable Inclination to Vertue, of the Pregnancie of his Wit, farre above his Age, comprehended in sundry of his witty and pleasant Speeches* (Leiden, 1634; STC 12581), p. 2; Charles Cornwallis, *A Discourse of The most Illustrious Prince, Henry, Late Prince of Wales* (London, 1641; Wing C6329), sigs. A3r–A3v; *The Life and Death of Our Late most Incomparable and Heroique Prince, Henry Prince of Wales. A Prince (for Valour and Vertue) fit to be Imitated in Succeeding Times* (London, 1641; Wing C6330), sig. A2r. See also: Catherine MacLeod, *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2012), pp. 160–161, 176; and J.S.A. Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), pp. 161–197.

The Elizabeth analogies of Charles's reign also engaged with the Elizabethan Reformation in new ways. Previously, Elizabeth analogies had emphasised Elizabeth's re-establishment of a Protestant Church of England, acknowledging her defence of England from Catholics, as well as the providential favour the many deliverances from the attempts on her life demonstrated. Some of the examples analysed in the previous chapters used James's accession to claim that aspects of England's Reformation should be revisited; in the Caroline period, commentators increasingly emphasised the fear of popery from within, exemplified by Henrietta Maria and Laud.¹⁵ This fear, coupled with the rising power and influence of vocal puritans who demanded further Godly reformation, meant that the Elizabethan Reformation needed to be revisited, with Elizabeth's settlement increasingly viewed as only a partial stripping away of Catholicism. While much of this criticism avoided disparaging Elizabeth's attempts directly (often claiming she was forced to ignore the counsel of godly men, or that had her reign been even longer, she would have finished the task), the fact that these criticisms, no matter how implicit, were even made shows how adaptable Elizabeth analogies were for presentist concerns.

The Road to the Personal Rule: Elizabeth as Admonition

The accession of Charles I to the English throne upon the death of his father on 27 March 1625 was the first time an adult male had succeeded his father as king since the twenty-six-year-old Henry V had succeeded Henry IV on 21 March 1413.¹⁶ Unlike the succession of March 1603, there was no need to explain the new monarch's right to the throne. Nevertheless, in the early years of his reign, Charles was linked to Elizabeth through his father, or both monarchs were offered together as examples to Charles. The example that these two monarchs could offer, however, was not always equal, and oftentimes Elizabeth was

¹⁵ That Henrietta Maria was a focal point for anti-Catholic sentiment in the period is well known to scholars, but it is a fact worth emphasising, especially as many of the authors I analyse implicitly link the Queen with popery. As Lois Potter has pithily argued: 'Feelings about the Catholic Henrietta Maria became inseparable from feelings about the Whore of Babylon'. Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 132. See also: Frances E. Dolan, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture* (1999; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), pp. 97–102; Diana G. Barnes, *Epistolary Community in Print, 1580–1664* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 73–135; and Susan Dunn-Hensley, *Anna of Denmark and Henrietta Maria: Virgins, Witches, and Catholic Queens* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 192–218.

¹⁶ Some scholars have inaccurately claimed that this was the first such succession in a century, alluding to that of Henry VIII 116 years previously. Henry, however, had succeeded his father two months shy of his eighteenth birthday, and his grandmother, Margaret Beaufort, had served as a *quasi*-regent for the short duration of his minority; her death on 29 June 1509 (five days after Henry's coronation) was so poetically timed that her important role during this period was largely forgotten. See: Nicola Tallis, *Uncrowned Queen: The Fateful Life of Margaret Beaufort, Tudor Matriarch* (London: Michael O'Hara Books, 2019), pp. 271–273.

held up as a more ‘worthy’ example—as was the case in Robert Horne’s *The Shield of the Righteous* (1625).

The Shield of the Righteous is a commentary on Psalm 91—a commentary that displayed some of Horne’s puritan leanings.¹⁷ Traditionally, the psalm is known for being one of protection, and despite the misgivings of several prominent Protestants (including Luther), was often recited in times of hardship in premodern Europe, especially as apotropaic magic.¹⁸ Given this, the pamphlet, or at the very least its publication, must have been intended to be topical: its running-head, ‘Shield of the righteous in this time of sicknesse and mortality’, seems to allude both to the death of James only four months previously, and to the severe bout of plague that was ravaging London (which forced Charles’s court and parliament to move to Oxford, and left more than 400,000 people dead).¹⁹ Kirsty Rolfe has discussed *The Shield of the Righteous*’s place in the wider context of plague-writing in 1625–1626, noting that Horne emphasised the need to trust in God, rather than in earthly means of protection and preservation.²⁰ While Horne was undoubtedly alluding to a literal pestilence, his pamphlet is also littered with references to the pestilence of Catholicism, and it is in reference to this pestilence that Elizabeth was remembered.

Horne first remembered Elizabeth in his commentary on verse six, ‘Nor for the Pestilence that walketh in the darknes.’ The commentary opened with Horne discussing various examples from the Bible where God had delivered His chosen people from a ‘pestilence’ (generally, from death) because ‘God will disclose to his people, what his peoples enemies shall devise privily, as in the darke against them’.²¹ His examples included Rebecca overhearing Esau’s vow to kill Jacob for tricking Isaac into giving him his blessing, which

¹⁷ A clergyman, these views brought him to the attention of the church courts, and caused his removal from his rectory in 1601. A non-separating non-conformist, Horne espoused deference to those ‘that God hath set up for government’, called for people to ‘submit to that estate that God hath laide upon them’, and railed against ‘Popish Churches and people’. Such pronouncements allowed Horne to retain several influential patrons, and in addition to a living in Ludlow, he edited and transcribed various manuscripts (including those of Bacon and Raleigh). E.T. Bradley, rev. by Stephen Wright, ‘Horne, Robert (1564/5–1640)’, ODNB; Robert Horne, *Points of Instruction for the Ignorant: As also, An Exposition on the ten Commandements, and the Lords Prayer, by Questions and Answers* (London, 1617; STC 13824), sig. B5v; Robert Horne, *Of the Rich Man and Lazarus: Certaine Sermons* (London, 1619; STC 13823), pp. 41, 128.

¹⁸ Brennan Breed, ‘Reception of the Psalms: The Example of Psalm 91’, in *The Oxford Handbook of the Psalms*, ed. by William P. Brown (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 298–303. See also: Robert Joseph Burrelli, ‘A Study of Psalm 91, with special reference to the theory that it was intended as a protection against demons and magic’ (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1994).

¹⁹ The pamphlet was entered into the Stationers’ Register on 11 July 1625.

²⁰ Kirsty Rolfe, ‘Fatal and Memorable: Plague, Providence and War in English Texts, 1625–6’, *The Seventeenth Century*, 35.3 (2020), p. 300.

²¹ Robert Horne, *The Shield of the Righteous: Or, The Ninety first Psalm, expounded, with the addition of doctrines and uses Verie necessarie and comfortable in these dayes of heavinesse, wherein the pestilence rageth so sore in London, and other parts of this kingdome* (London, 1625; STC 13825), p. 50.

allowed her to warn Jacob to flee and live with her brother Laban;²² and how Jonathan warned David that Saul planned to murder him, thereby allowing him to escape.²³ Not content to reference only the biblical past, Horne then turned to recent history:

Our owne dayes can speak as much in this matter, as the daies of old can tell us; for were not the daies of Queene Elizabeth, daies of miraculous discoveries? Could Esau that Romane Aramite, intend any thing (though never so secretly, as it were in his private Counsels) against the Jacob of England, and she not heare of it?²⁴

According to Horne, England was a contemporary Israel, with Esau's machinations against Jacob equated with Catholic conspiracies against Elizabeth—all of which were foiled before Elizabeth was ever in any real danger. The analogy is literary, and draws on multiple contexts.²⁵ Aram is the Hebrew word for Syria (so a Syrian in the Bible is an Aramite), but it also alluded to deceit, as Laban, who was an Aramite, deceived Jacob several times—most famously by deceiving Jacob into marrying Leah, rather than her sister Rachel.²⁶ The Aramites were Israel's neighbours and perennial enemies, and by not worshipping the Hebrew God, they were also derided as idolaters; in the premodern period they were used to reference Catholicism (especially given England's various Catholic neighbours).²⁷ Likewise, Esau was often associated with the pope by Protestants. For instance, in 1586, John Overton referred to Elizabeth's purging of Catholics by claiming, 'Although Esau himselfe (I mean the Pope) be banished by a most noble & vertuous prince, yet the stincke that he hath left behinde him hath to this day infected many'.²⁸ Similarly, in 1617, Richard Bernard claimed 'The Pope herein is [the] Antichrist, being more prophane then Esau, in changing Christs Spouse, the true Church, for the whore of Babylon, the false Church.'²⁹ While Esau was an established typology for the pope, the description of Elizabeth as the 'Jacob of England' is unusual. Jacob, who was given the name Israel by God, was regarded as the 'Patriarch of the Israelites', and

²² Genesis 27:41–45.

²³ 1 Samuel 20:18–42.

²⁴ Horne, *The Shield of the Righteous*, p. 50.

²⁵ One of the contexts Horne seems to be influenced by is the anonymous Tudor play, *The History of Jacob and Esau* (entered into the Stationers' Register in 1557 or 1558, and printed in 1568). The play certainly offers a Calvinist reading of the biblical story, with the character of Esau linked with cruelty, as well providing a crude satire on the Catholic doctrine of Free Will. Michelle Ephraim also suggests, convincingly, that the play's depiction of Rebecca was intended to be a typology for Elizabeth. Michelle Ephraim, 'Maternal Authority in *The History of Jacob and Esau*', in *Reading the Jewish Woman on the Elizabethan Stage* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 49–67; Helen Thomas, 'Jacob and Esau—"Rigidly Calvinistic"?'', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900*, 9.2 (1969), pp. 199–213; Ruth H. Blackburn, *Biblical Drama Under the Tudors* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971), pp. 148–154; and Dalia Ben-Tsur, 'Early Ramifications of Theatrical Iconoclasm: The Conversion of Catholic Biblical Plays into Protestant Drama', *Partial Answers*, 3.1 (2005), esp. pp. 50–55.

²⁶ See: Genesis 29.

²⁷ Michael F. Suarez, 'A Crisis in English Public Life: The Popish Plot, *Naboth's Vineyard* (1679), and Mock-Biblical Satire's Exemplary Redress', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 67.4 (2004), p. 539n. 25.

²⁸ John Overton, *Jacobs Troublesome Journey to Bethel: Containing a Briefe Exposition* (Oxford, 1586; STC 18924), p. 15.

²⁹ Richard Bernard, *A Key of Knowledge for the Opening of the Secret Mysteries of St Johns Mysticall Revelation* (London, 1617; STC 1955), p. 58.

his twelve sons were the progenitors of the Twelve Tribes of Israel. For Horne, Elizabeth, who had been preserved by God, had restored England to Protestantism, and had been called the mother of the English people, was thus a contemporary Jacob who had defeated the Esau of Catholicism.³⁰

Horne then discussed the ‘pestilence’ of Catholicism and popery, gleefully recounting how God had preserved both Elizabeth and James from various Catholic plots. He concluded the section by discussing Elizabeth and James together, reiterating that ‘Many and deepe were the counsels that the Leaguers of Rome have held against these two unmatched Princes’, before paraphrasing 2 Timothy 3:11: ‘yet from them all hath the Lord delivered us’.³¹ These examples seem to be particularly pointed at Charles, the successor of both Elizabeth and James. Despite the known fact that Catholics and the pope ‘prophane the blood of Kings, and touch them as farre as their lives, by their cruell Ministers’ (citing, amongst other examples, the placing of England under interdict by Innocent III during the reign of King John, and the assassination of the French king Henri IV in 1610), Charles had proceeded to marry a French, Catholic princess.³² While dealing with a literal pestilence, Horne was equally concerned about the pestilence of Catholicism that Charles had invited into the heart of the English court, perhaps even implying that the plague was a punishment from God for the marriage. Nevertheless, despite mentioning Charles’s father’s deliverance from the ‘Powder-traytors’, Horne placed greater emphasis on Elizabeth’s many deliverances, and compared her to Jacob. Jacob, who had to flee for his life, but eventually became a beloved father of a nation, was not a common analogy for Elizabeth, but his famous preservation allowed Horne to link Esau with the pope and Catholicism. But crucially, Elizabeth was not merely *a* Jacob, she was instead *the* Jacob of England, suggesting that Horne firmly subscribed to the belief that England was a new Israel. Not only did the English Jacob typology offer Charles a divinely sanctioned course of action for dealing with the plague of Catholicism, but it also made clear that just like the Israelites, the English had to continually work against the ‘evils’ of Catholicism to ensure that they remained worthy of God’s favour.

³⁰ For instance, in the aftermath of the Northern Rebellion, Thomas Norton reproached those who joined the rebellion, writing that ‘Her grace is the most loving mother and Nourse [sic] of all her good subjectes’, and during her progress to Norwich in 1578, Elizabeth was referred to as the ‘Mother of the Common Wealth’ by Norwich’s mayor, and she was farewelled in a way that linked her to Jacob: ‘Farewell oh Queene, farewell oh Mother deere, / Let Jacobs God thy sacred body garde’. Thomas Norton, *To the Quenes Majesties poore deceyved Subjectes of the North Countrey, draven into rebellion by the Earles of Northumberland and Westmerland* (London, 1569; STC 18679.5), sig. B3v; Bernard Garter, *The Joyfull Receyving of the Queenes most excellent Majestie into hir Highnesse citie of Norwich* (London, 1568; STC 11627), sigs. F1v, E4r. See: Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*, 2nd edn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), p. 87.

³¹ 2 Timothy 3:11 actually concludes: ‘but out of them all the Lord delivered me.’

³² Horne, *The Shield of the Righteous*, p. 139.

Horne returned to Elizabeth again in his commentary on verse 14, ‘Therefore will I deliver him’. Emphasising Elizabeth’s preservation from various Catholic plots once more, Horne listed various instances in the Old Testament where God saved His chosen one, asking rhetorically ‘Hath hee [not] promised, if thou be his lover, that he will be thy Deliverer?’³³ He recounted two occasions where Abraham, who ‘loved God’, was delivered by Him (once from Pharaoh, and later from Abimelech), and two instances where Jacob, who ‘trusted in God’, was protected so that Laban ‘could not but doe him good’ and Esau ‘could not hurt him’.³⁴ Horne then linked these biblical narratives to the recent, English past:

Saul had David fast in Keilah, but, what could he do against him more then Stephen Gardner, and the other Butchers of the Shambles of Rome could doe against the Lady Elizabeth, in the Tower, and Keilah where she was shut up? ... Can [there be] any doubt that God is as good as his word to those that love him, and that he will keepe his promise with Kings? So hee discharged Queene Elizabeth of her prison and troubles together, and set a crowne of pure gold upon her head.³⁵ The love that we can shew to God ... is but weake and simple; and yet, God esteemes of it, and rewards it with a promise of deliverance in troubles.³⁶

According to Horne, Elizabeth’s delivery during the reign of Mary I is analogous to these biblical deliverances, and he also equated Elizabeth’s protection from Bishop Gardiner to David’s from Saul. According to 1 Samuel 23, the Philistines had occupied the west of Judah to Keilah, and God sent David to defeat the Philistines. Saul was jealous of David’s victory, and realising that David could be trapped in the city, sent men to destroy the city and David; but God warned him of Saul’s plan, allowing David and his men to depart the city and to seek refuge in the woods around Ziph. This use of a David analogy seems to draw on the established trope of comparing Elizabeth with David and James with Solomon to create a link between the two, distantly-related monarchs, which thus depicted Charles as an inheritor of Elizabeth’s mantle as England’s divinely favoured Protestant defender—an inheritance that came with a grave responsibility to the English Israel. The descriptor ‘those that love him’ is also suggestive of Horne’s motives. The phrase was often applied to Protestants, with Catholics denigrated for not truly loving God, and instead loving the pope or the Virgin Mary.

³³ Horne, *The Shield of the Righteous*, p. 111.

³⁴ Horne, *The Shield of the Righteous*, pp. 111–112. During a famine, Abraham and Sarah travelled to Egypt; Pharaoh found Sarah beautiful, so he took her to his palace, and only let her and Abraham go once God had sent several plagues to the royal household (Genesis 12). Later, while Abraham was living in Gerar, King Abimelech desired the beautiful Sarah, believing her to be Abraham’s sister; God appeared to Abimelech in a dream and told him the truth, and ordered Abimelech to return Sarah to Abraham (Genesis 20).

³⁵ An allusion to Psalm 21:3: ‘For thou preventest him with the blessings of goodness: thou settest a crown of pure gold on his head.’

³⁶ Horne, *The Shield of the Righteous*, p. 112.

Horne is here perhaps suggesting that Charles would be corrupted by his Catholic wife, Henrietta Maria.³⁷

This section makes clear the parallel between England and Israel, with Charles counselled to defend and advance Protestantism so that God would protect and bless the English. With these analogies, Horne both emphasised England's providential favour, and warned the English that they must continue to 'love' God so that they can continue to receive 'deliverance in troubles'—with 'love' here seemingly referring to Protestantism and a defeat of Catholicism.

In *The Shield of the Righteous*, Horne both inserted the memory of Elizabeth into contemporary debates, and used the biblical past to comment on the dangers of Catholicism and popery in the present. Elizabeth had been delivered from the pestilence of Catholicism because of her Protestant faith, and Horne overtly reminded Charles of this fact. The reference to Elizabeth, published during the 1625 plague, may also have been intended to draw on Elizabeth's preservation from several bouts of plague and smallpox—especially her 1563 bout of smallpox, which was so nearly fatal that Cecil and other councillors had made contingency plans concerning the government and the succession.³⁸ Preservations like these were believed to be the result of direct intervention by God, and were interpreted as a sign of divine favour.

The dedicatee of the pamphlet, Edward Waties, was a lawyer and justice of the peace who served under both James and Charles as a justice of the Council of Wales and the Marches. While certainly hoping that the King would heed his counsel, Horne also seems to have hoped to counsel those in positions of power *around* Charles to be extra vigilant against the pestilence of Catholicism. Indeed, the dedication to Waties supports such a reading, given that parts of Wales remained Catholic strongholds, and that the justices of the Council of Wales and the Marches were involved in presiding over cases against recusants.³⁹

³⁷ Horne might also be hinting at the influence of the religiously ambiguous Anna of Denmark, Charles's mother and James's consort. While she arrived in Scotland as a Lutheran princess, by the time of her English coronation, her Catholicism was an open secret that James used for political purposes. Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli, the Venetian resident in England, felt confident enough to write on 28 May 1603 that Anna had 'became a Catholic'. Anna would go on to refuse communion at her coronation in England (which quickly became public knowledge), and in September 1608, she attended mass in the Spanish embassy. See: Jemma Field, 'Anna of Denmark and the Politics of Religious Identity in Jacobean Scotland and England, c.1592–1619', *Northern Studies*, 50 (2019), pp. 87–113; and Dunn-Hensley, *Anna of Denmark and Henrietta Maria*, pp. 27–31.

³⁸ Stephen Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558–1569* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 103–105.

³⁹ See: Alexandra Walsham, 'Holywell and the Welsh Catholic Revival', in *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 177–205; Martin Cleary, 'The Catholic Resistance in Wales: 1568–1678', *Blackfriars*, 38.444 (1957), pp. 111–125; Philip Jenkins, "'A Welsh Lancashire'? Monmouthshire Catholics in the Eighteenth Century', *British Catholic History*, 15.2 (1979), pp. 176–188; and Michael A. Mullett, *Catholics in Britain and Ireland, 1558–1829* (London: Macmillan, 1998), pp. 27–32, 97–100.

The Shield of the Righteous was thus a warning to everyone in England against the dangers of Catholicism. Despite having several important deliverances from James's reigns that he could have turned to (the Gunpowder Plot, for example), Horne instead turned to the monarch who he believed had been providentially favoured by God, and had defended her people from the 'plague' of Catholicism. To do so, he connected Elizabeth to both Jacob and David, and offered the Queen's actions against Catholicism as an example that both Charles and the English more generally should be emulating. Horne also conflated the biblical past with the recent past, using the last Tudor monarch as an example of God's continued intervention in human affairs to portray England as a new Israel. Elizabeth had defended the Protestant Church of England and been justly rewarded by God. In a period where plague was seen as punishment from God, Horne was suggesting that the pestilence of Catholicism was spreading in England, for which the English were being punished—just like the plagues that had been inflicted on Israel as punishment for their disobedience or ungodly behaviour. To Horne's mind, one of the most effective ways to deal with both pestilences was to emulate the example of Elizabeth, England's Jacob, and defend and advance England's Protestantism.

Horne's pamphlet was only one of several published in the early years of Charles's reign that, while mentioning James, emphasised Elizabeth as the example Charles should be emulating. As Kevin Sharpe has observed, while Elizabeth was remembered during James's reign as a coded example of religio-political victory, during Charles's reign, such references quickly became a pointed example of 'good Protestant rule and moderate government' in contrast to Charles, to his increasing frustration.⁴⁰ The contrast between Elizabeth's and Charles's ruling 'style' was quickly established in popular print, with Elizabeth's piety and her 'respect' for parliament key themes of contrast, especially given the rocky start to Charles's relationship with parliament. In early 1627, Christopher Lever, who had previously published *Queene Elizabeths Teares*, returned to the subject of England's providential Protestantism in *The Historie of The Defendors of the Catholique Faith* (that is, the Protestant faith). The pamphlet provided a history of the various religious reforms undertaken by the English monarchs from Henry VIII to James VI & I, punctuated with 'Observations Divine, Politique, [and] Morall' that focused on the ways that the monarchs had prosecuted their role as 'Defender of the Faith', although Lever's discussion of Mary I focuses on 'what particulars Queene Marie did most offend the Catholike Faith', with her (mal)treatment of Elizabeth featuring prominently. That Lever, as Samuel Pepys would comment of himself four decades later, had 'sucked in so much of the sad story of Queen Elizabeth' is made clear by the various marginal notes on the

⁴⁰ Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), p. 273.

text in the section on Mary's reign: he records 'The glorie of Queene Elizabeths deeds', claims that 'Queene Elizabeth [is] incomparable', and conveys the 'hurt the Q[ueen's] death had bene to Christedome'.⁴¹

As the section on Mary neared its end, Lever largely abandoned any pretence that he was talking about Mary. Embracing a Foxean narrative, Lever contrasted the 'evill Queene Marie had done' with the 'gratious governement' of Elizabeth, which 'defended the profession of Faith and Religion'. According to Lever, God had preserved Elizabeth so that she could succeed to the throne and be a true 'Defendresse' of the Protestant faith. This defence of Protestantism, however, was not merely through 'Pollicie', and in the context of the heightened threat of Catholicism, Lever used Elizabeth's reign to advocate for a militant form of Protestantism. To do so, Lever employed a somewhat confused analogy to compare Elizabeth's actions with Judith's: Elizabeth 'victoriously defended' Protestantism 'against all oppositions, cutting off (not by Pollicie) onely (as did Judith) but by her power the head of Holophernes (Idolatrie)'.⁴² England, therefore, was able to triumph 'in the spoyle of Gods enemies' because Elizabeth had 'most honourably defended' 'the Children of Faith'.

As a Judith, Elizabeth had defended England's Protestantism through both violence and policy, and this analogy is part of a noticeable shift in the way that the story of Judith was applied to Elizabeth after 1603. Certainly, the violence of Judith beheading Holofernes was central to virtually every invocation of the episode during Elizabeth's reign, but the overt reference to Elizabeth supporting Protestantism 'not only by policy' is telling.⁴³ For instance, in 1596, after a Spanish raid on Cornwall, Charles Gibbon wrote that 'as God brought ... [H]olifernes to destruction, by the hand of Judith a woman, ... so his mercy, can make her Majestie powerful ... to spoyle the Spanyard [i.e., Philip II]', while to John Norden it seemed evident that 'wee have in her Majestie, under GOD ... absolute hope that she is the Judith that GOD hath ordayned of cut off the head, namely, to dispoyle the man of sinne of all his glorie ... will it not bee honourable to Queene Elizabeth, to breake the force of the invincible navie of Spaine?'⁴⁴ While he is writing about the past (and thus cannot counsel Elizabeth to behave like Judith), Lever emphasises how Elizabeth *did* defend England's Protestantism, and in a

⁴¹ Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys, Volume 8: 1667*, ed. by Robert Latham and William Matthews (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 389 (17 August 1667); Christopher Lever, *The Historie of The Defendors of the Catholique Faith* (London, 1627; *STC* 15537), pp. 216, 217.

⁴² Lever, *The Historie of The Defendors of the Catholique Faith*, pp. 215–217.

⁴³ Aidan Norrie, 'Elizabeth I as Judith: Reassessing the Apocryphal Widow's Appearance in Elizabethan Royal Iconography', *Renaissance Studies*, 31.5 (2017), pp. 707–708, 722.

⁴⁴ Charles Gibbon, *A watch-woorde for warre Not so new as necessary: published by reason of the disperced rumors amongst us, and the suspected comming of the Spanyard against us* ([London], 1596; *STC* 11492), sig. G2v; John Norden, *A Christian Familiar Comfort and Incouragement unto all English Subjects, not to dismaie at the Spanish threats* (London, 1596; *STC* 18604), pp. 37–38. These examples, and others, are analysed in: Norrie, 'Elizabeth I as Judith', pp. 707–722.

period where the threat of Catholicism was again of paramount concern, this example served as an exhortation to Charles to emulate the example of his 'glorious' predecessor.

Lever also suggests, however, that simply *being* a Protestant was not enough reason for a monarch to be called 'Defender of the Faith'. The pamphlet's subtitle emphasised both 'by what means these Kings & Queenes have obtained this Title, Defendor of the Faith, and wherein they have deserved it'.⁴⁵ For Lever, a true Defender of the Faith needed to continually repel 'idolatrie'—just as Elizabeth did. Such a pronouncement seems to be a rebuke of Charles's policies, especially given he had invited a Catholic into the heart of the state by marrying a French princess (after unsuccessfully courting a Spanish Catholic infanta)—a decision that could hardly be described as repelling 'idolatrie'.

The pamphlet also contained references to Solomon, although it is Edward VI and Elizabeth who are referred to as Solomons, not James. According to Lever, 'God had given our Nation a Salomon for Wisedome, and a Josias for his Devotion, and Zeale', and that 'this Nation never had such a Salomon, who in so poore a number of yeares, had a like measure of those his rich treasures of Zeale, Wisedome, Love, and State,' meaning that Edward was a contemporary Solomon and Josiah, who had succeeded the Davidic Henry.⁴⁶

In the case of Elizabeth, however, Lever went further. In his section on Elizabeth's reign, he claimed that she 'indured so much for the tryall of her Faith, as may well approve her to bee most valiant in Christian patience, and to have worthily defended the profession of the Catholike Faith, before shee was made Defendresse'. He then directed his readers to the 'particular Narration of that which formerly I have declared'—namely, *Queene Elizabeths Teares*, as the marginal note makes clear.⁴⁷ While *Queene Elizabeths Teares* had compared Elizabeth's sufferings to Daniel, Lever now insisted that it was for exceeding Solomon's wisdom that the Queen should be remembered:

I receive speciall contentment, that in my knowledge of this Sovereigne Ladie Queene Elizabeth, I dare confidently report to have found more (in the travell of my time) than King Salomon withall his experience and wisdome could ever finde, A good Woman.⁴⁸

Lever seems to be building on Elizabeth's self-fashioning as a Solomon. For instance, when addressing parliament concerning her delay in signing the death warrant for Mary, Queen of Scots, Elizabeth had claimed that 'as Salomon, so I above all thynges have desyred wysdome at the handes of God'.⁴⁹ To Lever's mind, it was clear that God had granted this request, even

⁴⁵ Lever, *The Historie of The Defendors of the Catholique Faith*, sig. A1r.

⁴⁶ Lever, *The Historie of The Defendors of the Catholique Faith*, pp. 154, 130.

⁴⁷ Lever, *The Historie of The Defendors of the Catholique Faith*, p. 259.

⁴⁸ Lever, *The Historie of The Defendors of the Catholique Faith*, p. 259.

⁴⁹ Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.III.34, fol. 314.

to the point where she had exceeded the Hebrew king's wisdom. This reading is reinforced by Lever's allusion to Ecclesiastes 8:28: 'my soul seeketh, but I find not: one man amongst a thousand have I found; but a woman among all those have I not found'. The verse was generally thought to denigrate the possibility of women being good and wise. For instance, in his commentary on Ecclesiastes, published in 1654, John Cotton claimed that in this verse, Solomon meant that 'There is a great scarcity of men (worthy the name of men, or quitting themselves like men,) and a greater scarcity of women worthy of the name of women: and Kings of all men (especially penitent Kings) have most cause to to [sic] say so'.⁵⁰ According to Lever, the assumptions that decades of glosses had applied to the verse were redundant: Elizabeth was the one woman who 'hath attained hereto', and this attainment exceeded both her predecessors and her successors, and emphasised the providential favour of which Elizabeth was (still) believed to have been in receipt. Between this and his previous pamphlet, Lever had compared Elizabeth with Daniel, Judith, and Solomon, demonstrating the range of biblical antecedents that writers could draw on, while also suggesting that gender was not a primary consideration when invoking a biblical analogy. For Lever, Elizabeth analogies were such an effective and potent religio-political tool that he offered them as examples to two successive kings.

Lever's reference to Elizabeth's wisdom was evidently intended to comment—at least partially—on the relationship between the last Tudor monarch and her parliaments. The pamphlet was entered into the Stationers' Register on 8 March 1627, by which time Charles had already dissolved two English parliaments (the so-called Useless Parliament, 17 May to 12 August 1625; and the Second Parliament, 6 February to 15 June 1626) over disputes concerning the duties of tonnage and poundage, and had angered the Commons over the influence of the Duke of Buckingham (the Second Parliament having been dissolved primarily to avoid the impeachment of Buckingham).⁵¹ 1627 would end without a parliament being called, and Charles only begrudgingly agreed to call his third parliament in January 1628 to finance Buckingham's intended expedition against the French. Parliament assembled on 17 March 1628, but refused to vote Charles any money until he addressed what MPs saw as a

⁵⁰ John Cotton, *A Briefe Exposition with Practicall Observations Upon The Whole Booke of Ecclesiastes* (London, 1654; Wing C6413), p. 158. Such a gloss seems to draw on the English translation of Martin Luther's own commentary, which disparaged the wisdom a woman could attain: 'If men be not able to perfourme this thing, yea almost none, much lesse shall women be able to doe it. ... There may (sayth he) be founde one among a thowsande which by experience hath attayned to say: my counsels and devises can not succede or prevayle, and so by this meane be made meete to governe. But not one woman hath attained hereto, because of gods ordinance.' [Martin Luther], *An Exposition of Salomons Booke called Ecclesiastes or the Preacher* (London, 1573; STC 16979), sig. R4v (p. 132v). This translation was published anonymously by John Day.

⁵¹ See: Michael J. Braddick, *The Nerves of State: Taxation and the Financing of the English State, 1558–1714* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), pp. 52–53, 87, 139–140.

multitude of encroachments on parliamentary privilege.⁵² The four main areas of complaint were set out in the Petition of Right: for Charles to be voted the money, he had to agree to restrictions on non-Parliamentary taxation, forced billeting of soldiers, imprisonment without cause, and the use of martial law.⁵³ Despite public reservations from the King, the Commons passed the petition on 7 May. After much debate, the Lords passed an amended version of the petition on 26 May, which the Commons quickly approved on the following day. Charles was initially incensed at the passing of the Petition—on 2 June, he sent an answer to the petition in which he claimed ‘he holds himself in conscience as well obliged as of his Prerogative’.⁵⁴ Faced with such a response, the Commons again began discussing the impeachment of Buckingham, which forced Charles’s hand. He capitulated, and appeared before parliament on 7 June to grant assent to the petition.⁵⁵ Unwittingly, Charles had emulated the example of Elizabeth in climbing down in the face of parliamentary pressure. As Henry Burton wrote, ‘Even Salomon, for all his wisdom, had a grave Senate of sage Elders’—thus reminding Charles of the importance of listening to parliamentary counsel.⁵⁶

The Personal Rule: Elizabeth Analogies as Warning

Charles himself may not have drawn a parallel between his acceptance of the Petition of Right and Elizabeth, but others certainly did. In 1628, Elizabeth’s Golden Speech was reprinted for the first time since its original publication in 1601.⁵⁷ The unknown printer of the text added a preface that sought to make the speech as relevant in 1628 as it had been in 1601, reminding readers that Elizabeth had ‘graciously and speedily ... heard and yeelded to her Subjects desires, and proclaimed the same in their hearing’.⁵⁸ As Charles’s reign progressed, the image of Elizabeth as the ideal queen-in-parliament gained a wide acceptance, in spite of its dubious

⁵² Thomas Cogswell, ‘A Low Road to Extinction? Supply and Redress of Grievances in the Parliaments of the 1620s’, *The Historical Journal*, 33.2 (1990), pp. 291, 296–297, 300.

⁵³ *Commons Debates 1628, Volume III: 21 April–27 May 1628*, ed. by Robert C. Johnson, Mary Frear Keeler, Maija Jansson Cole, and William B. Bidwell (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), pp. 284, 287, 294; Elizabeth Read Foster, ‘Petitions and the Petition of Right’, *Journal of British Studies*, 14.1 (1974), pp. 21–45.

⁵⁴ *Commons Debates 1628, Volume IV: 28 May–26 June 1628*, ed. by Mary Frear Keeler, Maija Jansson Cole, and William B. Bidwell (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), p. 54; TNA SP 16/106, fol. 132r.

⁵⁵ Richard Cust, ‘Charles I, the Privy Council and the Parliament of 1628’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 2 (1992), pp. 30, 42–43, 45–47.

⁵⁶ Henry Burton, *Israels Fast. Or, A Meditation Upon the Seventh Chapter of Joshuah, A faire Precedent for these Times* ([London], 1628; STC 4147), p. 13. The pamphlet is dedicated to both Charles, who is called ‘our Royall Joshua’, and the members of parliament, who are referred to as the ‘loyall Elders of Israel, now happily assembled in Parliament’.

⁵⁷ The Speech was originally published as: *Her Majesties most princelie answer, delivered by her selfe at the court at Whitehall, on the last day of November 1601* (London, 1601; STC 7578). See: Patrick Collinson, ‘Elizabeth I and the Verdicts of History’, *Historical Research*, 76.194 (2003), pp. 481–482; and Aidan Norrie, ‘Kings’ Stomachs and Concrete Elephants: Gendering Elizabeth I through the Tilbury Speech’, *Royal Studies Journal*, 6.2 (2019), p. 200.

⁵⁸ *Queene Elizabeths Speech to her Last Parliament* ([London?], [1628]; STC 7579), sig. A2r.

historicity—with Elizabeth analogies used to counsel Charles to ‘yield’ to his subjects’ ‘desires’, just as Elizabeth had.

During the Personal Rule, godly writers used Elizabeth analogies as a warning to Charles—a warning that emphasised the dire consequences of the English no longer being God’s chosen people. As debates raged concerning the relationship between monarch and parliament, and the country faced a war against Catholic expansionism, writers (re)turned to the reign of Elizabeth, with the memory of the English—and Elizabeth’s—victory over the Spanish Armada in 1588 revived as prescriptive guidance for the contemporary tumult. In 1631, for example, John Vicars’s *Englands Hallelujah* offered Elizabeth’s providential Protestantism as an example that could help England weather the storm of the ‘Thirty Years’ War.’⁵⁹

A poet and chronicler, Vicars’s writings often commented on politics, and on numerous occasions he exhorted Charles to adopt a foreign policy of militant Protestantism.⁶⁰ The bulk of *Englands Hallelujah* contains 145, six-line verses (except for the last verse, which has seven) on the theme of ‘England’s Hallelujah’. That Vicars was paying close attention to Elizabeth’s providential protection with a view to its contemporary relevance is made clear in the pamphlet’s subtitle: ‘Great Brittaines gratefull retribution, for Gods gracious benediction In our many and most famous deliverances, since the halcyon-dayes of ever-blessed Queene Elizabeth, to these present times’.

The subtitle’s claim is made overt in verse thirteen, when Vicars stated that Elizabeth’s providential protection was the direct result of her Protestantism. In addition to ‘Those Halcyon-Dayes of sweet Eliza’s Raigne’, Vicars echoed many of the published Elizabeth analogies—from both Elizabeth’s life and after her death—by celebrating the Queen who was a ‘Friend to Faith’, and a ‘Scourge to Rome, & Spaine’.⁶¹ This successful militant defence of

⁵⁹ *Englands Hallelujah* was entered into the Stationers’ Register on 8 November 1630—Elizabeth had become Queen on 17 November—but the pamphlet was not published until 1631 (thus after 25 March). As Elizabeth died on 24 March 1603, and James VI & I had died on 27 March 1625, it is possible that the pamphlet was deliberately printed around these anniversaries.

⁶⁰ For instance, he was vehemently against the Spanish match. Julia Gasper, ‘Vicars, John (1580–1652)’, *ODNB*. In *Englands Remembrancer*, published in 1641, Vicars wrote ‘O great King Charles, / ... [it is] High time to put-on resolutions rare, / To honour God, who with such honours faire / Hath blessed thee and thy three Kingdomes, / Remember also and Commiserate / Thy royall Sisters poore Palatinate, / ... [and] Holland thine honest, ancient friend no lesse. / Who All, with Us, and on Us, looke for ayd. / From thee, great Prince, who long have been ore-layd / With Romish rage and Spanish cruelty, / Still groaning, grieving, by their tyranny, / ... give thee all their aide, to spend their blood, / To hasten-on this work so great, so good.’ John Vicars, *Englands Remembrancer, or, A thankfull acknowledgement of Parliamentary mercies our English-nation wherein is contained a breife enumeration of all, or the most of Gods free favours and choise blessings multiplied on us since this Parliament first began* (London, 1641; Wing V303), p. 4.

⁶¹ John Vicars, *Englands Hallelujah. Or, Great Brittaines gratefull retribution, for Gods gracious benediction In our many and most famous deliverances, since the halcyon-dayes of ever-blessed Queene Elizabeth, to these present times* (London, 1631; *STC* 24697), sig. B2r.

England's Protestantism, however, was the direct result of providential intervention: God, whose 'poore Church' 'he oft did save', had so many deliverances and 'wonders wrought'.⁶² For Vicars, there was no greater example of these 'wonders wrought' than the life and reign of Elizabeth.

The last Tudor monarch, 'whom in their owne Snares hir Foes he caught', overcame numerous attempts on her life, including 'the Treasons ofte[n] contrived by' the Earls of Westmorland and Northumberland (which culminated in the Northern Rebellion of 1569), John Savage's 'savage plotted Villanies', William Parry's 'pernicious practis'd Insolence', and Anthony Babington's 'barbarous Treason'.⁶³ Vicars also seemed to be aware of the growing concerns over the Catholic threat from within, as he mentioned the 'Jewish Lopez'—a reference to Roderigo Lopez, Elizabeth's Catholic-*converso* physician who was executed in 1594 for plotting to poison her. Just as Elizabeth was almost undone by a Catholic court physician, Vicars was possibly suggesting that Charles might also be undone by someone close to him—namely, his Catholic wife, or her (Catholic) attendants.

After mentioning these various failed assassination attempts, Vicars described the defeat of the Spanish Armada through an analogical lens:

But, if you'l see, Sisera's Pride at height
Against that English Deborah most sweet;
And how the Lords strong Arme did for Hir fight,
Behold it in his Eighty-Eights great Fleet:
His great Armado ...
Which, Hee, Invincible did fondly call.⁶⁴

The use of the English Deborah typology equates England with Israel, with England's delivery in 1588 paralleled with the Israelites' victory over the Canaanites under Deborah. Just as Deborah had defended God's people, so had Elizabeth defended England's Protestantism, and for which God rewarded her. That the Hebrew past provided a 'mirror' for the English is made all the more overt by the way Vicars equated Philip II with Sisera, the commander of the Canaanite army.

That England was a 'new' Israel, and that Elizabeth's reign proved that God had blessed England because of its Protestantism, was again brought to the fore in verse 23:

Our Englands Deborah most deare,
(By Gods all-potent power, all-patent Grace)
Made most triumphant over foes and feare,
Heaven did from Hir, proud Sisera quite chace:
The starres in order, windes, waves, seem'd to fight,

⁶² Vicars, *Englands Hallelujah*, sig. B2v.

⁶³ Vicars, *Englands Hallelujah*, sig. B2v.

⁶⁴ Vicars, *Englands Hallelujah*, sig. B3r. The marginal note on this verse is: 'Spaines Armado. 1588.'

To vindicate hir Innocence and Right.⁶⁵

According to Vicars, the Spanish Sisera was defeated by the ‘all-potent’ God, who had even turned nature against Philip. This attack on Elizabeth—in spite of her ‘Innocence’ and her ‘Right’ (playing on the double meaning of ‘right’ to refer to both her right to her throne, and the ‘rightness’ of her Protestantism)—was obviously doomed to fail, because God was on the side of the English Deborah.

Englands Hallelujah twice presented Elizabeth as ‘England’s Deborah’, but did not employ any comparable analogies for James. For Vicars, it was the reign of Elizabeth that proved the link to the Israel of the Old Testament, with James’s reign failing to provide a continuation of the blessings that the English Deborah had accorded England. As Paul Hammer has noted, the defeat of the Armada was a ‘staple’ of English propaganda, yet the commonplace habit of remembering Elizabeth through these analogies went beyond mere propaganda, and indeed beyond commemoration.⁶⁶ The religio-political turmoil of 1631 showed no sign of abating: parliament had been dissolved for two years, and Laud, who was already Bishop of London and a privy councillor, was accused of Arminianism, and was widely believed to be secretly harbouring ‘popish’ doctrines that he was advising Charles to impose on England. Within this context, which saw clear concerns over the Catholic threat from within, Vicars returned to the events of 1588 and re-interpreted them through a lens of presentism. Elizabeth was not merely *a* Deborah, but instead was *England’s* Deborah: like the ‘original’ Deborah, who God had sent not only to the Israelites, but also for His people in perpetuity, Elizabeth had been sent not merely for her reign, but also for England’s godly until the end of days—and thus, the Queen’s actions against Catholics were just as relevant in 1631 as they had been in 1588.

The English Deborah typology, however, also served as a warning to Charles. After Deborah’s death, the Israelites committed ‘evil in the sight of the Lord: and the Lord delivered them’ into the hands of the Midianites.⁶⁷ According to Vicars, now that England’s Deborah was dead, and James had inadequately emulated her example, it fell to Charles to prevent England from repeating the Israelites’ mistake. In early modern England, the Midianites—Israel’s idolatrous, Baal-worshipping neighbours—were sometimes depicted as sly enemies of Israel who worked to defeat the Israelites from within, rather than through direct combat. For instance, Theodor Hering claimed that ‘the slie Midianites have a thousand wiles and wayes to

⁶⁵ Vicars, *Englands Hallelujah*, sig. B3r.

⁶⁶ Paul E.J. Hammer, ‘The Catholic Threat and the Military Response’, in *The Elizabethan World*, ed. by Susan Doran and Norman Jones (New York: Routledge, 2014), p. 640.

⁶⁷ Judges 6:1.

vexe and beguile the plaine hearted downe-right Israelites.⁶⁸ Francis Taylor went even further, warning that ‘the Midianites vexe the Israelites with their wiles: they first use them courteously, draw them into their acquaintance, so perswade them both to corporall and spirituall fornication.’⁶⁹ The English Israel was thus under attack from the Midianite-Catholics, and unless Charles emulated the example of England’s Deborah, England would be conquered, and lose its status as God’s new chosen people.

The English Deborah remained a key typological device for understanding, and potentially averting, the tumult of the 1630s. Vicars’s theme was taken up and expanded on by Thomas Adams’s *Commentary* on the Second Epistle of St Peter. The commentary was published in 1633—the year Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury, and the fourth year since an English parliament had sat—and as a Calvinist episcopalian, Adams unsurprisingly devoted much of the work to decrying popery, and to extolling the virtues of parliamentary counsel.⁷⁰ Equating Elizabeth with Deborah, he celebrated the last Tudor monarch’s defence of England’s Protestantism, as well as her ‘positive’ relationship with parliament. As the Personal Rule continued, these invocations of Deborah seemed to hark back to the fifth pageant of Elizabeth’s coronation procession in January 1559, where the judge was depicted ‘with her estates, consulting for the good government of Israel’.

The commentary breaks down, and discusses, each verse from the Epistle in great detail. The discussion of 2 Peter 1:1 alone—‘Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ’—lasts for thirty-two pages. In the second of the five ‘conclusions’ he drew from the last part of the verse—‘through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ’—Adams turned to the religious situation in England under Mary I. He began by claiming that ‘The faith of a Christian is well grounded, upon the righteousness of Christ For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ’, noting in Matthew 16:18, Jesus said ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this Rocke (which thou hast acknowledged to be the Son of the living God) I will build my Church: and the gates of hell shall not prevaile against it.’ Adams then invoked Stephen Gardiner, and mocked his confessional expediency, he ‘did reade that Text with the Popes spectacles’ in Mary I’s reign, despite that fact that he had preached ‘that the Rocke was only Christ’ during Edward VI’s

⁶⁸ Theodor Hering, *The Triumph of the Church over Water and Fire* (London, 1625; STC 13204), p. 21.

⁶⁹ Francis Taylor, *Selfe-Satisfaction Occasionally taught the Citizens in the Lecture at St. Magnes neere London-bridge* (London, 1633; STC 23717), sig. C3r.

⁷⁰ Adams desired vigilant observance of the Sabbath and often referred to the ‘evils’ of Catholicism and popery, but was against the abolition of the episcopacy, which he believed would herald an ‘Anabaptisticall ataxie or confusion’. J. Sears McGee, ‘Adams, Thomas (1583–1652)’, ODNB; Thomas Adams, *Five Sermons Preached Upon Sundry Especiall Occasions* (London, 1626; STC 115), p. 34.

reign.⁷¹ Gardiner had served as Bishop of Winchester under both Henry VIII and Mary, although he had been deprived under Edward VI. Under Henry, he had not only served as the King's secretary, but had also published a treatise—*De Vera Obedientia* (*Concerning True Obedience*)—in support of the royal supremacy. Adams's point was thus that if Gardiner, the arch-Catholic and duplicitous Achitophel, had once claimed that the 'Rocke was only Christ' and not the Pope, then Protestant theology was clearly the truth.

After setting out his grievances against Catholics, Adams turned to discuss the Reformation in England. Exhorting his readers to trust in 'the righteousness of Jesus Christ', which is the faith 'that God requires', Adams praised the reign of Elizabeth as an example for the present:

Let the memorie of her be blessed, even that our Debora, whereof all true hearted English are glad to heare: Shee was truly the Defender of this true, ancient, Catholike, and Apostolike Faith: she reared up the Preaching of this faith, she maintained this faith, shee lived in this faith, in this faith shee died.⁷²

Here, Deborah has virtually become a metonym for the last Tudor monarch—Elizabeth is merely 'her'. Adams evidently assumed that his readers would be aware of the tendency to link England with Israel, meaning that this reference to 'our Debora' was all the detail needed to understand that he was praising Elizabeth and her Reformation.

According to Adams, by listening to the counsel of the 'popish' Laud, and ruling without parliament, Charles had allowed 'superstition' back into the English Church, and unlike the English Deborah, he was not 'with his estates, consulting for the good government of Israel'. Adams's commentary reminded Charles that it was his duty to ensure that 'our children after us' could worship free of 'superstition', just as 'our fathers [did] before us' in the days of 'Queen Elizabeth of blessed memorie'.⁷³ By offering such counsel through an Elizabeth analogy, Adams was highlighting the overt connection between Old Testament Israel and contemporary England. The Deborah typology not only showed that Elizabeth had been divinely favoured, but also suggested that if England continued to ensure that the 'clouds of error' remained 'dispersed', God would protect His 'new' chosen people just as He did under the leadership of Deborah the Judge.

For many of the godly, their fears surrounding the popish 'clouds of error' were realised when Laud finally succeeded as Archbishop of Canterbury. Elected on 29 August 1633, and installed on 19 September, Laud—with Charles's backing—quickly asserted his

⁷¹ Thomas Adams, *A Commentary or, Exposition upon the Divine Second Epistle Generall, written by the Blessed Apostle St. Peter* (London, 1633; STC 108), p. 29 (sig. D3r).

⁷² Adams, *A Commentary*, pp. 29–30.

⁷³ Adams, *A Commentary*, p. 57.

authority, and began reshaping the Church in his desired image.⁷⁴ One of the most controversial of Laud's innovations was the requirement that all altars be placed at the eastern end of the Church and surrounded by rails.⁷⁵ Beginning in April 1634, and expanded in summer 1635, this 'popish' overhaul faced widespread resistance, although by 1640 the process was largely complete, thanks to a concerted legal effort by Laud and his supporters.⁷⁶

The furore over the placement of the altars, coming as it did in the sixth year of the Personal Rule, may have prompted John Taylor to republish his *Booke of Martyrs*. Originally printed in 1616, the booklet was produced in the tiny, 64mo format.⁷⁷ It proved popular—in addition to its easy-to-digest content, people seem to have considered it a novelty—and it was reprinted in 1617, and again in 1627.⁷⁸ Taylor's *Booke of Martyrs*, however, is not merely a versified summary of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, as several scholars have inaccurately claimed.⁷⁹ Instead, in addition to a versified summary, it provided a continuation of Foxe that used biblical analogies to elevate Elizabeth into the hallowed ranks of England's godly.⁸⁰ The booklet also served as a record of the many people who had struggled to free England from the evils of popery—struggles that Taylor saw as assuring the status of the English as God's new chosen people.

The Elizabeth analogies in Taylor's *Booke of Martyrs* appeared in every edition of the booklet since its first printing. The 1635 republication, however, was radically different from its predecessors, which suggests a pointed purpose for reissuing. The most obvious difference is the pamphlet's size, as it was printed in octavo. It also included a woodcut image of a man being burned at the stake (possibly based on the one from *Acts and Monuments* depicting the martyrdom of William Sawter), which was clearly intended to evoke the many woodcut images from Foxe's book. The religio-political purpose for the republication, however, is made clear

⁷⁴ Charles Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987), pp. 87–88.

⁷⁵ Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 147–149; Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, p. 96.

⁷⁶ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, pp. 209–210, 218.

⁷⁷ STC 23731.3. The booklet is no bigger than a modern credit/debit card.

⁷⁸ STC 23731.5 and STC 23731.7, respectively. On the 'novelty factor', see: David Scott Kastan, 'Little Foxes', in *John Foxe and his World*, ed. by Christopher Highley and John N. King (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), pp. 124–128; and Clare Wikeley, 'John Taylor the Water Poet, Authorship and Print, 1612–1631' (PhD thesis, University of Southampton, 2009), esp. p. 33n. 68.

⁷⁹ For instance, Kastan calls Taylor's work a 'redaction'; Capp claims the pamphlet contains 'summaries of ... Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"'; and Wooden simply describes the pamphlet as an 'abridgement of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*'. David Scott Kastan, 'Size Matters', *Shakespeare Studies*, 28 (2000), p. 151; Bernard Capp, *The World of John Taylor the Water-Poet, 1578–1653* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), p. 121; and Warren W. Wooden, 'The Peculiar Peregrinations of John Taylor the Water-Poet: A Study in Seventeenth-Century British Travel Literature', *Prose Studies*, 6.1 (1983), p. 3.

⁸⁰ That Taylor continued from where Foxe left off is most visible in the description of the 1603 succession. Taylor laments Elizabeth's death, writing 'Her death fill'd wofull England full of feares', before praising James, claiming 'Succession lawfully did leave the Crowne, / Unto a prince whose vertue and renowne, / And learning doth out-strip all Kings as far' (sig. B3r).

in the pamphlet's new subtitle:

Wherein are set downe the names of such Martyrs as suffered persecution, and laid downe their lives for witnesse-bearing unto the Gospell of Christ Jesus; drawne downe from the Primitive Church, to these later times, especially respecting such as have suffered in this Land under the tyranny of Antichrist, in opposition to Popish Errours.⁸¹

This new subtitle suggests that this *Booke of Martyrs* was intended as a rebuke to the Caroline regime, as well as a critique of the 'Popish Errours' of Laudianism. By republishing, Taylor intended to bolster those who were resisting the 'tyranny' of Laudian popery, in addition to recalling the 'Golden Age' of English (and Elizabethan) Protestantism, when popery was banished from England. Such attitudes can be found in the pamphlet's Elizabeth analogies, which describe Elizabeth's providential accession to the throne:

The Almighty guards his servants still.
And he at last did ease her sorrowes mone,
And rais'd her to her lawfull awfull throne;
This royall Debora, this princely Dame,
Whose life made all the world admire the same.⁸²

Taylor does not stop at the miraculous accession of Elizabeth, however, and he used another analogy to describe the last Tudor monarch's anti-Catholic programme:

As Judith in Bethulia's fame was spread,
For cutting off great Holophernes head:
So our Eliza stoutly did beginne,
Untopping and beheading Romish sinne,
Shee purg'd the Land of Papistry agen,
She liv'd belov'd of God, admir'd of men:
She made the Antichristian Kingdome quake,
She made the mighty power of Spaine to shake.⁸³

According to Taylor, Elizabeth succeeded to the throne through divine intervention (like Deborah), and like Judith, she defeated England's Catholic enemies and purged the land of popery. Such a retelling of Elizabeth's actions against Catholics was surely intended to make a presentist, didactic point. In celebrating Elizabeth's restoration of England's Protestantism, Taylor implied that Charles (and Laud) had failed to emulate the example of England's Deborah. As such, their failure to prevent 'Popish Errours' from taking root in England (and

⁸¹ John Taylor, *The Booke of Martyrs. Wherein are set downe the names of such Martyrs as suffered persecution, and laid downe their lives for witnesse-bearing unto the Gospell of Christ Jesus; drawne downe from the Primitive Church, to these later times, especially respecting such as have suffered in this Land under the tyranny of Antichrist, in opposition to Popish Errours* (London, 1635; STC 23732.8), sig. A1r.

⁸² Taylor, *The Booke of Martyrs*, sig. B2v.

⁸³ Taylor, *The Booke of Martyrs*, sig. B2v.

had even introduced such ‘errors’ through their ‘Popish’ altar and vestment policies)⁸⁴ had caused the English to commit evil in the sight of the Lord—a reproof made all the more pointed by the reprinting of this ‘new’ version of the booklet in 1639.⁸⁵

The reference to Elizabeth as Deborah here perhaps also utilises the typological device of Deborah consulting with her estates. In October 1634, Charles issued new writs for the collection of ship money, bolstered by precedents discovered in records in the Tower of London.⁸⁶ This taxation without parliamentary consent would of course fuel the Civil War, but the booklet’s conflation of Elizabeth and Deborah perhaps also served as an implicit critique of ship money (the reference to ‘Spaine’ would have brought to mind the Armada),⁸⁷ while also highlighting that Elizabeth was believed to have worked with her parliaments to raise taxes, thereby not needing to resort to such tactics.⁸⁸

Taylor’s successes as a writer were largely the result of his publishing strategy, which in addition to an early form of subscription, included publishing on topical subjects in a manner intended to reach the widest possible audience.⁸⁹ This focus on topicality and universality is not the whole reason for his engagement with the hugely popular Foxe. The reprinting suggests that Taylor sought to assert his Protestant credentials by reviving the memory of the monarch who had ‘purg’d the Land of Papistry’ during a time when England was widely believed to have once again succumbed to ‘Popish Errours’.⁹⁰

⁸⁴ For instance, at his impeachment trial, William Piers, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, was accused of introducing ‘into all or most Churches in his Diocese sundry Innovations in the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, and other new inventions of his owne, tending to Popery and Superstition’, ‘namely, setting up of Alters’. Likewise, in his account of Laud’s trial, Prynne reviled the ‘Popish furniture of the Altar’. *Articles of Accusation and Impeachment of the House of Commons, and all the Commons of England against William Pierce Doctor of Divinitie and Bishop of Bath and Wells* (London, 1642; Wing A3832), p. 5; William Prynne, *Canterburies Doome* (London, 1646; Wing P3917), p. 121.

⁸⁵ STC 23733. This is the last, published edition of Taylor’s *Booke of Martyrs*.

⁸⁶ Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 550–555. For instance, precedents from the reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III were collected and presented to Charles in TNA SP 16/276, fols. 186r–189v.

⁸⁷ As Kevin Sharpe has observed, by the end of the Jacobean period, ‘the name and memory of Queen Elizabeth had become a code for a nostalgic evocation of English naval prowess and victory.’ Sharpe, *Image Wars*, p. 273.

⁸⁸ Such a belief of course ignores Elizabeth’s unpopular issuing of monopolies, but her capitulation—as exemplified in her Golden Speech—perhaps stands in stark contrast to James’s unpopular monopoly issuing, which was only halted by the passage of the Act Concerning Monopolies (1624). On Elizabethan monopolies, see: David Dean, *Law-Making and Society in Late Elizabethan England: The Parliament of England, 1584–1601* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 85–92.

⁸⁹ See: Capp, *The World of John Taylor*, pp. 61–78.

⁹⁰ For instance, on 12 January 1641, a petition against the ‘Government of Archbishops, Bishops’ by a group of people from Kent was presented to the Commons. Of their thirteen grievances, two specifically focused on the re-emergence of popery. Article 3 claimed that the current Church government had ‘late[ly] encourag’d Papists and Arminians, together with their Books’, while Article 4 claimed ‘They have deform’d our Churches with Popish Pictures and Altars’. [John Rushworth], *Historical Collections from the Year 1638 to the Year 1641. Abrig’d and Improv’d. Volume 3* (London, 1706), pp. 336–337. For this petition, and others like it, see: Margaret Stieg, *Laud’s Laboratory: The Diocese of Bath and Wells in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1982), pp. 31–37.

The End of the Personal Rule: Elizabeth Analogies as Rebuke

In 1640, the Personal Rule finally came to an end. The imposition of the 1637 Scottish Book of Common Prayer had been unpopular, and had led to the signing of the Covenant, which expelled Scotland's bishops and made Scotland fully presbyterian. Charles's armed response to the Covenanters resulted in the First Bishops' War of 1639. Neither side was serious about fighting, and the war was ended by the Treaty of Berwick without any major clashes.⁹¹ Realising the weakness of his position, and concerned that the Scots were colluding with the French against England, Charles summoned his first English parliament in eleven years. The Short Parliament, as it became known, first met in April 1640. Charles hoped that the new parliament would quickly vote him taxes to fund his planned military expeditions to Scotland; these hopes were almost immediately dashed when MPs began debating crown abuses (such as ship money), and the encroachment on parliamentary privilege (especially the arrest of the nine members in March 1629).⁹² After only three sitting weeks, Charles dissolved the parliament on 5 May.⁹³

Charles's position soon worsened. He decided to attack the Scots without parliamentary support in an attempt to crush the Covenanters, but after learning of the King's plan, the better-equipped Scots pre-emptively marched south, and invaded Northumberland

⁹¹ See: Mark Charles Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns Against Scotland, 1638–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 8–39; Julian Goodare, 'The Rise of the Covenanters, 1637–1644', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 43–59; and Sarah Waurechen, 'Covenanter Propaganda and Conceptualizations of the Public During the Bishops' Wars, 1638–1640', *The Historical Journal*, 52.1 (2009), pp. 65–66.

⁹² Esther S. Cope, 'Compromise in Early Stuart Parliaments: The Case of the Short Parliament of 1640', *Albion*, 9.2 (1977), pp. 135–145. The nine members were: Sir John Eliot, John Selden, Denzil Holles, Benjamin Valentine, William Strode, Sir Miles Hobart, Walter Long, William Coryton, and Sir Peter Hayman. Charles had been angered by parliamentary debates over his right to levy tonnage and poundage, and ordered parliament be adjourned on 2 March 1629 to prevent further debates. The Commons voiced their anger at the order, and to prevent the adjournment, MPs Denzil Holles and Benjamin Valentine held the speaker, Sir John Finch, down in his chair. This allowed Sir John Eliot to read to the House his resolutions against the payment of tonnage and poundage and 'innovation[s] in Religion', which were then passed on the voices. Charles was informed of what was happening, and sent a messenger to order that the mace be removed, but Sir Miles Hobart locked the doors of the House to prevent the sergeant entering. Arrest warrants were issued on 3 March for the members responsible, and over the following months the King attempted to have the men found guilty of various crimes. The final two MPs, Valentine and Strode, were only fully released with the opening of the Long Parliament. See: Ofir Haivry, *John Selden and the Western Political Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 49–55; John Reeve, 'The Arguments in King's Bench in 1629 concerning the Imprisonment of John Selden and Other Members of the House of Commons', *Journal of British Studies*, 25.3 (1986), pp. 264–287; and *Commons Debates for 1629*, ed. by Wallace Notestein and Frances Helen Relf (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1921), pp. 101–102, 103–106, 170–171, 239–244, 252–267.

⁹³ In his dissolution speech, Charles claimed: 'There can noe occasion of comeinge to this Howse be soe unpleasant to me as this at this time. The feare of doeing what I am to doe to daye made me not longe agoe to come into this Howse where I exprest these feares and remedies I thought necessarye for the escheweing of it.' *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640*, ed. by Esther S. Cope, with Willson H. Coates (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977), p. 197. See also: Esther S. Cope, 'The King's Declaration Concerning the Dissolution of the Short Parliament of 1640: An Unsuccessful Attempt at Public Relations', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 40.4 (1977), pp. 325–331.

on 20 August.⁹⁴ The English forces were no match for the Covenanters, and after a humiliating defeat at the Battle of Newburn on 28 August, they surrendered. The Scots now controlled all of Northumberland and County Durham, as well as the stronghold of Newcastle.⁹⁵ Charles had no choice but to agree to peace, and signed the Treaty of Ripon in October 1640.⁹⁶ The terms of the Treaty left the occupied northern counties in the hands of the Scots as surety of the financial terms of the Treaty. Faced with no other option, Charles called another parliament in order to raise the funds to pay the Scots.⁹⁷ This parliament, now known as the Long Parliament, opened on 3 November 1640. Unsurprisingly, like its predecessors, this parliament immediately began to debate what it saw as abuses of the royal privilege and encroachments on the rights of parliament.⁹⁸ In an even weaker position than he had been in April, Charles was forced to allow these hostile debates to take place in order that the necessary money bills were passed.

The contemporary relevance of Elizabeth's memory was asserted from the very beginning of the Long Parliament. Each morning and afternoon, from 3 November until mid-April 1641, the Speaker of the Commons read out a prayer that urged MPs to be thankful for God's great 'mercies to this nation', especially the great deliverance 'from the Spanish invasion in the days of blessed Queen Elizabeth'.⁹⁹ It is unclear who composed the prayer, but this theme of Protestant England's deliverances under the providentially favoured Elizabeth became a powerful trope during the tumult of the 1640s.

As was customary, sermons were preached to MPs on fast days in St Margaret's, Westminster.¹⁰⁰ The first fast sermon of the Long Parliament preached before the Commons was delivered by Cornelius Burges on 17 November 1640. The Calvinist Burges was particularly hostile to what he saw as the popery of Laudianism, clashing with Laud on several occasions.¹⁰¹ On 18 December, only a month after the sermon was preached, parliament

⁹⁴ Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars*, pp. 47–53. See also: Waurechen, 'Covenanter Propaganda and Conceptualizations of the Public', pp. 63–86.

⁹⁵ Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars*, pp. 54–60.

⁹⁶ Conrad Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 162–163.

⁹⁷ Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, pp. 918–921.

⁹⁸ Conrad Russell, 'Why Did Charles I Call the Long Parliament?', *History*, 69.227 (1984), p. 381.

⁹⁹ *Proceedings in the Opening Session of the Long Parliament, House of Commons: Volume 1, 3 November–19 December 1640*, ed. by Maija Jansson (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2000), pp. 5, 6.

¹⁰⁰ See: Tom Webster, 'Preaching and Parliament, 1640–1659', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. by Hugh Adlington, Peter McCullough, and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 405–406.

¹⁰¹ Burges was well known around London for his reformist sermons, which had on occasion seen him brought before the ecclesiastical authorities. Tai Liu, 'Burges, Cornelius (d. 1665)', *ODNB*; Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (London: Allen Lane, 1993), pp. 84–86.

found Laud guilty of high treason and impeached him, suggesting that Burges's wariness over the 'threat' of Laudianism was shared by many of the assembled MPs.¹⁰²

Burges's sermon, which was published in 1641 with the unimaginatively descriptive title, *The First Sermon, Preached to the Honourable House of Commons*, used Elizabeth and the Elizabethan Reformation to offer insight into the current religio-political turmoil, with Elizabeth analogies used to bolster Burges's calls for England to undergo further reformation. Near the middle of the sermon, Burges offered a brief history of England's Reformation that he linked to the Old Testament story of Nehemiah. A Jew who served as Artaxerxes I of Persia's cup-bearer, Nehemiah begged the King's permission to rebuild the walls and temple of Jerusalem, which had been largely destroyed. The King granted his request, and made him the governor of Judea. Blessed by God, he was able to miraculously rebuild the walls of Jerusalem in only fifty-two days, with Burges commenting that 'when God once directed Nehemiah to this course ... all things began to thrive and come on a maine.'¹⁰³ Burges then made explicit his reason for describing the story of Nehemiah: 'Let us now reflect upon our selves, and the State of Religion, and progresse of Reformation in our owne Church, that we may make up the Parallel.'

Turning to England, Burges described how Henry VIII 'threw out the Pope', and how Edward VI 'cast out Popery'. The section on Edward included a thinly veiled attack on Archbishop Laud, with Burges claiming that Edward had been blessed with 'an Excellent Archbishop'—something that Charles, it seems, had not been. Even this critique of Laud, however, implicitly criticised Charles, who had not only elevated Laud to the See of Canterbury, but also continued to rely on his counsel in spite of public protestations to the bishop's manifest unworthiness. Burges then lamented the accession of Mary I in very Foxean language: 'The Princesse that came after, quickly turn'd the Tide, ... she set all the Gates wide open againe both for Pope, and Popery to re-enter with triumph, and to drink drunk of the bloud of our Ancestors, till God discharged her, and released his people from her crueltie.'¹⁰⁴ Mary's death, Burges suggests, was the direct result of God's intervention.

Burges then turned to Elizabeth in order to make his point clear:

When Queene Elizabeth (that glorious Deborah) mounted the Throne, although her heart was upright and loathed the Idolatry of the former Reigne, yet found she worke enough to restore any thing at all, and to make any beginnings of a Reformation. She soone felt, when she would have throughly pluckt up Popery both root and branch, (superfluous Ceremonies, and all remaining raggs of superstition, as well as grosse

¹⁰² *Proceedings in the Opening Session of the Long Parliament, House of Commons: Volume 1*, pp. 658–659, 661–663.

¹⁰³ Cornelius Burges, *The First Sermon, Preached to the Honourable House of Commons now assembled in Parliament at their Publique Fast. Novemb. 17. 1640*. (London, 1641; Wing B5671), p. 52.

¹⁰⁴ Burges, *The First Sermon*, p. 53.

Idolatry) that she had to do with an Hydra, having such a strong partie of stout Popelings to grapple with at home, and such potent and dangerous abettors of them ... abroad.¹⁰⁵

Burges diagnosed much of the contemporary religio-political turmoil as being the result of the 'incomplete' Elizabethan Reformation. He suggested that Elizabeth was unable to 'perfect' England's Reformation because of the hold popery had in England, with the Queen forced to contend with larger and more pressing concerns, rather than focusing on the more minute, theological concerns. This seems to be part of a strategy of exculpating Elizabeth from any blame for England's 'imperfect' Reformation (and to avoid needing to explain why it was 'incomplete' at her death), while also calling for further reformation. The reference to the Hydra—a many-headed serpent from Greek mythology that grew back two heads wherever one was cut off—suggests that for everything Elizabeth did to stamp out popery, more problems arose (a rather vivid metaphor for the increasingly punitive treason and anti-Catholic laws that were introduced from the 1570s onward). Elizabeth's attempts to 'slay' the Hydra can also be connected to the use of the Deborah typology here, with Elizabeth's defence of Protestantism being militant, rather than merely through words.

Burges's call for England to undergo further reformation is made all the more compelling by his linking of Israel and England. The story of Nehemiah had clear parallels with England: Nehemiah purified the Temple and restored proper Jewish worship, despite being assailed by enemies from all around. His godliness, and respect for the Jewish religion, meant that the people were blessed by God. After twelve years in Jerusalem, Nehemiah returned to the Persian king. He only remained with the King for a short time, before journeying back to Jerusalem. In the period that he had been gone, the Jews had already fallen back into idolatry, so Nehemiah had to again enforce his earlier reforms, and pray to God to 'remember' and 'spare' them 'according to the greatness of thy mercy'.¹⁰⁶ Nehemiah's first 'reformation' was thus the Elizabethan Reformation, which, by removing popery from England, had returned the Church of England 'unto the law of God'.¹⁰⁷ However, after Elizabeth's death, the English, just like Israelites, had begun to fall back into their old ways by allowing 'popery' to creep back in to both the Church and state. For Burges, it was now time to again purify England and complete Elizabeth's Reformation. As Nehemiah 13 suggests, part of the reason that the Jews began to fall back into their old ways was that Nehemiah did not remove all of the 'wicked' priests and officials, meaning that once he was no longer there

¹⁰⁵ Burges, *The First Sermon*, p. 53.

¹⁰⁶ Nehemiah 13:22, 29.

¹⁰⁷ Nehemiah 10:28.

to oversee them, they were able to return to their old ways. Such an observation seemed to offer an implicit rebuke of Elizabeth's treatment of puritans, with Burges hinting that had she heeded their warnings, some of the current turmoil could have been avoided. It is also tempting to read this rebuke as an indictment on the failure of Elizabeth to remove all of the 'wicked' priests: after all, Laud, one of the architects of the current turmoil, had been priested during Elizabeth's reign. Nevertheless, the English Deborah provided a clear precedent for reforming England, and Burges made clear that it was time for Parliament, just like Nehemiah had in Israel, to take the 'beginnings of a Reformation' and wholeheartedly commit to 'the perfecting of the Reformation'.

Burges concluded this section of the sermon by discussing Elizabeth's government, both political and religious, as a contrast to Charles's. He praised the 'holy men' who 'underwent voluntary exile in the heat of the Marian persecution', noting how on their return 'they were advanced to places of Dignitie, and Government in this Church', meaning they were 'more apt and forward to maintaine and hold up that Cause'.¹⁰⁸ In what was a recurring theme throughout the sermon, Burges emphasised the role of godly ministers and councillors in Elizabethan England, seemingly criticising Charles for his poor choice of councillors: after all, important figures of the Elizabethan regime, including Sir Francis Walsingham, Sir Henry Killigrew, and Sir Francis Knollys, as well as Edmund Grindal (future Archbishop of York, then Canterbury) and Edwin Sandys (future Archbishop of York), had all been Marian exiles. Indeed, Burges seems in particular to be alluding to the 'ungodly' archbishop—Laud—who was responsible for the 'Government in this Church'. Despite praising these godly figures of the Elizabethan regime, Burges ended the section by emphasising his calls for England to undergo further reformation, noting that the Church could be more 'thoroughly polished', before concluding 'there is nothing so perfect, here, but is capable of more perfection'.¹⁰⁹

With this sermon, Burges urged the MPs present to both guard against the 'Hydra' of popery, and to help 'perfect' the Reformation that Elizabeth started. England's Protestantism was now under attack from all directions: internally, it was besieged by Laudianism; externally, England was entangled in religious conflict, most obviously the Bishops' War in Scotland and Catholic unrest in Ireland. To make his point, Burges stressed that England was a new Israel, using the example of Nehemiah to explain to MPs how they should proceed. By making use of the English Deborah typology, Burges reinforced the providential nature of Elizabeth's reign (just as Deborah was sent to the Israelites, so Elizabeth was sent to the English), and underscored the militaristic nature of Elizabeth's defence of England's Protestantism. Given

¹⁰⁸ Burges, *The First Sermon*, pp. 53–54.

¹⁰⁹ Burges, *The First Sermon*, pp. 54.

that one of the underlying causes of the Bishops' War was the (inaccurate) belief that Charles (and Laud) wished to impose Catholicism in both England and Scotland, the reference must surely have functioned as pointed counsel for how to deal with the Catholic threat, both within and without. It may also have served as an endorsement of the call by some puritans in parliament to send troops to Ireland as a pre-emptive move against the Catholic population there—a move that Elizabeth herself had endorsed during her reign, which led to the Nine Years' War.¹¹⁰

Later in the sermon, Burges employed another English Deborah analogy that both celebrated the Elizabethan Reformation, and emphasised the example that Elizabeth's reign offered. He observed that on 'this very day, the 17. of November, 82. yeeres sithence, began a new resurrection of this Kingdome from the dead, our second happy Reformation of Religion by the auspicious entrance of our late Royal Deborah (worthy of eternall remembrance and honour)'.¹¹¹ Elizabeth's 'blessed and glorious Reigne' ensured that 'Religion thrived, and prospered under her Government', despite the 'oppositions from Popish factors at home and abroad'. According to Burges, England had been providentially favoured because it embraced the religion that 'God by her meanes hath set up amongst us', which meant that 'the very Gates of hell were never able to extinguish that Light'.¹¹² Elizabeth's reign was therefore an indisputable tool of 'perswasion' for the current MPs. The use of the Deborah typology, however, not only reflects Elizabeth's militant defence of England's Protestantism, but also links the biblical past to the recent English past, with Elizabeth presented as '*our* late Royal Deborah'. This link to Israel is also visible in Burges's allusion to the 'Deborah with her estates, consulting for the good government of Israel' typological device: the reference to 'her Government' emphasised the (somewhat fanciful) view that Elizabeth and her parliaments worked constructively together, and that they did not experience the conflict that the English parliament had seen over the previous decades. Such a reference was probably directed at Charles, who was not emulating Elizabeth in encouraging 'good' government (especially since he kept Laud and Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, around him in spite of parliamentary

¹¹⁰ See: Pádraig Lenihan, *Confederate Catholics at War, 1641–49* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2001), pp. 16–24; Nicholas Canny, 'The Attempted Anglicisation of Ireland in the Seventeenth Century: An Exemplar of "British History"', in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641*, ed. by J.F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 163–164; and Paul E.J. Hammer, *Elizabeth's Wars: War, Government and Society in Tudor England, 1544–1604* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 182–186.

¹¹¹ Burges, *The First Sermon*, p. 66.

¹¹² Burges, *The First Sermon*, p. 66.

hostility), but may also have served as a warning to parliament that members should work with their anointed sovereign.¹¹³

Burges also made reference to the entrenched fear of the threat from within, noting that during Elizabeth's reign, England confronted a 'whole world of oppositions from Popish factors at home and abroad'. As had been the case during Elizabeth's reign, England now faced a rebellion in Scotland, a rebellion over religion in the Netherlands, and Catholic expansionism, with Burges making it clear that he believed that the situation should be handled in the same way as it had been by Elizabeth. Nevertheless, the oblique reference to 'Popish factors' also seems to criticise Charles for the Catholic queen consort he had inflicted upon England, something Elizabeth—despite encouraging the suits of several Catholic princes—never did.

Nevertheless, Burges made clear that Elizabeth's reign should be considered as the *starting* point of England's new Reformation. He remarked on the date the sermon was delivered—'it is not without a speciall Providence that this your meeting was cast upon this very day (for, I presume, little did you think of the 17 of November, when you first fixed on this day for your Fast;)'—before laying bare the purpose of the recourse to Elizabeth:

one hammer might be borrowed to drive home this nayle of Exhortation; that the very memory of so blessed a work begun on this very day, might thoroughly [sic] inflame you with desire to enter into a Covenant; and so, to go forward to perfect that happy Reformation, which yet in many parts lyes unpolished and unperfect.¹¹⁴

The reference to 'Covenant' both here and elsewhere in the sermon lays bare Burges's political objective, and demonstrates the sermon's presentist and didactic purpose. Burges had taken Jeremiah 50:5 as his text—'They shall ask the way to Zion with their faces thitherward, saying, Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten'—and in doing so, he made clear his desire to link the biblical past to the present. To Burges's mind, the Bishops' War had been a punishment from God for the English Church's idolatry, and the interim peace brought about by the Treaty of Ripon necessitated

¹¹³ More radical preachers in the mid-1640s would eventually supersede Burges, and he neither joined nor supported Cromwell. He publically railed against the Regicide, and in a sermon preached in the Mercers' Chapel on the evening before the King's trial opened, cited the various instances in the Bible where men had chosen not to kill their king, even when there was a clear opportunity (such as David choosing to ignore the calls of his fellow soldiers to kill Saul as he sat in the cave they were hiding in), before concluding: 'Be wise now therefore, O ye Citizens; have no hand, nor joyn with any, in such a wicked Act'. While he may have criticised Charles, Burges never questioned the role or right of kings, thereby suggesting his desire for parliament and king to work together. Cornelius Burges, *Prudent Silence: A Sermon Preached in Mercers Chappel, to the Lord Mayor and City, Jan. 14, 1648, shewing the great sin and mischief of destroying kings, deborting from taking away our late sovereign, and deterring all from like wickedness* (London, 1660; Wing B5677), p. 31.

¹¹⁴ Burges, *The First Sermon*, p. 66.

that the Church of England reform itself closer to God.¹¹⁵ Indeed, the reference to ‘covenant’ here recalls Jeremiah 50:3, which foretold that ‘out of the north there cometh up a nation against her, which shall make her land desolate’—an almost overt reference to the Scottish Covenanters who attacked from the north and who, at the time the sermon was delivered, controlled the north of England.

It seems unlikely, however, that the Commons was unaware of the significance of the date chosen for the fast. As Cressy has shown, throughout the seventeenth century, Elizabeth’s accession day functioned as a honorary red-letter day: for instance, on 16 November 1634, the parish of St Botolph without Bishopsgate paid three shillings for the ringing of the bells in response to an official order that Henrietta Maria’s birthday be commemorated; the next day, 17 November, the parish commemorated Elizabeth’s accession day with the ringing of bells, for which the churchwardens paid ten shillings, without any official prompting.¹¹⁶ In spite of this rhetorical sleight of hand concerning the apparent coincidence of the date that the sermon was preached, Burges emphasised the firm link between Elizabeth and providence, arguing that England’s Protestantism was the will of God, and that the current religio-political turmoil—which would culminate in the impeachment of Archbishop Laud, the passing of The Grand Remonstrance in November of the following year, and the beginning of the Civil War in August 1642—demonstrated the need for MPs ‘to go forward to perfect that happy Reformation’, especially now that Laud’s days appeared to be numbered.

Burges’s Elizabeth analogies emphasised England’s status as a new Israel. The use of the English Deborah typology, as well as the link between the story of Nehemiah and the present situation, served to counsel—or demand—that MPs complete, or ‘perfect’, the Reformation that Elizabeth began. For Burges, a completed Reformation would resolve the religio-political crisis in which the country found itself. A completed Reformation would not only remove the internal threat of popery (what that would mean for Henrietta Maria remains unclear), but would also ensure that England received God’s protection and favour as the new Israel, thereby negating the threat of England’s Catholic neighbours. There could be no doubt that Elizabeth’s reign provided a ‘hammer [that] might be borrowed to drive home this nayle of Exhortation’.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ John F. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism During the English Civil Wars, 1640–1648* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), p. 39.

¹¹⁶ Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, p. 138.

¹¹⁷ Burges, *The First Sermon*, p. 66.

As the impeachment of Laud, and the attempted impeachment (and subsequent attainting) of Strafford demonstrated, parliament was eager to clamp down on unrestrained crown authority. One of the most effective of Charles's tools of control during the Personal Rule was the Court of Star Chamber. First under James, then under Charles, the court was increasingly viewed as an organ of the misuse of crown authority.¹¹⁸ In particular, the court was used to examine cases of sedition—an offence that was so broadly defined that it came to encompass almost any expression of opposition to crown policy. The court was also used to suppress the spread of non-conformist beliefs, often owing to pressure from Laud, and had severely punished prominent non-conformists including William Prynne, John Lilburne, and Henry Burton.¹¹⁹ The Long Parliament spent many of its first months freeing people imprisoned by the Star Chamber, quashing convictions, and reversing sentences. Increasingly, parliament impeached the court's judges and began to undermine the functions of the Star Chamber.¹²⁰ Discussion quickly turned to abolishing the widely-despised court, and between 26 June and 2 July 1641, both the Commons and the Lords passed the Habeas Corpus Act 'with much allacrity'.¹²¹ The Act, which was given royal assent on 5 July 1641, finally abolished the Star Chamber.¹²²

The abolition was a popular decision, and quickly led to an explosion of printing and reprinting in England.¹²³ Without the Star Chamber, which had been used punitively to control the printing trade, publishers were able to not only print tracts with a lessened fear of reprisal, but they could also print tracts whatever their 'copyright' status, meaning that

¹¹⁸ See: Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, pp. 679–682.

¹¹⁹ See: Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, pp. 77–80, 122–125.

¹²⁰ An 'Intent' of the Commons from the Long Parliament declared: 'Whatsoever is declared by the two houses binds the star chamber, the Lords of the Councill, and all other Courts of Justice' (TNA SP 16/474, fol. 30r). Likewise, in an attempt to prevent the Bill passing the Lords, it was suggested that the composition of the Star Chamber be change to remove bishops: 'No Archbishops, Bishops, or any other person being in orders and having care of soules, to be Judge of the Star Chamber, or Privy Counsellore, or Justice of the Peace, or a commissioner from any temporall court, under several penalties and disabilities' (TNA SP 16/482, fol. 1r). At its heart, these proposals were clearly intended to curtail Laud's power, given he was both a privy councillor and a Star Chamber judge, suggesting that the Bill was seen as being directed (at least partially) at Laud.

¹²¹ Letter of Thomas Smith to Sir John Penington, 29 June 1641, TNA SP 16/481, fol. 150v. The debates in both Houses, and the various amendments presented, can be viewed in: *Proceedings in the Opening Session of the Long Parliament, House of Commons. Volume 5: 7 June–17 July 1641*, ed. by Maija Jansson (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2005), esp. pp. 355–510.

¹²² TNA SP 16/482, fols. 28–29.

¹²³ In a letter to Sir John Penington, written on 8 July 1641, Sidney Bere claimed: 'The king was pleased on Monday to passe the bills for putting down the Starre Chamber and high Commission Courts, which hath given great satisfaction' (TNA SP 16/482, fol. 44v). Later, on 9 December, a petition was presented to the Commons from the City of London that, amongst its provisions, sought to 'thanke the House of Commons for putting downe the high Commission, and the Starre Chamber' (TNA SP 16/486, fol. 57r). For the role of print in the Civil War, see: Jason Peacey, 'The Revolution in Print', in *The Oxford Handbook of The English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 276–293.

documents long circulated in manuscript form could now, for the first time, be printed for mass consumption.

One of the most controversial pamphlets of Elizabeth's reign had been *The Copie of a Leter Wryten by a Master of Arte of Cambrige [sic] to his Friend in London*, which is now generally known as *Leicester's Commonwealth*. First published in France in 1584, *Leicester's Commonwealth* was a Catholic libel that denigrated and vilified the royal favourite, Robert Dudley: the author(s) accuse Leicester of being a poisoner and a tyrant, and having a voracious sexual appetite. At the same time, the text argued for greater freedoms for Catholics in England, and engaged with the succession debate, arguing for the claim of Mary, Queen of Scots (as well as that of her son, James, who, the author claims, 'is inclined to be a papist').¹²⁴ Although the pamphlet was actively and aggressively suppressed by Elizabeth's privy council (a proclamation issued on 12 October 1584 banned the importing and selling of the libel, and granted an amnesty for those who surrendered their copies, while threatening prison to those who were found with a copy in their possession), the many manuscript copies that survive suggest it was still widely read.¹²⁵ In c.1605, Thomas Rogers produced a summary and response to *Leicester's Commonwealth* in the style of a 'Mirror for Magistrates' called *Leicester's Ghost*, which remained only in manuscript form.¹²⁶ The fortunes of both texts were dramatically changed in 1641: the abolition of the Star Chamber allowed *Leicester's Commonwealth* finally to be reprinted, and for *Leicester's Ghost* to enter into print for the first time.¹²⁷ At least one edition of *Leicester's Ghost* was printed in 1641, with pamphlets containing both that text and *Leicester's Commonwealth* appearing shortly after.¹²⁸

As Rachel Willie has argued, the reprinting of this (and other) Tudor satires in the early 1640s demonstrates that writers were drawing parallels with their contemporary circumstances and the late Tudor period, and that the intended readership was happy to, or

¹²⁴ Dwight C. Peck, 'Introduction to Leicester's Commonwealth', in *Leicester's Commonwealth: The Copy of a Letter Written by a Master of Art of Cambridge (1584) and Related Documents*, ed. by Dwight C. Peck (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1985), p. 4; *The Copie of a Leter, Wryten by a Master of Arte of Cambrige, To His Friend in London* ([Paris?], 1584; STC 5742.9), p. 160. See also: Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Her Circle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 117–118, 307, 329n. 72; and Peter Lake, *Bad Queen Bess? Libels, Secret Histories, and the Politics of Publicity in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 119–124.

¹²⁵ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 21–22; *A Proclamation for the Suppressing of Seditious Bookes and Libelles* (London, 1584; STC 8146). For instance, on 2 December 1619, Lady Anne Clifford recorded in her diary that 'Wat Coniston made an end to reading a Book called *Leicester's Common Wealth*, in which there's many things concerning the reignment & Death [of] the Queen of Scots, which was all read to me.' *The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford*, ed. by D.J.H. Clifford (1990; Stroud: The History Press, 2009), p. 86.

¹²⁶ Franklin B. Williams, Jr., 'Introduction', in *Thomas Rogers' 'Leicester's Ghost'*, ed. by Franklin B. Williams, Jr. (Chicago: Newberry Library and University of Chicago Press, 1972), pp. xi–xiv.

¹²⁷ Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, p. 24.

¹²⁸ The 1641 edition of *Leicester's Ghost* is Wing R1837A, and *Leicester's Ghost* and *Leicester's Commonwealth* were printed together in Wing L969. Wing L969A also contains both *Commonwealth* and *Ghost*, but due to a typesetting and printing error, it omits the page that calls Elizabeth a Deborah.

even wanted to, hark back to Elizabeth's reign.¹²⁹ That Elizabeth's reign was a source of example in the immediate aftermath of the Star Chamber's abolition is acutely demonstrated by the reprinting of several Marprelate tracts from the 1580s—the critics of Laudianism in the 1640s clearly saw parallels between their situation and the anxieties of the 1580s and 1590s around godly governance and the role of bishops.¹³⁰

Leicester's Commonwealth may rail against Dudley, but its depiction of Elizabeth is far more positive.¹³¹ The author of *Leicester's Ghost* builds on this positive depiction, and takes it a step further. *Leicester's Ghost* opens with the ghost of Leicester reflecting on his life and Elizabeth's reign,¹³² and linking his and his family's life with the Tudor monarchs: 'I was the of-spring of a Princely Syre / ... Hee by a Queene did die, and as that chanc'd, / I by a Queene did live, and was advanc'd.'¹³³ The ghost then discussed his and his family's life under the Tudors. For supporting Lady Jane Grey, the ghost lost 'my renowne' and his father 'his life' when 'Queene Mary got the Crowne'. The ghost's fortunes changed, however when 'That Peerles Queene of happy memory / That late like Debora the Kingdome swaid'.¹³⁴ With this couplet, Rogers has shown how intrinsically Elizabeth and Deborah were linked in the minds of seventeenth-century writers. The use of the English Deborah typology reinforced the belief that Elizabeth had been sent to England by God after 'Queene Maries tragick raigne', and that she had defended England from foreign enemies.¹³⁵

The abolition of the Star Chamber certainly created the *opportunity* for the pamphlet to be published, but such a relaxation of publishing restrictions was not in itself a reason to publish a thirty-year-old, widely circulated manuscript libel. It seems, however, that the contemporary political situation offered the ideal moment to widely share the text and to make a profit.¹³⁶ In the first instance, the use of first-person references to Leicester's father, John Dudley, the Duke of Northumberland (who led Edward VI's government as Lord President of the Council after the fall of Protector Somerset), suggests a pointed purpose for publishing the response in 1641. Northumberland's attempt to place Jane Grey on the throne

¹²⁹ Rachel Willie, *Staging the Revolution: Drama, Reinvention and History, 1647–72* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), p. 38.

¹³⁰ Rachel Willie, 'Sensing the Visual (Mis)representation of William Laud', in *What is an Image in Medieval and Early Modern England?*, ed. by Antoinina Bevan Zlatar and Olga Timofeeva (Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, 2017), pp. 183–184; Helen Pierce, 'Anti-Episcopacy and Graphic Satire in England, 1640–1645', *The Historical Journal*, 47.4 (2004), pp. 835–847.

¹³¹ Peck, 'Introduction to *Leicester's Commonwealth*', p. 7.

¹³² The ghost says 'Where of Elizas death I understand, / And that the Heavens, carefull of Englands good, / Rais'd up a King', demonstrating a post-1603 composition (p. 1).

¹³³ *Leycesters Ghost* ([London], 1641; Wing R1837A), p. 1.

¹³⁴ *Leycesters Ghost*, p. 2.

¹³⁵ *Leycesters Ghost*, p. 3.

¹³⁶ Franklin B. Williams, Jr., 'Leicester's Ghost', *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, 18 (1935), pp. 278–279.

as a Protestant successor to Edward VI, in place of Edward's Catholic half-sister, Mary I, is the crux of Northumberland's story in *Leicester's Ghost*, with *Ghost* thus portraying a negative depiction of Mary's 'tragick raigne'. The reference to 'Queene Mary [who] got the Crowne', however, would have brought to mind the current queen. Since her marriage to Charles in 1625, Henrietta Maria had been known publicly in England as 'Queen Mary': the link between the Catholic Tudor queen and the Catholic Stuart queen consort is thus rendered practically overt.¹³⁷

Usefully, a 'Northumberland' was also at the core of the current political regime. Algernon Percy had been the Earl of Northumberland since the death of his father in November 1632; he was appointed Lord High Admiral of England in April 1638, and was a member of an important Privy Council subcommittee that Charles had set up in response to the revolt against the imposition of the Book of Common Prayer in Scotland in 1637 (the revolt that led to the Bishops' Wars).¹³⁸ Significantly, he was one of six commissioners appointed to govern England in the King's stead while Charles was leading the English forces against the Covenanters.¹³⁹ While the current Northumberland had little in common with the Marian Duke of Northumberland, the title itself evoked the 'threat' of Catholicism: the 7th Earl of Northumberland had co-led the Northern Rebellion of 1569, and the 8th Earl had been a supporter of Mary, Queen of Scots during her imprisonment in England, and was imprisoned for his part in the Throckmorton Plot of 1583.

The political role of the current Earl of Leicester was also a useful publishing congruence. Robert Sidney, Earl of Leicester, had been a member of the Commons, and upon succeeding his father to the earldom, took up his seat in the Lords. Throughout the 1630s, he travelled to Denmark and France on diplomatic missions for Charles, and although Laud consistently obstructed his career in royal service, he became a privy councillor in May 1639. With Laud's arrest in December 1640 along with Strafford, Leicester's fortunes changed. Strafford, the Lord Deputy of Ireland, was executed on 12 May 1641; Leicester was recalled to

¹³⁷ Initially, it was planned that she would be known as Queen Henry, but these plans were quickly abandoned. On 14 May 1625, John Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton saying: 'She was prayed for last weeke in the k[ing]'s chappell by the name of Q. Henry for Henriette, but since [then] the stile is chaunged every where to Q. Marie.' TNA SP 16/2, fol. 108r. In *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, Lucy Hutchinson wrote disparagingly of the Anglicisation: 'a French queene never brought any happinesse to England: some kind of fatality too the English imagined to be in her name of Marie, which, 'tis sayd, the king rather chose to have her call'd by then her other, Henrietta, because the land should find a blessing in that name, which had bene more unfortunate; but it was not in his power, though a greate prince, to controule destiny.' Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, ed. by Julius Hutchinson (London, 1806), p. 69. See also: Carolyn Harris, *Queenship and Revolution in Early Modern Europe: Henrietta Maria and Marie Antoinette* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 96–97; Dunn-Hensley, *Anna of Denmark and Henrietta Maria*, pp. 1–3; and Karen Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 73, p. 243n. 71.

¹³⁸ George A. Drake, 'Percy, Algernon, tenth earl of Northumberland (1602–1668)', ODNB.

¹³⁹ Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, p. 182.

England from France that same month, and was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland as Strafford's successor. While he never actually set foot in Ireland, owing to disagreements between Charles and parliament, such an outcome cannot have been foreseen in mid-1641.¹⁴⁰ It was thus plain for readers in 1641 to see that important political figures from Tudor England seemed to have been reincarnated in Caroline England.

In spite of the fifty years that had elapsed since *Leicester's Commonwealth* was first printed, the contemporary political situation bore many similarities to the events and situations both *Leicester's Commonwealth* and *Leicester's Ghost* discussed and commemorated. Without the Star Chamber, publishers were able to produce a wider range of pamphlets than they had ever before. In 1641, the reign of 'That Peerles Queene of happy memory' would have seemed like a distant dream, with the political moment such that Elizabeth as England's Deborah was a powerful tool of critique, especially given the belief that England was a new Israel. The prevailing view was that England currently had a monarch who had an antagonistic approach to parliament, who was responsible for a war with Scotland, and who had married a Catholic and was believed to be a Catholic sympathiser; in printing *Leicester's Ghost*, publishers reminded the public of England's Deborah, and linked the current Queen with Elizabeth's maligned half-sister and predecessor, which by extension tainted Charles. Elizabeth, who was remembered for defending England's Protestantism from internal and external Catholic threats, and was believed to have had a 'good' relationship with her parliaments, was almost the antithesis of Charles between 1639 and 1641. The many surviving manuscript copies of both *Leicester's Commonwealth* and *Leicester's Ghost* attest to the texts' popularity, and those who were part of the Caroline regime—including Charles himself—cannot have been unfamiliar with the tracts' contents.¹⁴¹ The reprinting of such texts therefore allowed readers to recollect Elizabeth's reign—*Leicester's Ghost* even warns against 'forget[ting] so soone you[r] ould Queene dead'—and their implicit critique of the contemporary religio-political situation served to both offer pointed criticism of Charles's behaviour, and to offer the biblical past, and its links to the recent past, as precedent for the present.¹⁴²

¹⁴⁰ Ian Atherton, 'Sidney, Robert, second earl of Leicester (1595–1677)', ODNB.

¹⁴¹ In addition to the many references to the libel that survive in the state papers, Charles's Secretary of State, Edward Nicholas, actively attempted to prevent the printing of *Leicester's Commonwealth*. Nicholas wrote to the Wardens of the Stationers' Company on 13 October 1641, claiming that the libel was 'scandalous' and 'unfit to bee divulged', and ordered them to 'stay the printing or dispersing of any of those Bookes' until 'the Lords of the Privy Councill shall meete' (TNA SP 16/484, fol. 158r). Given such high-level interest in the pamphlet's printing, it is unlikely that the King was not aware of the libel and its contents. For the wider circulation of *Leicester's Commonwealth* across a range of social classes and confessional identities, see: Noah Millstone, *Manuscript Circulation and the Invention of Politics in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), p. 166; and D.C. Peck, 'Government Suppression of Elizabethan Catholic Books: The Case of *Leicester's Commonwealth*', *The Library Quarterly*, 47.2 (1977), pp. 163–177.

¹⁴² *Leycesters Ghost*, p. 17.

It is uncertain exactly when in 1641 either pamphlet was published, although it seems likely that Burges's was published early in the year (shortly after the sermon was originally preached), and that *Leicester's Ghost* was published in the weeks after the abolition of the Star Chamber. By the end of 1641, parliament had heeded Burges's call to action against 'popery' and Charles's 'evil advisers', and passed what is now known as the Grand Remonstrance. The document listed numerous grievances that were already in existence when the Long Parliament sat, and offered suggestions to redress them.¹⁴³ After a lengthy preamble, the Remonstrance presented 204 clauses: the vast majority of which (136 of them) referred to the first seventeen years of Charles's reign, with the balance pertaining to the present and the future (forty-eight and twenty, respectively), which included demands that Charles establish a national synod to enforce uniformity in the Church, and that he allow parliament to approve his ministers.¹⁴⁴ Like many of the published Elizabeth analogies, the Grand Remonstrance can be viewed as an attempt to fuse the turmoil of the recent past with the historical past—showing, according to Noah Millstone, a belief in the need to return to how things were done in a bygone 'Golden Age'—in order to deal with the 'threat' posed by 'papists and reckless councillors' in the present.¹⁴⁵

The Grand Remonstrance narrowly passed the Commons on 22 November 1641, and was presented to the King on 1 December. At first, Charles largely ignored the document, and the Commons, which had already circulated manuscript copies of the Remonstrance, voted on 15 December to take the unprecedented step of printing it.¹⁴⁶ Finally, Charles responded on 23 December.¹⁴⁷ He began his reply by claiming that he was 'very sensible of the disrespect' parliament had shown him by the unprecedented printing of the document. He then turned to the substance of the Remonstrance, rejecting the suggestion that he should dismiss his 'evil counsellors' by maintaining 'we know not any of our Council to whom the character set forth in the petition can belong', before claiming that 'there is no man so near unto us ... whom we will not leave to the justice of the law, if you shall bring a particular charge and sufficient proofs against him'. Asserting that 'it is the undoubted right of the Crown of England to call such persons to our secret counsels ... as we shall think fit', the King rejected calls to curb the powers and influence of the bishops by claiming 'that for any illegal innovations which may

¹⁴³ See: 'The Grand Remonstrance (1641)', in *A Political History of Tudor and Stuart England: A Sourcebook*, ed. by Victor Stater (London: Routledge, 2002), pp. 135–140.

¹⁴⁴ Oliver Knight, 'The Grand Remonstrance', *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24.1 (1960), p. 79.

¹⁴⁵ Millstone, *Manuscript Circulation*, pp. 314–315.

¹⁴⁶ *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, From the First Recess of the Long Parliament to the Withdrawal of King Charles from London*, ed. by Willson Havelock Coates (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), p. 295; Millstone, *Manuscript Circulation*, p. 315.

¹⁴⁷ *Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, p. 335.

have crept in, we shall willingly concur in the removal of them'.¹⁴⁸ Finally, Charles attempted to assert his Protestant credentials:

no Church can be found upon the earth that professeth the true religion with more purity of doctrine than the Church of England doth, ... [and] we will with constancy maintain (while we live) in their purity and glory, not only against all invasions of Popery, but also from the irreverence of those many schismatics and separatists, wherewith of late this kingdom and this city abounds.¹⁴⁹

For a King who was married to a Catholic, and was protecting the impeached and 'popish' Laud, such a promise would have rung hollow with the MPs who voted in support of the Remonstrance. The standoff between Charles and parliament that the Remonstrance caused laid bare the divisions in the country that would ultimately lead to the Civil War.¹⁵⁰ On 30 December 1641, Robert Slingsby, a captain in the English navy, wrote to Admiral Sir John Penington about his concerns over the Remonstrance, and the King's response. Slingsby concluded his letter with a prophetic observation: 'There is no doubt but if the king do[es] not comply with the commons in all thinges they desire a sudden civill war must insue: which evry day we see approaches nearer'.¹⁵¹ Both men sided with the Royalists during the Civil War, so such an observation suggests an unease at the Commons' demands, with an acknowledgement that the King had limited room to manoeuvre. Charles certainly believed that his options were limited, and less than a week after this letter was written, he would irreparably damage his relationship with parliament, and in doing so, would bring the legacy of Elizabeth once again to the fore.

The Civil War, Charles, and Elizabeth Analogies

On 4 January 1642, Charles irreversibly damaged his relationship with the Commons by going after five puritan members of the Commons—John Pym, John Hampden, Denzil Holles,

¹⁴⁸ *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625–1660*, ed. by Samuel Rawson Gardiner (Oxford, 1899), pp. 233–236.

¹⁴⁹ Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents*, p. 235. Charles had previously attempted to invoke Elizabeth's legacy in order to demonstrate his commitment to England's Protestantism. On 18 October 1641, he wrote from Edinburgh to the Clerk of the Council, Edward Nicholas: 'I hear it is reported that I am resolved at my returne, to alter the Form of the Church Government in England: To this here therefore I command you to assure all my servants there, that I am constant for the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, as it was established by Queen Elizabeth and my father, And resolve by the Grace of God to live and dye in the maintenance of it.' TNA SP 16/485, fol. 5r. A version of this letter was soon after published in: *King Charles His Resolution Concerning the Governement of the Church of England, being contrary to that of Scotland* (London, 1641; Wing C2753).

¹⁵⁰ Referring to the late-night session of parliament that passed the Remonstrance, Gardiner observed that 'The Civil War was all the nearer for that night's work'. Samuel Rawson Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603–1642: Volume 10, 1641–1642* (1884; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 79. See also: Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies*, pp. 426–430, 439; and Anthony Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London: Edward Arnold, 1985), pp. 145–153, 169–170.

¹⁵¹ TNA SP 16/486, fol. 227v.

Arthur Haselrig, and William Strode.¹⁵² The attempted arrest of these five MPs alienated both parliament and the City of London, and it was seen to encapsulate Charles's disdain for the rights and privileges of parliament.¹⁵³ In the aftermath of this failed endeavour, Elizabeth's Golden Speech was reprinted for the first time since 1628. The printed speech—which featured an engraving of the Queen based on the Ditchley portrait—began with a preface that could only have been read as a sharp rebuke of Charles's behaviour:¹⁵⁴

I accept them with no lesse joy then your loves can have desire to offer such a Present, and doe more esteeme it then any Treasure or Riches, for those Wee know how to prize, but Loyaltie, Love, and Thankes, I account them invaluable; and though God hath raysed Mee high, yet this I account the glorie of my Crowne, that I have reigned with your Loves.¹⁵⁵

This reprinting of the speech was certainly removed from its original context: the speech was a begrudging capitulation over monopolies after Elizabeth could no longer ignore the mounting criticism of their continued issuing. Most tellingly, like the fabricated Stuart belief that Elizabeth was the great puritan defender, the printed version of the speech downplayed Elizabeth's implicit, backhanded retort that, in spite of this climb-down, she could, and would, continue to reward whomever she desired, which demonstrated a commitment to the absolutist principles that Charles continued to show.¹⁵⁶ Nevertheless, as C.V. Wedgwood observed half a century ago, the Golden Speech, through which Elizabeth 'had strengthened the links of loyalty which bound her subjects to her, was used by opponents of King Charles to emphasize that ideal of monarchy from which he had so lamentably departed.'¹⁵⁷ The legacy of Elizabeth's reign was thus used—and manipulated—to comment on the present turmoil.

Elizabeth's memory, however, was employed for presentist purposes in ways other than simply reprinting parliamentary speeches. Elizabeth analogies, already a well-established trope of counsel and critique, were an important part of the pamphlet wars that played out between the Royalists and Parliamentarians in the 1640s. The social, religious, and political events that culminated in Charles raising his standard against his own parliament are perhaps some of the most widely-studied events of English history, with the Civil War fascinating both

¹⁵² Florene S. Memegalos, *George Goring (1608–1657): Caroline Courtier and Royalist General* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p. 113.

¹⁵³ TNA SP 16/488, fols. 18r, 25r, 34v; *The Private Journals of the Long Parliament: 3 January to 5 March 1642*, ed. by Wilson H. Coates, Anne Steele Young, and Vernon F. Snow (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), pp. 4, 5.

¹⁵⁴ In the engraving, Elizabeth holds an orb and sceptre. For the engraving, see: Roy Strong, *Portraits of Elizabeth I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 156 (Engravings 10 and 11). The engraving was based on one that appeared in Henry Holland, *Baziliologia, A Booke of Kings Beeing The true and lively Effigies of all our English Kings from the Conquest untill this present* (London, 1618; STC 13581).

¹⁵⁵ *Queene Elizabeths speech to her last Parliament* (London, 1642; Wing E534), sig A2r.

¹⁵⁶ Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth*, p. 94.

¹⁵⁷ C.V. Wedgwood, *Oliver Cromwell and the Elizabethan Inheritance* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1970), p. 6.

scholars and the public even before the Restoration.¹⁵⁸ Nevertheless, the role of Elizabeth analogies, with their concerted and overt depiction of England as a new Israel and their calls to complete Elizabeth's Reformation, are largely overlooked in the scholarship.

After requests from both the Commons and the Lords, Charles issued a proclamation on 8 January 1642 ordering that the last Wednesday of each month be observed as a fast day.¹⁵⁹ On these days, the House of Commons gathered to hear a sermon at St Margaret's, Westminster. One of these sermons, preached on 27 July 1642, was Thomas Hill's *The Trade of Truth Advanced*. It was entered into the Stationers' Register on 9 August, and Thomason's copy is annotated 'Aug. 12', showing that the Commons' order to print the sermon was quickly enacted.

Hill, a clergyman and theologian with puritan sympathies, had since March 1641 been an adviser to the Lords' committee on religious reform, and he became a member of the Westminster Assembly.¹⁶⁰ Hill did not shy away from the didactic purpose of preaching, writing in the epistle of *The Trade of Truth*: 'I commend it to your Practicall observation, for whom I intended it; heartily desiring Gods Blessing upon your spirits in the perusall of it; that you may read and act it, turning words into works'.¹⁶¹ The 'act' that Hill wished the gathered MPs to undertake was further reformation of the Church of England, and he claimed 'I shall still pray that in your Intention, the purging, the settling, the advancing of True Religion may be most Dear unto you'. Like several of his contemporaries, he invoked the example of England's Deborah to bolster his argument.

Hill offered various suggestions 'to engage and quicken' the assembled MPs to embark on 'the happy purchase of truth'—that is, a further reformation. One of his central points was that the Church had continually been reforming itself since the Council of Nicaea, so parliament needed to continue the work that had been underway for centuries. Speaking of the work of the Westminster Assembly, he exhorted the MPs to

¹⁵⁸ In addition to the 'classic' studies of the Civil War—C.V. Wedgwood, *The King's War, 1641–1647* (London: Collins, 1958); Christopher Hill, *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970); and Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (London: Maurice Temple Smith, 1972)—see: Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*; John Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London: Longman, 1993); Ann Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998); John Adamson, ed., *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Eamon Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013); Richard Cust, *Charles I and the Aristocracy, 1625–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); and *The Oxford Handbook of The English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

¹⁵⁹ *A Proclamation for a generall fast thorowout [sic] this Realme of England* (London, 1641/1642; Wing C2582), p. 1; Christopher Durston, "'For the Better Humiliation of the People': Public Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving during the English Revolution", *The Seventeenth Century*, 7.2 (1992), pp. 132–133.

¹⁶⁰ C.S. Knighton, 'Hill, Thomas (d. 1653)', ODNB.

¹⁶¹ Thomas Hill, *The Trade of Truth Advanced*. In *A Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons, at their Solemn Fast, July 27. 1642* (London, 1642; Wing H2031), sig. A3r.

not onely bid us enquire what Reformation was ... in our Deborahs dayes, Queene Elizabeths, (though we must for ever blesse God for the light that appeared in those times) ... Rather bid us give you an account ... so divine Truth may triumph, and we enjoy a Scripture Reformation.¹⁶²

Hill believed that such work would not be easy, but he warned the MPs against shying away from this important work. In addition to ‘backing’ the work of the Assembly, MPs needed to be

willing to grapple with difficulties, to expose your selves to troubles and hazzards, and to be at any cost and charges, that you may possesse your selves and the Kingdome of the true Religion.¹⁶³

While celebrating the Elizabethan Reformation, Hill made clear that England required further reformation. In order to exculpate Elizabeth from criticism for an incomplete Reformation, he attempted to contextualise Elizabeth’s actions as being part of a long history of religious reformation. Nevertheless, Hill asserted that parliament must heed the counsel of godly men like himself to ensure that England would ‘enjoy a Scripture Reformation’—a comment that also implicitly criticised parliament for failing thus far to instil the ‘true Religion’ in England.

In addition to claiming that Elizabeth had been sent to England by God in order to carry on the work of reformation, Hill argued that England’s Deborah had spread the ‘light’ of Protestantism in England—a point made overt by the sermon’s many references to the ‘darknesse of Popery’. According to Hill, Elizabeth had defended England’s Protestantism from ‘the Devill and the Pope combine[d]’, but it was now time for parliament to complete the centuries-long process of reformation. Completing the Reformation was not only God’s will, but Hill believed it would also bring an end to the conflict that was already engulfing the nation.

While the solution to the current turmoil was to reform the Church—‘The Church cal[s] for Truth; the State cryes for Peace’—Hill also used this turmoil as a warning. Given the deep familiarity of people in seventeenth-century England with the Bible, the use of the English Deborah typology would have conjured up a range of meanings and implications. One such implication is the suggestion that the current conflict was the result of the English committing ‘evil in the sight of the Lord’. While the Book of Judges does not often explain what this ‘evil’ was, there are several references to the Israelites forsaking God and his religious prescriptions. For instance, according to Judges 3, ‘the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and forgat the Lord their God, and served Baalim and the groves. Therefore the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he sold them into the hand of

¹⁶² Hill, *The Trade of Truth Advanced*, p. 31.

¹⁶³ Hill, *The Trade of Truth Advanced*, p. 32.

Chushanrishathaim king of Mesopotamia.¹⁶⁴ Catholicism was often derided as being no better than Baal-worship, and Hill made clear that the English Church was still burdened by elements of popery. Hill therefore suggested that England's incomplete Reformation had caused the current conflict. He may have critiqued Elizabeth's 'incomplete' Reformation, but Hill made clear that England's Deborah was an example to be emulated, and like many of his fellow preachers, he firmly believed that it was up to each and every one of them to prevent England committing the 'evil in the sight of the Lord' that had allowed God to deliver the Israelites into the hands of the idolatrous Midianites.

Hill's was not the only fast-day sermon from 1642 to engage with the English Deborah typology. On 28 September, Thomas Wilson delivered his firebrand polemic *Jerichoes Down-Fall*. The sermon was also 'Published by Order from that House', although it did not appear in print until early 1643—Thomason's copy is dated 'Jan 7 1643'.

A vocal puritan, Wilson often found himself dragged in front of Church officials.¹⁶⁵ *Jerichoes Down-Fall* was the second sermon Wilson preached before the Commons—its precursor, *Dauids Zeale to Zion*, was preached on 4 April 1641—and went further than his first: he openly attacked Laud, calling him 'wicked', and advocated for a 'root and branch' reform of both the Church and State, railing against prelacy, claiming it was 'not only not fruitfull, but hurtfull'.¹⁶⁶ The sermon was also delivered in the heated moments of the beginnings of the Civil War: it had been just over a month since Charles had raised his standard at Nottingham, and just a week since the first skirmish of the war—the Battle of Powick Bridge—which was a victory for the Royalists under Prince Rupert of the Rhine. The meaning of Wilson's opening—that 'out of the severall divisions of the Kingdome; when the enemy would come in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord hath lift up a Standard against him'—could not have been plainer.¹⁶⁷

In his dedicatory epistle, Wilson lamented that the 'Church and State [were] bruised and diseased', and he reminded the MPs that they were the nation's 'healers', exhorting them to act as 'Physitians'.¹⁶⁸ This theme was carried into the sermon, the text for which was Hebrews 11:30: 'By Faith the walls of Jericho fell downe after they were compassed about seven dayes.' For Wilson, these walls connoted many things—including prelates—but most

¹⁶⁴ Judges 3:7–8.

¹⁶⁵ Wilson eventually found political friends, and was appointed in late 1642 as one of the Kent representatives to the Westminster Assembly. [George Swinnock], *The Life and Death of Mr. Tho[mas]. Wilson, Minister of Maidstone, in the county of Kent, M.A.* (London, 1672; Wing S6277), p. 22.

¹⁶⁶ Thomas Wilson, *Jerichoes Down-Fall as it was presented in a sermon preached in St. Margarets Westminster before the honourable House of Commons at the late solemne fast, Septemb. 28, 1642* (London, 1643; Wing W2948), pp. 16, 6.

¹⁶⁷ Wilson, *Jerichoes Down-Fall*, sig. A2r.

¹⁶⁸ Wilson, *Jerichoes Down-Fall*, sig. A2v.

especially they were a metaphor for popery, with England a Jericho that needed to be liberated. As the sermon progressed, Wilson referred in increasingly heated language to the Catholicism he saw creeping back into England. In doing so, he conflated Catholicism with leprosy—linking it with a disease just as Horne had in 1625.¹⁶⁹ As had been the case since the medieval period, leprosy was associated with spiritual sins—sins that threatened not only an individual, but also their whole community.¹⁷⁰ Wilson, railing against the ‘Popes filthy wickednesse’, spoke of how the work of the Reformation was being undone in the present:

A leprosie was discovered in Queen Mary her dayes ... but all was new plaistered in the Raigne of that Englands Deborah, Queen Elizabeth: but the plague is broken out againe, wherefore downe must the house, leave not one stone upon another unthrowne downe. For profanenesse from the Priests is gone out through all the land, profanenesse, superstitions, are spread ... Preachers [must] be active to cast down Antichrist, Popery in doctrine, and worship; the Churches be called Reformed, not onely in doctrine true, but in discipline pure.¹⁷¹

Wilson here offered Elizabeth’s reign as an example that parliament should be emulating—after all, it was parliament who would ultimately be responsible for ensuring that ‘the Churches [can] be called Reformed’. The use of the English Deborah typology not only emphasised Elizabeth’s militant defence of England’s Protestantism from the ‘plague’ of Catholicism, but also conflated England and Israel (as is made clear by the parallel between Jericho and England). Even though Laud had been impeached and remained in prison, Wilson was concerned by the threat that ‘popery’ still posed in England, especially for a poorly ‘disciplined’ Church. For the puritan Wilson, Elizabeth represented a disciplined form of militant Protestantism—hence the recourse to Deborah, who defended Israel and defeated the Canaanites—that ensured all but the properly reformed religion was kept at bay.

Behind this argument is a keen desire for England to undergo further reformation. Elizabeth may have ‘plaistered’ popery during her reign, but ‘the plague is broken out againe’. Such language suggests that Elizabeth, despite all her efforts, had not completely rooted out Catholicism. ‘Plaster’ had several meanings in the period, but most generally speak to a short-

¹⁶⁹ Leprosy was used to describe Catholicism or ungodliness by a variety of preachers in early modern England. See, for instance: Richard Leake, *Four Sermons Preached and Publickly Taught by Richard Leake, preacher of the word of God at Killington ... immediately after the great visitation of the pestilence in the foresayd Countie* (London, 1599; STC 15342); Henoeh Clapham, *His Demaundes and Answeres touching the Pestilence: Methodically handled, as his time and meanes could permit* ([Middelburg], 1604; STC 5343); Thomas Taylor, *David’s Learning, or The Way To True Happinesse: In a Commentarie upon the 32. Psalme* (London, 1617; STC 23827); John Denison, *Heavens Joy, For A Sinners Repentance. A Sermon Preached at White-Hall the 4. of March, 1623* (London, 1623; STC 6590), p. 38: ‘Thus ungodlinesse is become an Epidemicall disease: like a Contagious leprosie it hath infected and runne over the whole Body of this Land’.

¹⁷⁰ Bryon Lee Grigsby, *Pestilence in Medieval and Early Modern English Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2004), p. 153.

¹⁷¹ Wilson, *Jerichoes Down-Fall*, p. 36.

term, or temporary, solution.¹⁷² In the context of the ‘plague’ of popery, it is possible that Wilson meant that Elizabeth’s reforms were only a temporary cover (like a paste or an ointment), and that the cover had come off (or was no longer being applied), which had allowed popery to once again spread. Similarly, because Elizabeth did not ‘throw down’ the ‘house’, but instead only ‘plaistered’ over the walls, Wilson argued that popery was able to again take root after her death. Whatever the intended metaphor, Wilson was adamant that England needed to undergo further reformation. This conviction, coupled with the use of the English Deborah typology, served to again conflate England and Israel. In particular, the claim that ‘the plague is broken out againe’ seems to hint at the fate of the Israelites after Deborah’s death—as several texts already discussed make clear. It was now up to the MPs listening to the sermon to undertake a further reformation—leaving ‘not one stone upon another’—so that ‘the Churches [can] be called Reformed’.

Hill and Wilson were not the only writers in the early years of the Civil War to link Israel with England. Between the publication of these sermons, the Elizabethan Reformation was publicly fused with the recently implemented protestation. The Protestation, as it became known, was one of the steps parliament took to reduce tensions between the various political and religious factions across England before the outbreak of the Civil War. An oath-like document drawn up by the Commons on 3 May 1641, the Protestation required those who swore it to defend and uphold England’s Protestant Church, the King, and parliament.¹⁷³ It was intended that every Englishman over the age of eighteen would swear the Protestation, but the Lords refused to pass a bill making swearing compulsory, leaving the Commons to rely on heavy-handed exhortation. After the attempted arrest of the Five Members in January 1642, the Commons redoubled their efforts to have the Protestation sworn across the country. The vast numbers of people who swore the Protestation in this second, concerted period in early 1642 (as identified by the surviving Protestation returns) have been justifiably described by both John Walter and David Cressy as an unequivocal display of parliament’s

¹⁷² There does not appear to be any link between a plaster and leprosy. I have consulted a range of early modern medical treatises, and while they discuss various treatments and cures for leprosy (generally bleeding or a type of ointment), none mention the use of a plaster. This therefore suggests that Wilson was relying on plaster as a short-term measure that needed to be continually reapplied or was only temporary. See: Girolamo Ruscelli and Richard Androse, *A verye excellent and profitable Booke containing sixe hundred foure score and odde experienced Medicines, apperteyning unto Phisick and Surgerie* (London, 1569; STC 309), p. 14 (sig. K3v); James Balmford, *A Short Dialogue Concerning the Plagues Infection* (London, 1603; STC 1338), pp. 14–15, 35–36; Christopher Wirtzung and Jacob Mosan, *The General Practise of Physicke* (London, 1605; STC 25864), pp. 582–584; and Timothie Bright, *A Treatise, wherein is declared the sufficiencye of English Medicines, for cure of all Diseases, cured with Medicines* (London, 1615; STC 3752), pp. 45–46.

¹⁷³ John Walter, *Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Political Culture in the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 1–2, 8–13.

authority.¹⁷⁴ The Protestation ultimately failed to unify the country and prevent the outbreak of the Civil War, but it enjoyed a long afterlife, with both Royalists and Parliamentarians, and conformists and non-conformists alike, invoking the Protestation's contents in support of their cause.¹⁷⁵ In particular, the Protestation remained popular with the navy, with the document routinely used as a loyalty oath for sailors and troops.¹⁷⁶ On 11 January 1642, it was 'Ordered, by the Vice-Admiral'—that is Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick, a key Parliamentarian and puritan—that *The Seamans Protestation* 'be published and set forth throughout the whole Kingdome, as a manifestation of the Seamans Loyaltie to their King, and love to their Country'.¹⁷⁷ Despite this statement on the cover of the pamphlet, copies of this Protestation were hung from the rigging and masts of the many, heavily-armoured boats that accompanied the MPs returning to Westminster. These sailors may have been ready to defend their King, but they were convinced that Parliament was in greater need of their protection. Significantly, the Protestation oath included in this pamphlet differed from the 'official' document, and emphasised the Elizabethan Reformation:

I A, B, C,
Do Protest before Almighty God, to maintain with my dearest life and blood, the Protestant Religion as it was established in the dayes of Queen Elisabeth: To acknowledge Charles, by the grace of God, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland: To stand, for the Priviledges of Parliament. [And] Utterly from my heart to abhor all Poperie, and Popish innovations. So help me God.¹⁷⁸

According to those who supported this Protestation, English Protestantism was intrinsically linked with Elizabeth. This oath acknowledged Charles's authority, but it also sought to defend against the encroachments on parliament's privileges, and took aim at 'Popish innovations'—an overt criticism of Laudianism.

¹⁷⁴ The Protestation returns were the parochial lists of those who swore the Protestation, which were then sent to Parliament. Walter, *Covenanting Citizens*, p. 113; David Cressy, 'The Protestation Protested, 1641 and 1642', *The Historical Journal*, 45.2 (2002), pp. 252, 278.

¹⁷⁵ Walter, *Covenanting Citizens*, p. 244; TNA SP 16/515/1, fol. 167r.

¹⁷⁶ Walter, *Covenanting Citizens*, p. 244.

¹⁷⁷ *The Seamans Protestation. Concerning, Their Ebbing and Flowing to and from The Parliament House, at Westminster* (London, 1642; Wing S2191), sig. A1r; Walter, *Covenanting Citizens*, pp. 228–229.

¹⁷⁸ *The Seamans Protestation*, sig. A3v. The text of the official document is as follows:

I, A. B., do in the presence of Almighty God, Promise, Vow, and Protest, to maintain and defend, as far as lawfully I may, with my life, power, and estate, the true Reformed Protestant Religion, expressed in the Doctrine of the Church of England against all Popery and Popish Innovations within this Realm, contrary to the same Doctrine, and according to the duty of my Allegiance, His Majesties Royall Person, Honour, and Estate; As also the Power and Priviledges of Parliament; The lawfull Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and every person that maketh this Protestation, in whatsoever he shall do in the lawfull pursuance of the same. And to my power, and as far as lawfully I may, I will oppose, and by all good wayes and means indeavour to bring to condigne [appropriate] punishment, all such as shall either by Force, Practise, Councels, Plots, Conspiracies or otherwise, do any thing to the contrary of any thing in this present Protestation contained. And further, that I shall in all just and Honourable wayes indeavour to preserve the Union and Peace between the three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; And neither for hope, fear, nor other respect, shall relinquish this Promise, Vow, and Protestation.

Die Mercurii: 5 Maii. 1641 (London, 1641; Wing E2609A), p. 1.

Like the ‘original’ Protestation, *The Seamans Protestation* did not prevent further conflict. In 1643, *The Sea-Mans Protestation Renewed* was published. It was an ‘enlarged’ version of the 1642 version, and made the link between England and Israel, and indeed Elizabeth and Israel, overt. This pamphlet, which Thomason dated ‘May 9’, and may thus have been written in response to the recent capture of Reading by the Parliamentarians, included a ‘Continuation, confirmation, and augmentation’ where its predecessor had finished.¹⁷⁹ In this additional section, the pamphlet spoke to the current religio-political moment:

now the Kingdom is involved in a civill War, and a mighty Army of Papists (and Atheists) contrary to the Knowne Lawes of the Land are in Arms against the Parliament, if they could, to destroy the same, and so trample the Common Laws and the Commons of England under foot, and to make us all slaves in our Religion imunities and priviledges.¹⁸⁰

‘The Protestant Religion as it was established in the dayes of Queen Elisabeth’ was clearly no more, with the Royalists depicted as Catholics who sought to undo the Elizabethan Reformation, and return England to Rome. The author, however, exhorts the sailors to look back to the reign of Elizabeth:

It behoves us that are sea men, ... [who] manage the Navy of Shippes, which are and ever have beene accompted the brazen Walles of this Kingdome, against all Forraigne invasion, witnesse our memorable and never to be forgotten defeating the (falsly tearmed [sic]) Invincible Armado in 88 which was in the blessed, happie, and haleluyon [sic] days and raighn of our Deborah, the Nurse of our English Israel, Queen Elisabeth of immortall Memory which victory was to god alone against the potent Monarch Phillip the second King of Spaine.

And verily it ... [behoves us] to pray for the hapy proceedings of the Armies as well by land as sea that are in Armes for King and Parliament, against all our Enemyes as well domestike as forraign, and for our parts, let them nor theirs prosper, that will not say to the same with us.¹⁸¹

For the author, England was not merely *like* Israel: England actually *was* a contemporary Israel. But not only that, Elizabeth, as *our* Deborah, was thus the example that the English Israel should be emulating—a point made all the clearer by the reference to Elizabeth’s ‘immortal’ memory, which made clear the ongoing relevance of the English Deborah’s legacy.

¹⁷⁹ The Siege of Reading commenced on 14 April, and while the Royalist garrison held out, the Parliamentarians, led by the Earl of Essex, were able to repel a reinforcing army commanded by Charles himself. The commanding officer of the Royalist garrison, Sir Richard Fielding, called for a truce on 25 April, and the Royalists left for Oxford on 27 April, having completely surrendered the town. See: Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War, 1642–1649: Volume I, 1642–1644* (London, 1886), pp. 149–151. On 18 April, during the siege, Charles issued a proclamation offering a ‘Pardon to the Rebels’ who ‘doe traiterously lay seige to, and intend to assault Our Towne of Reading’. See: *His Majesties gracious offer of Pardon to the Rebels now in Armes against Him, under the Command of Robert Earle of Essex* (Oxford, 1643; Wing C2340).

¹⁸⁰ *The Sea-Mans Protestation Renewed, Confirmed, and Enlarged* (London, 1643; Wing S2193), sig. A4r.

¹⁸¹ *The Sea-Mans Protestation Renewed*, sigs. A4r–A4v.

Elizabeth's providential sending is also emphasised in her description as England's 'Nurse'. Not only do multiple Elizabeth analogies describe Elizabeth as such (including *Weepe with Joy* discussed in Chapter 1), it also references the premodern meaning of the word—which meant to educate in, or to foster a quality (that is, Protestantism)—and thus the prophecy of Isaiah: 'kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers'.¹⁸² Finally, the recourse to the English victory over the Spanish Armada would also have been highly relevant to the English navy, as it was were largely allied with the Parliamentarians, meaning it was in a position, just like in 1588, to prevent the 'Army of Papists' conquering England.

As with many other texts from the period, this section emphasised the (Catholic) enemies, both foreign and domestic, by which England was beset—with England's Deborah 'never to be forgotten' for defending her people. Given the emphasis on the Royalists who are acting 'contrary to the Knowne Lawes of the Land', the use of the English Deborah typology asserted Elizabeth's 'good' relationship with parliament as a contrast to the 'poor' relationship between Charles and Parliament. The example also emphasised that Deborah was a judge who had successfully and righteously adjudicated the law. The typology made clear that Elizabeth had emulated Deborah in this regard, but rebuked Charles for failing to do so. Deborah's righteous tenure had ensured that 'the land had rest forty years'; 1642, the year the Civil War began, marked forty years since Elizabeth's death (using the Lady Day New Year), and it is possible to read the reference to Deborah as a statement that the current conflict was punishment for the 'evil' the English had committed in the sight of the Lord after the English Deborah's death. Nevertheless, the pamphlet makes clear that Charles was not emulating England's Deborah, and was not upholding the laws of England—the implication being that the conflict had been brought about by Charles's flagrant disregard for Elizabeth's precedent. Such an observation meant that the only way out of the current turmoil was for Charles to disband his 'Army of Papists (and Atheists)', and to embrace the example set by the English Deborah, 'Queen Elisabeth of immortall Memory', by reinforcing England's Protestant Church and embarking on a new, cooperative relationship with parliament.

In addition to the Protestation, one of the most significant steps Parliament took towards this 'further' reformation was the convening of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, the first meeting of which took place on 1 July 1643.¹⁸³ The work of the Assembly would slowly progress over the next decade, during which time it produced a new Directory

¹⁸² *OED*, s.v. 'nurse, v, 1b', 'nurse, n, 1b'; Isaiah 49:23.

¹⁸³ See: Chad van Dixhoorn, 'The Westminster Assembly and the Reformation of the 1640s', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume I: Reformation and Identity, c.1520–1662*, ed. by Anthony Milton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 430–443.

for Public Worship (1644, which replaced the Book of Common Prayer), the Form of Church Government (1645), and a Confession of Faith (1646). The legacy of Elizabeth loomed large over the work of the Assembly, and there are multiple references to her reign in the Assembly's minutes.¹⁸⁴ Most telling, Elizabeth's reign was used as reason for the Assembly's encouragement that people sign the Solemn League and Covenant:

Nor hath this doctrine or practise beene deemed seditious or unwarrantable by the Princes that have sate upon the English Throne, but justified and defended by Queene Elizabeth of blessed memory, with the expence of much Treasure and Noble blood ... against the unjust violence of Philip of Spaine.¹⁸⁵

Elizabeth herself would have been horrified at some of the provisions of the Covenant—especially the 'extirpation' of 'Prelacy (that is, Church-government by Archbishops, [and] Bishops[]]'—but this was beside the point. For the Assemblymen, Elizabeth, a Deborah who had defended England's Protestantism from 'popery', and had been blessed and protected by God for doing thus, was the ideal figure to employ in support of the Covenant—a document that desired the 'extirpation of popery', and committed its adherents to discovering those 'hindering the reformation of religion'.¹⁸⁶ The Covenant, which sought the 'Defence of Religion', was thus seen as an extension of Elizabeth's religious policies. By invoking the memory of England's Deborah, Wilson and Hill, just like the Assemblymen, argued that it was now time to finish the Elizabethan Reformation, so that the Church could once again be free from the Babylonian captivity of Rome, and thus 'be called Reformed'.

Laud, who had been in prison since his impeachment, was finally brought to trial on 12 March 1644. As had been the case in Strafford's trial, it was impossible to point to a specific treasonous deed, and the trial eventually ended without a verdict on 11 October.¹⁸⁷ The Commons then took up the issue, passing an act of attainder on 11 November, which

¹⁸⁴ For instance, in the debate over the Directory for Ordination on 18 April 1644, Bulstrode Whitelocke claimed he was 'Not satisfied why the word "established" should be left out', preferring to follow the example of 'The booke of ordination' of 'Queene Elizabeth'; on 31 October 1644, during the debate over the preface to the directory for public worship, George Gillespie, one of the Scottish commissioners to the Assembly, reminded those assembled that Pope Pius (either IV or V) had told Elizabeth that he would 'confirme out of his owne authority, the English Liturgie'—and while 'the queen [Elizabeth] must receive it from him', which was of course anathema to the Queen, it nevertheless demonstrated validity of the English liturgy; and finally, in the 'Petition to both houses of parliament for ministers and elders to be permitted to carry out the discipline of the church' from August 1645, the assembly cited the 'the Injunctions of King Edward the 6t[h]' and 'the Injunctions & Articles of Inquiry of Queen Elizabeth, Princes of famous memory' as precedent for ministers to exclude people they deemed 'ignorant' or 'scandalous' from partaking in communion. *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly 1643–1652*, ed. by Chad van Dixhoorn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), vol. 3, p. 29; vol. 3, p. 433; vol. 5, p. 234.

¹⁸⁵ 'An Exhortation to the Taking of the Solemne League and Covenant, 9 February 1644', in *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly 1643–1652*, vol. 5, pp. 45–46.

¹⁸⁶ *A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation, and Defence of Religion, the Honour and Happinesse of the King, and the Peace and Safety of the three Kingdomes of Scotland, England, and Ireland* (Edinburgh, 1643; Wing S4447A), pp. 4, 5.

¹⁸⁷ Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, p. 223.

was eventually passed by the Lords on 4 January 1645, despite only nineteen peers being present.¹⁸⁸ The animosity towards Laud was demonstrated by his being initially sentenced to be hanged, drawn, and quartered, with the royal pardon issued by Charles completely ignored. After the intervention of the Lords, Laud's sentence was commuted to beheading, and he was executed on Tower Hill on 10 January.¹⁸⁹

Laud, like Strafford, was now dead, and many hoped that Laudianism would die with him. Although he did come to regret the trust he placed in Laud (Laud seems to have been on Charles's mind when he advised the future Charles II in *Eikon Basilike* against 'consent[ing] to their [bishops'] weak and divided novelties'), Charles remained adamant that both Strafford and Laud had been murdered, with God punishing England for their deaths.¹⁹⁰ Nevertheless, the damage was done, and neither side was prepared to back down. While negotiations to end the Civil War were undertaken between 29 January and 22 February 1645 (concerning the Treaty of Uxbridge), like the failed Treaty of Oxford from 1643, they proved fruitless, especially since Charles would only agree to limited changes to the role of bishops and the episcopacy.¹⁹¹

In the midst of these negotiations, on 15 February 1645, the New Model Army was formally constituted. Over the next year, the Army decidedly routed the Royalists at successive battles. Faced with limited options, on 5 May 1646, Charles surrendered his forces to a Covenanter army near Southwell, Nottinghamshire. On 30 January 1647, after negotiating a settlement, the Scots handed the King over to the Parliamentarians. Except for a quickly foiled escape attempt, Charles would remain a prisoner for the rest of his life.

Elizabeth Analogies and the Second Civil War

From 11 November 1647, Charles was imprisoned in Carisbrooke Castle on the Isle of Wight. While there, on 26 December 1647, he signed a secret treaty with the Scots, which committed Charles to imposing Presbyterianism in England for three years in exchange for military assistance. The news of Charles's agreement soon spread, and on 17 January 1648 parliament passed the Vote of No Addresses, which broke off negotiations with Charles, thereby setting

¹⁸⁸ Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, p. 223. The attainder was full of the oft-repeated claims against Laud, with the archbishop guilty of 'endeavouring to subvert the fundamentall lawes and government of the kingdome of England, and insteade thereof to introduce an arbitrary and tyrannicall government against lawe, and to alter and subvert Gods true religion by law established in this realm, and instead thereof to sett up Popish superstition and idolatrie, and to subvert the rights of Parliament, and the ancient course of Parliamentary proceedings, and by false and malicious slanders to incense his Majesty against Parliaments' (TNA SP 16/506, fol. 4r).

¹⁸⁹ Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud*, p. 224.

¹⁹⁰ Charles I [and John Gauden], *Eikon Basilike* (London, 1648/49; Wing E269), p. 159; Patricia Crawford, "'Charles Stuart, That Man of Blood'", *Journal of British Studies*, 16.2 (1977), p. 49.

¹⁹¹ D.E. Kennedy, *The English Revolution, 1642–1649* (London: Macmillan, 2000), pp. 38–40.

the stage for the Second English Civil War. The intensified fighting was mirrored in print, with pamphlets and newsbooks serving as proxy soldiers for the Royalists and Parliamentarians.¹⁹² At this juncture, the legacy of the last Tudor monarch was again revived for presentist concerns, with two pamphlets offering the reign of England's Deborah as an example to be emulated in order to escape the horrors of the Civil War.

O Friends! No Friends, to King, Church and State invoked the English Deborah typology in order to counsel (and reprove) both king and parliament.¹⁹³ The author is identified only by the pseudonym Veridicus, which is Latin for truthful.¹⁹⁴ It is clear from the pamphlet's subtitle—'or Thames, Twede and Tyne paraell'd [sic] with Romes Tyber and King-poysoning Po'—that the author is contrasting England with Rome (that is, the pope and Catholicism). The author, however, also seems to dislike radical puritans, as the second subtitle claims the pamphlet condemns 'Positions and Practices from Rome and from Rhemes, from Edenburgh and Geneva, poiz'd to some purpose, as the Case now stands'.

The pamphlet is full of references to events from the classical world, which make the work impenetrable in some places; the prose is disjointed, with single sentences running for over half a page. The only real hint at the author's point comes from the fourth subtitle, which states that the work is 'Presented to all impartiall Patriots and Presbyterians.' Given Charles's agreement with the Scots for the imposition of presbyterianism in England in exchange for military help against the English parliament, the author seems to be a Scottish presbyterian, and also a Royalist. That the pamphlet's author was Scottish (or was writing for a Scots readership), and was writing about the Engagers and the Scottish aspect of the Civil War, is suggested by the date on Thomason's copy, 20 March. The pamphlet was thus likely published just after the Engagers, under the Duke of Hamilton, took control of the government, and began raising an army, which did not cross over to England until 8 July. The pamphlet, and its author, thus seems to want the end of the Civil War, the King restored to power, and the adoption of presbyterianism in England.

The author, however, clearly desires the imposition of presbyterianism to be accompanied by a reformation of the Church of England's doctrine. They lament that religion has 'turned all into Rites and Ceremonies'—a common criticism of Laudianism—and this point is alluded to alongside a reference to Elizabeth:

¹⁹² Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, p. 214.

¹⁹³ The title is likely a play on the lines 'O eyes, no eyes', 'O life, no life', and 'O world, no word', from Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* (3.2.1–3).

¹⁹⁴ The title page presents the author's name as 'Veridicus, praeterea nihil', meaning 'the truth and nothing else' (itself a play on the Latin 'vox et praeterea nihil', meaning 'a voice and nothing more', or simply 'nonsense').

for many by-past yeares Episcopacy tutoring Regality, that it sailed betwixt two Rocks, the Scylla of Popery, and the more dangerous Carybdis of Puritanisme, as then all true zeal for Reformation was nick-named, of the two evils ... the lesse being to bee chosen, Queen Elizabeth, and two succeeding Monarchs after her, were perswaded that more favour and connivance was to be used to the first as birds of their owne feather, then to the last as more factious, and so more perillous to Church and State.¹⁹⁵

As a presbyterian, the author seeks the abolition of episcopacy in England, which they claim successive monarchs have kept in place because of the roles bishops play in both tutoring monarchs and in government. Nevertheless, a presbyterian Church of England must be accompanied by reforms, and the author laments that godly reformers were tarnished with the label of puritan, as ‘all true zeal for Reformation was nick-named’. They thus seem to present presbyterianism as a middle ground between ‘the Scylla of Popery’ and ‘the more dangerous Carybdis of Puritanisme’.¹⁹⁶ Given that bishops had been excluded from the Lords in 1642, that Archbishop Laud had been executed a little over two years earlier, and that parliament had ordered the abolition of episcopacy in October 1646, the point about bishops’ political roles would have been rather prescient. That Elizabeth is named, and both James and Charles are merely the ‘two succeeding Monarchs’, emphasises how it is Elizabeth who provided the supreme example to be emulated. Certainly, of the three, Elizabeth granted bishops the least role in active politics.¹⁹⁷ The author does, however, imply that Elizabeth did not complete England’s Reformation because she was ‘perswaded’ to keep bishops. Nevertheless, it seems that Elizabeth, despite keeping the episcopate, had largely steered England through the Strait of Messina, while increasingly, James and Charles had veered towards Scylla—meaning that the abolition of episcopacy could no longer be avoided.

Later, the author used Elizabeth’s role in the fight against Catholicism to make clear that England needed to purge itself of popery. For the author, Catholicism was akin to tyranny, and they made multiple, belaboured observations, claiming that ‘Antichristian Popes’ were not only ‘the great Antichrist’, but also one of the worst tyrants throughout European history because of their use of their spiritual powers for political purposes. Calling them ‘absolute Tyrants’, the author described how popes had ‘deposed’ and ‘excommunicated’ ‘Othoes, Henries and Fredericks in Germany, Childerick in France, and our English Deborah

¹⁹⁵ Veridicus, *O Friends! No Friends, to King, Church and State* (London, 1648; Wing O14), p. 4.

¹⁹⁶ A popular idiom that referenced Scylla and Charybdis, mythical sea monsters from Greek mythology who were believed to live on opposite sides of the Strait of Messina between Sicily and the Italian mainland.

¹⁹⁷ The only bishop to be made privy councillor during Elizabeth’s reign was John Whitgift, the Archbishop of Canterbury—he was appointed by 4 February 1586, and served until his death on 29 February 1604. Nicholas Heath, the Archbishop of York, who had served under Mary I, had been reappointed by Elizabeth at her accession, but he was removed from the council after he was deprived of his See on 5 July 1559 for refusing the Oath of Supremacy.

here in England, by five Popes'.¹⁹⁸ In addition to alluding to *Regnans in Excelsis*, which had not only excommunicated Elizabeth, but also absolved Elizabeth's subjects of 'Oath[s] and from any duty arising from lordship, fealty and obedience' and had 'deprive[d] the same Elizabeth of her pretended title to the crown', the author was clearly mocking the lack of biblical precedent for such moves.¹⁹⁹ A clear, recent example was Henri IV of France's excommunication in 1589 by Sixtus V: he had been declared devoid of any right to inherit the French crown, but because he later converted to Catholicism his excommunication was lifted by Clement VIII on 17 September 1595. The author thus believed that the meddling in secular affairs by that 'great Antichrist', the Bishop of Rome, served as proof that episcopacy in England should be abolished and replaced with presbyterianism.

While the pamphlet emphasised the contrast between England and Rome, by including the somewhat redundant phrase, 'our English Deborah here in England', the author made a point of conflating contemporary England with Old Testament Israel.²⁰⁰ On the one hand, the invocation of Deborah, a judge who adjudicated the law, glances at the legal implications of excommunication, especially when it was done for political purposes (as the author seems to be suggesting). It also, however, underscores the close connection between both Elizabeth and Deborah, and England and Israel. Elizabeth, like Deborah, had been chosen by God to free and protect his people, with the author placing the pope in the role of oppressing tyrant—just like the many enemies who had oppressed the Israelites, including Jabin, king of the Canaanites, who 'mightily oppressed the children of Israel' until the Israelites rose up under Deborah.²⁰¹ Elizabeth may have, somewhat successfully, kept the

¹⁹⁸ Veridicus, *O Friends! No Friends*, p. 12. Otto IV, Holy Roman Emperor, was excommunicated in 1211 by Pope Innocent III and while he was not deposed, the military successes of Frederick II forced him to abdicate in 1215 in favour of Frederick; Emperor Henry IV was excommunicated five times by three different popes throughout his reign; Emperor Henry V was excommunicated in 1116 for his role in the Investiture Controversy, although the sentence was lifted in 1122; Frederick I Barbarossa was excommunicated in 1160 by Alexander III; Childeric III, King of the Franks, reigned from 743 until he was deposed by Pope Zachary in March 751 at the behest of Pepin the Short (there is no evidence, however, that Childeric was excommunicated). Colin Morris, *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), pp. 425, 80, 126, 161, 194; P.S. Barnwell, 'Einhard, Louis the Pious and Childeric III', *Historical Research*, 78.200 (2005), p. 135.

¹⁹⁹ Pius V, 'Regnans in Excelsis', in *Elizabeth I and Her Age*, ed. by Donald Stump and Susan M. Felch (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 2009), pp. 155–157. The author mentioned 'the roaring bulls of Pius (or Impius) the fifth, and Gregory the 9. against Queen Elizabeth': while Pius V issued *Regnans in Excelsis*, it is unclear what Gregory IX refers to, given that he was pope from March 1227 to August 1241, but it may refer to the suspension of *Regnans in Excelsis* by Gregory XIII in 1580, before it was renewed by Sixtus V in 1588, or to Innocent IX, who supported Philip II against Henry IV before his conversion. Veridicus, *O Friends! No Friends*, p. 13 (misprinted as '23').

²⁰⁰ If my suggestion that the author was Scottish is correct, then this redundant repetition not only emphasises that the English were indeed the intended audience of the pamphlet, but it also suggests that the author believed Scotland's Presbyterian Church was a Godly model that the English should emulate. It is worth noting that the author may also be a Covenanter, and the pamphlet may thus be intended to persuade the English to support the efforts of the Engagers.

²⁰¹ Judges 4:3.

English episcopate under control; but since her death, the bishops had proved themselves ‘perillous to Church and State’. It was therefore up to parliament (and the King) to eradicate episcopacy once and for all. If this was done, and it was combined with a thorough repudiation of popery, the author of *O Friends! No Friends* believed that the tumult of the Civil War could finally be put to rest.

The second pamphlet from 1648 that invoked Elizabeth analogies in order to comment on the present is the intriguingly named *A Muzzle for Cerberus, and his three whelps Mercurius Elencticus, Bellicus, and Melancholicus*, by ‘Mercurio-Mastix Hibernicus’. Probably a pseudonym for an Irish person, it seems likely that the choice of both title and pseudonym was intended to invoke well-established newsbooks, such as *Mercurius Britannicus* (1643–1646), *Mercurius Elencticus* (1647–1649), and *Mercurius Pragmaticus* (1647–1649). According to one of the pamphlet’s subtitles, the author was prompted to take up his pen because of ‘the revolt of Inchequin in Ireland’. This refers to Murrough O’Brien, Baron Inchiquin, a Protestant who had fought for the King in Ireland since the Rebellion of 1641. After Charles reneged on the rewards he had promised him for his service, Inchiquin abandoned the Irish Confederacy for parliament, and was appointed the parliamentary Lord President of Munster in July 1644. In April 1648, once his control over the south of Ireland was entrenched, and before parliament could fully supplant him, he defected back to Charles. His dwindling supplies, and lack of reinforcements (Inchiquin was a Protestant, and was harried by Catholics and Parliamentarians alike), meant that after a final defeat at the hands of Cromwell in 1650, he escaped to exile in France.²⁰² Thomason’s copy of the pamphlet is dated ‘June 20th’, meaning that the ‘revolt’ referred to the defection back to Charles, not Inchiquin’s earlier defection to parliament.

‘The revolt of Inchequin’, therefore, was not an example of Irish Catholics taking up arms against godly, English Protestants. Instead, the author of *A Muzzle for Cerberus* was incensed that Inchiquin had abandoned the Parliamentarians and returned to the side of the King. In no uncertain terms, the author blamed Charles for the Civil War, claiming ‘the Kings evill in the head, / And Gangreens through the body spread / ... Whom Prince, Pope, Pests, nor vulgars lust / Could once divert from Lawes, right, just’.²⁰³ As with many other Civil War texts, *A Muzzle for Cerberus* equated Charles and the Royalists with Catholicism, and claimed that they did not follow England’s ‘Lawes’, which had brought about the War. The author also

²⁰² Patrick Little, ‘O’Brien, Murrough, first earl of Inchiquin (c. 1614–1674)’, ODNB. See also: Patrick Little, Patrick. ‘The Irish “Independents” and Viscount Lisle’s Lieutenantcy of Ireland’, *The Historical Journal*, 44.4 (2001), pp. 941–961.

²⁰³ Mercurio-Mastix Hibernicus, *A Muzzle for Cerberus, and his three whelps Mercurius Elencticus, Bellicus, and Melancholicus* (London, 1648; Wing M3166), p. 38.

alluded to the way that Catholicism had infected England, denouncing ‘strong French Philters and slye trickes’. A philter was generally a love potion, meaning that the author was insinuating that Henrietta Maria had ingratiated herself with Charles through witchcraft and trickery in order to undermine England’s Protestantism. The pamphlet, with its newsbook-like cover, and its claim to be directed at ‘every unpartiall Reader, Cleare and Candid, without prejudicate Opinion’, was thus part of the parliamentary war of words.

Given the emphasis on parliament and Protestantism, it is unsurprising that the author invoked the legacy of the last Tudor monarch through several, different Elizabeth analogies. For the author, the pope—who had corrupted Charles—was one of the chief causes of England’s current tumult. Nevertheless, the author turned to history to explain that while popes might wage futile wars on Protestants, as the Protestants were ‘fighting the Lords battailes’, they would eventually be victorious. The author recalled the various ‘Antichristian’ popes who had excommunicated God’s chosen people, ‘and armed their own Subjects against them’. In addition to the ‘Hugonites in France’ and the ‘Huniades in Hungare’, the author named ‘Luther in Saxon’ and ‘Queen Elizabeth here in England’ as examples of people that

God [had] preserved and reserved to better times, and to better ends and purposes, after he had pulled them as brands out of the fire, and brought them Daniel-like out of the very jaws of Lyons, and as his three courageous servants out of the very flaming furnace, where they were tried as pure gold.²⁰⁴

These people had been preserved, however, because they would instigate ‘great workes of reformation’ or oversee the ‘preservation of a people’. God was sure of their worthiness, because ‘he fitted them by many fiery trialls’, but England, the author warns, was in danger of losing the protection Elizabeth had won for it:

sure if the Parliament stand for God, as he hath promised to stand for them, and to deliver them as all his true Members, Ministers and Magistrates, out of all their troubles, and to honour them which honour him.²⁰⁵

God had thus preserved Elizabeth like Daniel, and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, and she had ushered in the Reformation in England, and defended her people from ‘many fiery trialls’. Not only does this analogy link Elizabeth with her Old Testament antecedents, showing that the last Tudor monarch was indeed providentially sent to the English, but it also offers Elizabeth’s example as a solution to the current turmoil. If parliament would ‘stand for God’, God would ‘stand for them’, and ‘deliver them’. Presenting England as a new Israel, the author admonished parliament for not emulating the example of Elizabeth—who had been

²⁰⁴ *A Muzzele for Cerberus*, p. 18.

²⁰⁵ *A Muzzele for Cerberus*, p. 18.

preserved for ‘better ends and purposes’—because England was now in danger of losing God’s blessings.

After reminding his readers that ‘if their work be of God it cannot be overthrown’, the author made explicit the reason Elizabeth’s legacy should be emulated:

[We] shall see Gods hand fearfully on those who have had heads, hearts, or hands against his Church: as ... in [the days of] Hezekias, Constantine, Obediah, Abdemelech,²⁰⁶ ... and I may adde our English late Deborah, our Elizabeth, ... friends of the Church, ... ever gloriously honoured and patronized in this life, which I prescribe as a cordiall and cooler to our Senators, against the hot tongue poyson of this Mercurialized sonne of Beliall.²⁰⁷

England’s Deborah is thus a ‘cordiall’ that the ‘Senators’—that is, MPs—should drink, rather than continuing to allow themselves to be poisoned by the pope, the son of the Devil. This list of righteous people from the Old Testament (as well as Constantine the Great) not only linked Elizabeth with her Old Testament antecedents, but also conflated England with Israel. Elizabeth had been sent to the English, just as Deborah had been sent to the Israelites; but like the biblical story of Deborah, the English had committed ‘evil in the sight of the Lord’ after Elizabeth’s death, and God punished the land by allowing it to descend into Civil War. Elizabeth, who had defended her people from ‘many fiery trialls’, and had removed Catholicism from England, was thus presented as a divinely favoured example in this tumultuous period. Nevertheless, the author’s suggested course of action does hint at the idea that Elizabeth’s Reformation was not fully complete at her death, with popery still found in parts of both Church and state; indeed, the author criticises the Royalists for joining forces ‘with the bloody Canniballized Popish Rebels’.²⁰⁸ Nevertheless, the author blamed parliament for failing to finish Elizabeth’s work, writing ‘our Parliamenteires are to be pitied as passives’.²⁰⁹ This means, then, that if parliament were to become ‘active’ by removing the last vestiges of popery in England, and finishing the Reformation that Elizabeth had begun, God would bless the nation, and bring an end to the fighting.

These two pamphlets from 1648 both imply that the Civil War was punishment from God because England had yet to completely eradicate popery. In doing so, both pamphlets also suggested that the English Reformation was not complete at Elizabeth’s death. This suggestion was quickly brushed aside, however, and both pamphlets made clear that it was up to parliament to finish what the English Deborah had begun. While the authors of the

²⁰⁶ Probably Abdemelech (also Ebed-Melech), an Ethiopian eunuch at the court of King Zedekiah, who saved the prophet Jeremiah from death after he was cast into a deep pit in the dungeon and left to die. Jeremiah 38:4–13.

²⁰⁷ *A Muzzle for Cerberus*, p. 19.

²⁰⁸ *A Muzzle for Cerberus*, p. 22.

²⁰⁹ *A Muzzle for Cerberus*, p. 17.

pamphlets emphasise different aspects of their preferred ideology (for instance, *A Muzzle for Cerberus* does not rail against bishops like *O Friends! No Friends*), they both depict England as a new Israel, and assert that the reign of England's Deborah was an example that should be emulated in the present. Even with the puritans effectively in control of England, debate continued to rage about how England's church should be run—especially the relationship between church and state. Despite her preference for bishops, and her dislike of puritanism, Elizabeth was invoked as part of the critique these two pamphlets intended to offer. These invocations of the English Deborah typology go beyond mere commemoration, however: England's Deborah had defended her people and its Protestant Church from threats both internal and external, and both authors acknowledged that in order to reform the Church, and to prevent popery again taking root and spreading, England needed to look back to the reign of the last Tudor monarch, and emulate the actions of a monarch who, like Daniel and Deborah, was indisputably favoured by God.

Charles and England's Deborah

On 30 January 1649, Charles I was beheaded outside the Banqueting House of Whitehall Palace. For the first time in its history, England was ruled without a monarch—a situation that was formalised on 17 March, when the Rump Parliament abolished the English monarchy and created the Commonwealth of England. During the tumult of the period between Charles's accession in 1625 and his execution, the legacy and memory of the last Tudor monarch provided examples of stability and of providential Protestantism, with commentators turning to the example of England's Deborah in order to suggest a course of action out of the present crisis.

This chapter has argued that during Charles's reign, Elizabeth analogies were a crucial part of the wider conceptualisation of England as a new Israel. During the Caroline period, the last Tudor monarch was typologised with an array of Old Testament figures, including Deborah, Judith, David, Solomon, Jacob, Daniel, and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. This wide range of antecedents not only reinforced Elizabeth's status as a providential, Protestant monarch, but also—and more importantly—allowed polemicists to suggest ways for the various crises of Charles's reign to be handled, and overcome. These examples emphasise the universality of biblical analogy, demonstrating how Elizabeth analogies were incredibly flexible and inherently adaptable; they tapped into a deeply rooted set of mental associations, thereby allowing a variety of writers in an array of contexts to warn, rebuke, or counsel their audience.

As this chapter has shown, Elizabeth analogies were a hermeneutic device that allowed writers to offer counsel, rebuke, or warning concerning the present—and in doing so, these typologies offered a prescriptive plan for ending or solving contemporary turmoil. By moving beyond mere historical example, and suggesting that England *was* a new Israel, commentators used the biblical past as a map for the present, with Elizabeth, primarily as England's Deborah, employed both to assert that the English were God's new chosen people, and to warn against repeating the mistakes of the Israelites.

Some writers, like Hill, Adams, and Horne, described this link more implicitly; others, like Wilson, Vicars, and Burges, were much more overt in their desire to make the English understand the great benefit, but also great responsibility, that came from being the new Israel. Like Deborah, who was sent to the Israelites in their time of need, Elizabeth had been sent to England to champion Protestantism and defend England from the internal and external threat of Catholicism. The eternal nature of typologies, however, meant that the utility of the English Deborah did not end with her death in 1603. As many of the writers during Charles's reign made clear, the example of England's Deborah was acutely relevant in the present, and this example offered a clear path out of contemporary conflict.

Throughout Charles's reign, Elizabeth analogies, and especially the English Deborah typology, were also a potent way to criticise the King for his poor relationship with parliament. Given this increasingly fraught relationship, it is perhaps unsurprising that both Charles and the parliamentary leaders were exhorted to look to the reign of Elizabeth to prevent England succumbing to tyranny. Elizabeth, whose Golden Speech was reprinted twice during Charles's reign, was increasingly seen as the epitome of monarchical collaboration with parliament. Many writers, including Adams, Burges, and the author of *The Sea-Mans Protestation Renewed*, were clearly drawing on the typology of Deborah 'consulting with her estates for the good of Israel' in their pointed, and increasingly polemical, counsel. Elizabeth's relationship with parliament may not have been as friendly as seventeenth-century writers increasingly idealised it as being, but the use of the English Deborah typology created a form of idealised, godly governance that writers used to attack the Caroline regime, and increasingly, to defend the Parliamentarians during the Civil War.

Writers also turned to England's Deborah throughout Charles's reign in order to warn against Catholicism, lamenting that this plague, which had been held back during Elizabeth's reign, had again broken out. Charles, who had courted a Spanish infanta before marrying a French princess, was stuck between Catholics who believed his marriage meant he would be more sympathetic to their cause, and an increasingly vocal group of hotter Protestants who

wanted England to undergo further reformation. These warnings concerning the internal and external threat of Catholicism were made all the more pronounced by the link that was increasingly made between Charles, Royalists, and their ‘Army of Papists’. As part of this decrying of popery, Elizabeth analogies were central to calls for England to undergo further godly reformation. Much more so than in James’s reign, Caroline writers suggested that the Elizabethan Reformation was merely the beginning of the ‘blasting’ of popery, and that England needed further reformation to ensure that its Church had embraced the ‘true religion’. None of these texts that argue for further reformation, however, directly criticise Elizabeth for her incomplete Reformation, with the last Tudor monarch instead generally regarded as having ‘done what she could’.²¹⁰ Nevertheless, many of these calls for England to undergo further reformation were made through the invoking of the English Deborah typology. The use of this typology helped explain how England’s incomplete Reformation was, in part, the underlying cause of the Civil War. For many writers, after Elizabeth’s death, the English committed ‘evil in the sight of the Lord’ by not completing the Reformation, meaning that embracing the ‘true religion’ was the only way to end the conflict.

The Regicide did not do away with the counsel that Elizabeth’s reign could offer. Both Oliver and Richard Cromwell would be exhorted to emulate England’s Deborah in order to both reign with God’s approval, and to successfully rule the people of the Commonwealth. Despite the Commonwealth’s republican-style government, the last Tudor monarch was still viewed as a model that any leader should emulate. Elizabeth as England’s Deborah provided a model of providential, Protestant government. As the writers who employed the typology during Charles’s reign demonstrated, England was a new Israel, and it was thus paramount that the country fully embrace the ‘true religion’ in order to end the decades of conflict that had beset the British Isles.

²¹⁰ Mark 14:8.

Chapter 4

Elizabeth Analogies and the Lords Protector: Counsel and Commemoration in the Commonwealth

On 17 September 1656, Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell delivered a speech to MPs at the opening of the Second Protectorate Parliament. In it, he recalled ‘Queen Elizabeth of famous memory’, touched on the religious issues that had been a key part of parliamentary grievances during the Civil War, and warned against the machinations of the Spanish:

No sooner did this nation form that which is called unworthily the Reformed Religion, after the death of Queen Mary, by the Queen Elizabeth of famous memory,—we need not be ashamed to say so—but his [Philip II’s] designs were by all unworthy unnatural means to destroy that person, and to seek the ruin and destruction of these kingdoms.¹

As his speech continued, Cromwell focused in on Spain, and again invoked Elizabeth: ‘It would not be ill to remember the several assassinations designed upon that lady, that great Queen; the attempts upon Ireland, their invading it; the designs of the same nature upon this nation.’² These themes were reiterated in Cromwell’s speech at the commencement of the second session of the Second Protectorate Parliament, delivered at Whitehall on 25 January 1658. Cromwell reasserted his concerns over Spain by once again invoking Elizabeth—‘you know that your enemies be the same that have been accounted your enemies ever since Queen Elizabeth came to the crown’—before referring to the situation in the Dutch Republic: ‘the Dutch needed Queen Elizabeth of famous memory for their protection. They had it.’³ Cromwell had spoken vehemently against monarchy just nine months earlier, when he refused the crown, but one monarch—Elizabeth—seemed to hold a special place in his mind. His words suggest genuine affection, or at least admiration, but by telling his audience that ‘we need not be ashamed’ of Elizabeth’s ‘famous memory’, he perhaps recognised that some MPs would be uneasy about this commemoration. Whatever Cromwell’s views on republicanism, ‘Queen Elizabeth of famous memory’ was clearly both a touchstone for rallying against the expansionist Spanish, and a historical ideal of parliamentary and religious reformation.

¹ *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume IV, The Protectorate, 1655–1658*, ed. by Wilbur Cortez Abbott (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 262.

² *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume IV*, p. 262.

³ *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume IV*, p. 715. Elizabeth’s support for the Dutch was also remembered by the Swedish ambassadors in London. On 8 February 1656, Christer Bonde wrote to Queen Christina of his concerns that the Dutch would out-manoeuvre Swedish plans for a trade deal because the Dutch made clear their belief that ‘Queen Elizabeth [had] raised them up as a counter-balance against the power of Spain, and that for that reason it is in the interest of England that they should be supported.’ *Swedish Diplomats at Cromwell’s Court, 1655–1656: The Missions of Peter Julius Coyet and Christer Bonde*, ed. and trans. by Michael Roberts (London: Royal Historical Society, 1988), p. 252.

During the Commonwealth, Royalists and Parliamentarians alike invoked Elizabeth's memory—despite the abolition of monarchy in this period. In addition to Cromwell himself, a number of writers, commentators, and pamphleteers used the life and reign of Elizabeth as a potent tool of didactic and polemical counsel. This chapter analyses Elizabeth analogies during England's post-Regicide Commonwealth, showing that Elizabeth's memory was inserted into ongoing religio-political debates and offered as an example to be emulated. A range of commentators used Elizabeth analogies to counsel both parliamentary leaders and the Cromwells on how they should rule. During the Protectorate, much of this counsel criticised the Lords Protector for their generally poor relationship with parliament, and exhorted them to rule in a way that was acceptable to God. As this chapter demonstrates, Deborah—who was a judge, not a monarch—was a key typological figure for writers during the Commonwealth, and analogies that compared Deborah and Elizabeth sat alongside ones that depicted Oliver Cromwell as a new Moses, and Richard Cromwell as a new Joshua.⁴ Finally, this chapter analyses how the succession between Oliver and Richard was understood through Old Testament analogies, arguing that such conceptions of the succession recalled analogies that had been drawn between Elizabeth and James in 1603, meaning that such analogies were an important iconographic tool that afforded legitimacy to a new, non-monarchical ruler.

The invocation of biblical analogies during this period emphasises how the Civil War truly was the last of the European wars of religion: disagreements over religion continued into the Protectorate (perhaps best exemplified in the rule of the Major-Generals), and these disagreements provided fertile ground for Elizabeth's memory to be invoked at various religio-political junctures, including at the establishment of the Protectorate in 1653, the offering of the crown to Oliver in 1657, and Oliver's death and Richard's succession in 1658.⁵

⁴ John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 99. For instance, in a panegyric for Richard's accession, William Kaye declared, 'God takes care to set up the Magistrate, not suffering any vacancy, whereby as Moses falls a sleep, he proclaimeth arise Joshua, so ought all the people to see God in the same power, and thankfully acquiesce in submitting accordingly. Which that in reference to his Highness Richard Lord Protector, this may in some good measure be truly discovered, let us in God's Name take notice'. Likewise, in a satire published after Richard's resignation as Lord Protector, 'Richard' claimed, 'That whereas, after the Addresses of many thousands of these actions, faithfully promising to establish me on my Fathers usurped Seat, and protesting before God to live and die for me, whom they stiled their Joshua, appointed by God to compleat that happinesse to the Saints which was begun by my Father, whom they called Moses, that had brought them out of Aegypt and the Wildernesse unto the borders of Canaan ... were guilty of such insolent and contrary proceedings as to turn me out of my place before I was well warm.' William Kaye, *God's Gracious Presence with His Highness Richard Lord Protector of Great Brittain and Ireland* (London, 1658; Wing K36), p. 2; *The Humble Petition of Richard Cromwell, late Lord Protector of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to the Councel of Officers at Walingford House* (London, 1659; Wing H3480), p. 1.

⁵ John Morrill, 'The Religious Context of the English Civil War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 34 (1984), p. 178. See also: D. Alan Orr, 'Sovereignty, Supremacy and the Origins of the English Civil War', *History*, 87.288 (2002), pp. 474–490; and Charles W.A. Prior, 'England's Wars of Religion: A Reassessment', in *The*

Elizabeth analogies, much like the ‘Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory’ epithet, were a rhetorical device that appealed to the dead Queen’s legacy to provide counsel and to warn, while at the same time invoking the explicitly providential lens through which Elizabeth’s life and reign was viewed. Not all of the counsel contained within an Elizabeth analogy invoked during the Commonwealth was as direct or explicit as it had been under James and Charles, but writers of varying confessional identities and political persuasions understood the utility of Elizabeth’s life as a tool of counsel and critique, employing it to further their own agendas.

One of the key arguments of this chapter is that the concept (or doctrine) of providence was central to the religio-political context of the Commonwealth, with providentialism pervading virtually all aspects of English life and politics. As the pamphlets analysed in this chapter show, claims by scholars such as Kevin Sharpe that the concept of providence ‘lost its edge’ during the Commonwealth are difficult to sustain.⁶ Indeed, that providence was at the heart of the Protectorate is made clear in the proclamations issued at Richard’s accession as Lord Protector in September 1658. Despite the minor differences between the various copies of the text, all versions of the proclamation emphasise that ‘it hath pleased ... God in his Providence to take out of this world the most serene and renowned Oliver late Lord Protector’, before concluding by ‘beseeching the Lord, by whom Princes rule, to bless him [Richard] with longe life and those Nations with Peace and Happiness under his Government.’⁷ The reference to providence here is deliberate: the accession proclamations for James VI & I and Charles I, which Richard’s was modelled on, do not mention providence at all.⁸ Instead, providence and providentialism, as Blair Worden has suggested, remained a ‘major force in English life and English politics’ during the Commonwealth years.⁹

As many scholars have noted, the Old Testament was a powerful political tool during the Civil War and Commonwealth, and Parliamentarians in particular turned to its narratives

European Wars of Religion: An Interdisciplinary Reassessment of Sources, Interpretations, and Myths, ed. by Wolfgang Palaver, Harriet Rudolph, and Dietmar Regensburger (Farnham: Ashgate, 2016), pp. 119–138.

⁶ Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 196. Sharpe claims to be quoting Worden, but Worden openly hedges: whereas Sharpe says ‘the doctrine of providence, as Blair Worden put it, “lost its edge” during the 1650s’, Worden actually says ‘Possibly the doctrine of providence—like much else in Puritanism—lost a little of its edge during the 1650s, at least among younger men. But if so, erosion was to be a very long and very unsteady process. At its period of widest influence, from about 1620 to 1660, Puritan providentialism was a major force in English life and English politics’. Blair Worden, ‘Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England’, *Past and Present*, 109 (1985), pp. 55–99. The passage has been removed in its revised form in *God’s Instruments*, although the message is still implicit.

⁷ BL Add MS 4159, fol. 71r. The printed copy for Scotland is: *By His Highnes Council in Scotland, for the government thereof* (Edinburgh, 1658; Wing S1019H).

⁸ James’s proclamation concluded by ‘Beseeching God to blesse his Majestie and his Royall posteritie with long and happy yeeres to raigne over us’ (TNA SP 14/187, fol. 6r), and Charles’s similarly concluded by ‘Beseeching God, by whom Kings doe Reigne, to blesse the Royall King Charles, with long and happy yeeres to Reigne over us’ (BL Add MS 34217, fol. 50r).

⁹ Worden, ‘Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England’, p. 98.

both to explain what they had been through, and to conceptualise how to move forward. As John Coffey has convincingly argued, the Civil War was compared with the Exodus, and Parliamentarians were believed to be ‘treading in the footsteps of the Hebrews’, with the result that England was ‘delivered from Egyptian bondage—both ecclesiastical and civil’.¹⁰ Furthermore, Blair Worden has shown how ‘Oliver Cromwell knew that God had a special and surpassing purpose in the civil wars’, with God’s plan for the English being as important as the preservation of the Jews, because, like their Hebrew antecedents, the English ‘had passed out of an Egypt (the captivity of the Church under Archbishop Laud), through a Red Sea (of civil-war blood), towards a promised land.’¹¹ Indeed, Cromwell himself, in his first speech at the opening of the First Protectorate Parliament in September 1654, declared that the Exodus was the ‘only parallel’ for the parliamentarians’ victory in the Civil War.¹² He was not, however, the only person to draw such parallels, and in the aftermath of the Regicide, numerous publications drew on the Exodus theme and depicted Oliver as a contemporary Moses. In 1651, in the wake of Cromwell’s defeat of the Scots at Dunbar, John Fenwicke called Cromwell ‘Englands Moses’, and claimed that the victory was ‘hardly to be paralleled since these warrs begun: as like unto that famous deliverance of his People at the Red Sea of old under Moses’.¹³ In 1652, a *Levellers Remonstrance* dedicated to Cromwell claimed that ‘God hath honored you with the highest Honor of any man since Moses time, to be the Head of a people, who have cast out an Oppressing Pharaoh’.¹⁴ In 1653, John Spittlehouse, a Fifth Monarchist, published an entire pamphlet that compared ‘Our present General’ with ‘Moses,

¹⁰ John Coffey, *Exodus and Liberation: Deliverance Politics from John Calvin to Martin Luther King Jr.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 42, 26. See also: John Morrill, ‘A Liberation Theology? Aspects of Puritanism in the English Revolution’, in *Puritanism and Its Discontents*, ed. by Laura Lunger Knoppers (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003), pp. 27–48; John Coffey, ‘Religion’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, ed. by Laura Lunger Knoppers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 98–117; Matthew Neufeld, ‘Doing without Precedent: Applied Typology and the Execution of Charles I in Milton’s *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 38.2 (2007), pp. 329–344; and Matthew P. Rowley, ‘Godly Violence: Military Providentialism in the Puritan Atlantic World, 1636–1676’ (PhD thesis, University of Leicester, 2018).

¹¹ Blair Worden, *God’s Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 13. See also: Achsah Guibbory, ‘England’s “Biblical” Prophets, 1642–60’, in *Writing and Religion in England, 1558–1689: Studies in Community-Making and Cultural Memory*, ed. by Roger D. Sell and Anthony W. Johnson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 305–325; Kathleen Lynch, ‘Conversion Narratives in Old and New England’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, ed. by Laura Lunger Knoppers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 425–441; and Charles W.A. Prior, ‘Hebraism and the Problem of Church and State in England, 1642–1660’, *The Seventeenth Century*, 28.1 (2013), pp. 37–61.

¹² *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume III, The Protectorate, 1653–1655*, ed. by Wilbur Cortez Abbott (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1945), pp. 434–435.

¹³ John Fenwicke, *England’s Deliverer: The Lord of Hosts Her Strong God, none like to Him* (Newcastle, 1651; Wing F721), sig. A2r, p. 5.

¹⁴ *The Levellers Remonstrance, sent in a letter to his excellency the Lord Gen: Cromwel: concerning the government of this commonwealth, his wearing of the crown of honour, and preservation of the lawes, liberties, and priviledges thereof* (London, 1652; Wing L2136A), p. 3.

as he was their Deliverer, Judge, and General'.¹⁵ 'E.M.', writing in 1654, claimed that 'the Lord made him a Moses to us in many respects', and that Cromwell was sent as 'A Moses to guide and lead us, through a dangerous wilderness of war, wo, and wretchednesse'.¹⁶ Typologies, like the concept of Moses delivering God's people from captivity, were bound up with such explicit meaning that writers often did not need to go further than merely drawing the connection: readers were immediately aware of the point being made because, as Kevin Killeen has observed, 'The Bible functioned as political language because of its ubiquity, its presence in every crevice of thought, across the political nation.'¹⁷

As the examples analysed in this chapter show, Elizabeth analogies of the 1650s were also a product of changing views of the past and on the writing of history brought about by the Civil War. With the abolition of the Court of Star Chamber in 1641, and the burgeoning use by both Parliamentarians and Royalists of print-based propaganda to support their respective causes, commentators not only produced far more historical writing in the 1640s and 1650s than had ever been published previously, but also paid more attention to the (very) recent past—an area that had typically been avoided in historical discourse.¹⁸ As Daniel Woolf has observed, this shift 'gradually redirected public attention to the past as *cause* of the present rather than merely [a] *mirror* on the present'. It also meant that 'the distribution of viewpoints—parliamentarian, royalist, republican, Presbyterian, independent—became much wider as historians debated responsibility for the current predicament.'¹⁹ The use of history in the Commonwealth has not, to date, been a major focus of scholarly interest—analysis

¹⁵ John Spittlehouse, *A warning-piece discharged: or, Certain intelligence communicated to His Excellencie the Lord General Cromwel, with all the real and cordial officers and souldiers under his command* (London, 1653; Wing S5016), sig. A1r. Thomason's copy is dated 19 May 1653.

¹⁶ E.M., *Protection Perswading Subjection: Or A word of peace to the well-affected* (London, 1654; Wing M20), pp. 15, 17–18. This Moses analogy bears striking similarity to its invocations in Sweden for Gustav I. As discussed in the Introduction, both men had led their people out of bondage—in Gustav's case, the bondage of Rome, and in Cromwell's case, the bondage of a tyrannical monarch and monarchy.

¹⁷ Kevin Killeen, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 7–8. Similarly, as Coffey has shown, 'The [Exodus] story was so familiar that there was not need for a detailed rehearsal—a simple allusion to Egypt, Pharaoh, the Red Sea, the Wilderness, or the Land of Canaan conjured up a vivid scene from this most familiar of biblical epics. Although few preachers developed the Exodus analogy at length, it was cited so insistently that the godly developed a sustained sense of reenacting sacred history'. Coffey, *Exodus and Liberation*, p. 42.

¹⁸ See: David R. Como, 'Print, Censorship, and Ideological Escalation in the English Civil War', *Journal of British Studies*, 51.4 (2012), pp. 820–857; Joad Raymond, 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century', *Prose Studies*, 21.2 (1998), pp. 109–136; Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 196–197; Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 644–654, 680–683; and Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), pp. 334–338.

¹⁹ Daniel Woolf, 'Historical Writing in Britain from the Late Middle Ages to the Eve of Enlightenment', in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Volume 3, 1400–1800*, ed. by José Rabasa, Masayuki Sato, Edoardo Tortarolo, and Daniel Woolf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 482. See also: Daniel R. Woolf, 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500–1700', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1–2 (2005), pp. 33–70.

generally either ends in 1649, begins in 1660, or largely ignores the 1650s.²⁰ But, as I argue, the use of Elizabeth analogies during this period shows that shifts in the way the past was conceived of, which began in the 1640s, continued into the Commonwealth, with the reign of Elizabeth used as a propaganda-like tool by both Royalists and Parliamentarians to support their preferred political settlement.²¹

More than any other period covered in this thesis, the gendered implications of Elizabeth analogies invoked in the Commonwealth are worth considering. As argued in the Introduction gender was not structurally determinative for Elizabeth analogies, with writers making use of the doctrine of the king's two bodies to make sense of female kingship, which meant that both male and female Old Testament figures were employed as typologies for Elizabeth. It was, therefore, the thrust or purpose of the typology that was central to its use. This means that when a writer wished to praise a monarch's divinely granted wisdom, for example, he employed an analogy with Solomon, irrespective of the sex of the monarch. It should therefore come as no surprise that, like Henry VIII, who was compared to Judith by Henry Parker in the 1530s,²² Oliver Cromwell was, on at least two occasions, compared to Deborah. These analogies with Deborah suggest that the non-monarchical judge of the Old Testament was a powerful type in the Commonwealth—irrespective of gender. In 1651, William Barton, an Independent and one of the period's foremost hymn-writers, published *Hallelujah, Or Certain Hymns, Composed out of Scripture, to celebrate some special and Publick Occasions*.²³ Several of the hymns provided a choice of words that could be substituted within a particular line of a verse. The third hymn, which 'Celebrates Nazeby [sic], and other great Victories of the Church', contained the most options. One of the sentences reads:

Parliament,	Barak
Awake awake, O { Deborah, {}	rise { Conqu'rors } sing a Song. ²⁴
	Fairfax
	Cromwel,

²⁰ These divisions are evident in, for instance: Matthew Neufeld, *The Civil Wars After 1660: Public Remembering in Late Stuart England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013); Erin Peters, *Commemoration and Oblivion in Royalist Print Culture, 1658–1667* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017); Gary Rivett, 'Peacemaking, Parliament, and the Politics of the Recent Past in the English Civil Wars', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76.4 (2013), pp. 589–615; and David Cressy, 'Remembrancers of the Revolution: Histories and Historiographies of the 1640s', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1–2 (2005), pp. 257–268.

²¹ See: Felicity Heal, 'Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Past', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1–2 (2005), pp. 109–132; and Ian W. Archer, 'Discourses of History in Elizabethan and Early Stuart London', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1–2 (2005), pp. 205–226.

²² See: Introduction, p. 39.

²³ See: Edwin Welch, 'William Barton, Hymnwriter', *The Guildhall Miscellany*, 3 (1971), pp. 235–241; and John Coffey, 'Between Puritanism and Evangelicalism: "Heart-work" in Dissenting Communion Hymns, 1693–1709, in *Heart Religion: Evangelical Piety in England and Ireland, 1690–1850*, ed. by John Coffey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), esp. p. 36.

²⁴ William Barton, *Hallelujah, Or Certain Hymns, Composed out of Scripture, to celebrate some special and Publick Occasions* (London, 1651; Wing B1002), pp. 12–13.

This means that congregations could have sung the line ‘Awake awake, O Deborah, rise Cromwel, sing a Song’—a rephrasing of Judges 5:12. By composing the hymn with these options, Barton demonstrated the belief that Cromwell, as well as Sir Thomas Fairfax, was a contemporary Deborah, with his victory at Naseby equivalent to Deborah’s victory over the Canaanites.²⁵ Cromwell was not mentioned when the hymn was first published in 1645, which suggests that Barton made a deliberate decision to include Cromwell and allow him to be linked with Deborah when revising the hymn.²⁶

Similarly, in 1653, the Baptist preacher and pamphleteer Samuel Richardson declared:

the Lord [hath] raised up and was with, so as to make a chief instrument in delivering his people from their enemies; the Lord made that man their judge and counsellor, so was Gideon and Debora, &c. the Lord hath raised up Oliver Cromwell, and hath been wonderful with him, and made him a chief instrument in delivering us from our enemies in England, Scotland and Ireland, and God hath set him up and made him chief Governour over these three Nations; therefore he is a Judge and Counsellor as at the first, and is a fulfilling of that promise.²⁷

Cromwell was thus England’s ‘Judge and Counsellor’, just as Gideon and Deborah were for the Hebrews.²⁸ That Cromwell could be linked to both Gideon and Deborah suggests that gender was a secondary concern to the typology being employed: in the same way that both male and female monarchs could use the Solomon *typos*, Deborah was an antecedent of both Elizabeth and Cromwell, allowing both figures to exercise divinely ordained authority in matters religious and political.

Elizabeth analogies of the 1650s are also evidence of the contested ways in which power and authority were conceived during England’s first republic. This chapter shows how the invocation of Elizabeth’s memory demonstrates a continuation with England’s monarchical past. As numerous scholars have argued, the Protectorate adopted many of the trappings of monarchy to legitimise and perpetuate its claim to authority.²⁹ While Laura

²⁵ The link in the hymn here between parliament and Deborah seems to be further evidence that in the monarchless Commonwealth, Deborah the Judge was a particularly useful typology.

²⁶ William Barton, *The Choice and Flower of the Old Psalms* (London, 1645; Wing B1000A), sig. A4v.

²⁷ Samuel Richardson, *Plain Dealing: Or the unvailing of the opposers of the present government and governors* (London, 1653; Wing R1412), p. 10.

²⁸ Gideon seems to have been a useful type for Cromwell, especially in the early years of the Commonwealth. In her *Cry of a Stone* (1654), Anna Trapnel, a Fifth Monarchist, claimed that ‘God had raised up’ Cromwell as ‘a Gideon’, and asserted that he was like ‘Gideon, going before Israel, blowing the trumpet of courage and valour, the rest with him sounding forth their Courage also; that as sure as the Enemy fell when Gideon and his Army blew their trumpets, so surely should the Scots throughout Scotland be ruined’. Anna Trapnel, *The Cry of a Stone* (London, 1654; Wing T2031), p. 6.

²⁹ See: Andrew Barclay, ‘The Lord Protector and his Court’, in *Oliver Cromwell: New Perspectives*, ed. by Patrick Little (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 195–215; Janet Clare, *Drama of the English Republic, 1649–60* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 181–191; Jonathan Fitzgibbons, *Cromwell’s House of Lords: Politics, Parliaments and Constitutional Revolution, 1642–1660* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2018), esp. pp. 3–4; Patrick Little, ‘Music at the Court of King Oliver’, *The Court Historian*, 12.2 (2007), pp. 173–191; Patrick Little, ‘Uncovering a Protectoral Stud: Horses and Horse-breeding at the Court of Oliver Cromwell, 1653–8’, *Historical*

Lunger Knoppers rightly cautions against reading deliberate similarities into what were essentially stop-gap measures to keep up day-to-day governance, the debates in parliament and in print that raged during the Protectorate emphasise that Cromwell could not escape, or even obscure, England's monarchical past.³⁰ As the offer of the crown to Cromwell in 1657 in the Humble Petition and Advice shows, many people viewed monarchy as a stabilising force, and believed that a return to monarchy would provide a definitive settlement to the conflict wrought by the Civil War. This turbulent religio-political context provided writers of differing political and confessional identities with a key opportunity to invoke the legacy of England's Deborah, with Elizabeth analogies used both to explain what the country had been through, and to conceptualise how to move forward.³¹

Elizabeth Analogies in the Early Years of the Commonwealth

The Regicide swept away long-held notions that the monarch was semi-divine and ordained by God and, conversely, that tyrants were imposed by God as punishment for sin and thus were to be endured and not resisted. Many writers, including Milton, therefore had to make sense of a world that was completely unfamiliar, without actually admitting that anything revolutionary had happened.³² This shift can be seen in the way that the typological view of the world changed: Charles was not a Saul, who was chosen by God and had to be endured,

Research, 82. 216 (2009), pp. 252–267; Patrick Little, 'Fashion at the Cromwellian Court', *The Court Historian*, 16.1 (2011), pp. 25–42; Sharpe, *Image Wars*, pp. 463–537; Roy Sherwood, *The Court of Oliver Cromwell* (Cambridge: Willingham Press, 1977); Roy Sherwood, *Oliver Cromwell: King In All But Name, 1653–1658* (Stroud: Sutton, 1997); and Simon Thurley, 'The Stuart Kings, Oliver Cromwell and the Chapel Royal 1618–1685', *Architectural History*, 45 (2001), pp. 238–274. See also: Edward Holberton, "'Soe Honny from the Lyon came": The 1657 Wedding-Masques for the Protector's Daughters', *The Seventeenth Century*, 20.1 (2005): 97–112; Bernard S. Capp, *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649–1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 14; Amy Calladine, 'Public Ritual and the Proclamation of Richard Cromwell as Lord Protector in English Towns, September 1658', *The Historical Journal*, 61.1 (2018), pp. 53–76; and Benjamin Woodford, *Perceptions of a Monarchy Without a King: Reactions to Oliver Cromwell's Power* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2013).

³⁰ Fitzgibbons, *Cromwell's House of Lords*, p. 4; Sean Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic: The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649–1653* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), pp. 168–170; Laura Lunger Knoppers, 'The Politics of Portraiture: Oliver Cromwell and the Plain Style', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 51.4 (1998), pp. 1283–1319; and Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645–1661* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

³¹ For instance, Joan Faust argues that Marvell used the masque performed for Lady Mary Cromwell's wedding 'as a nod to the "golden" age of Elizabeth and [as] criticism of the present age'; and John Watkins has described how the 'characterization of Elizabeth's administration as a kind of commonwealth allowed Cromwell to use it as a positive examples without compromising his own regime.' Joan Faust, "'Sounding to Present Occasions": Andrew Marvell's "Two Songs at the Marriage of the Lord Fauconberg and the Lady Mary Cromwell"', *Marvell Studies*, 3.2 (2018), pp. 1–28; Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England*, p. 99.

³² See: Neufeld, 'Doing without Precedent', p. 334. In his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, Milton explained: 'Saint Paul in the forecited Chapter [Romans 13:3–4] tells us that such Magistrates hee meanes, as are, not a terror to the good but to the evill, such as beare not the sword in vaine, but to punish offenders, and to encourage the good. If such onely be mentiond here as powers to be obeyd, and our submission to them onely requird, then doubtless those powers that doe the contrary, are no powers ordaind of God, and by consequence no obligation laid upon us to obey or not to resist them.' John Milton, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (London, 1649; Wing M2181), p. 16.

but was instead a Pharaoh, who could be resisted and overthrown. This changing view is why Donald Dickson cautions against reducing typology to a straightforward ‘game’ of equivalences: the idea that ‘all one had to do was simply match types with their corresponding antitypes’ is inaccurate and anachronistic.³³ In this period of profound religio-political turmoil, Elizabeth was remembered and commemorated, with her reign viewed as both a beacon of stability and an example to be emulated. This overly positive view of Elizabeth and her reign emphasises how, during the Commonwealth, writers compared the last Tudor monarch to the Lord Protector to obfuscate the fact that England was in completely unfamiliar religio-political territory, just as the comparisons drawn between Elizabeth and James in 1603 displayed a continuity that was not actually there.

Elizabeth’s reign was included in the second part of Samuel Clarke’s *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie*, published in late 1650. The pamphlet contained ‘The lives of many Eminent Christians’, with Elizabeth included as one of the ‘Christian Emperors, Kings, and Sovereign Princes’. In an attempt to counsel the Council of State, the puritan-leaning Clarke described the last Tudor monarch as a Deborah, and compared her actions to Daniel and David. Given Elizabeth’s dislike of puritanism, there is something ironic about her image and memory being co-opted and reused so enthusiastically by puritans in the seventeenth century. Of course, ‘puritanism’ is a general descriptor rather than a precise label, but it is significant that Elizabeth’s memory was able to be adapted for use by various strands of the godly. Clarke himself seems to embody some of these potentially conflicting elements. He held puritan and non-conformist beliefs: in the 1620s, he was reprimanded by the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield for nonconformity, and he co-authored a tract defending presbyterianism, claiming it was the system of church government sanctioned by God, which was reprinted several times throughout the 1650s. He was, however, also a loyalist: he signed a protest against the Regicide on 20 January 1649, and in 1666, he swore the required oath prescribed by the Five Mile Act against resistance to monarchy.³⁴ Like other puritans, who have been described by Patrick Collinson as non-separating non-conforming Congregationalists, Clarke also regarded the Church of England as the true church: ‘I durst not separate from the Church of England, nor was satisfied about gathering a private church out of a true Church, as I judge the Church of England to be.’³⁵ Implicit, therefore, in Clarke’s writings is a support for, or at least an

³³ Donald R. Dickson, ‘The Complexities of Biblical Typology in the Seventeenth Century’, *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, 11.3 (1987), p. 253.

³⁴ Ann Hughes, ‘Clarke, Samuel (1599-1682)’, *ODNB*.

³⁵ Samuel Clarke, *The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons in this Later Age* (London, 1683; Wing C4538), p. 11; Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (1967; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 372–373, 380. These non-separating non-conformists were generally concerned with specific doctrinal or interpretive issues (such as

acknowledgement of the role of, monarchy.

The events of 1649 seem to have been the catalyst for Clarke publishing the work. The first part of *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie* was published in early 1650—Thomason's copy is annotated '[Jan[uary] 31 1649]'. The second part, which features Elizabeth, was published later the same year. Clarke's epistle to the dedicatee, Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick, was dated 15 July 1650, and Thomason's copy of the pamphlet is dated 1 September 1650. These dates indicate that the pamphlet was printed during attempts by Scottish Covenanters to have Charles II restored to the throne. Indeed, Cromwell and Parliamentarian forces would defeat the Covenanters at the Battle of Dunbar on 3 September (a victory Cromwell described as 'one of the most signal mercies God hath done for England and His people').³⁶ The conflict between the Covenanters and the Parliamentarians seems to have provided Clarke with an opportunity to publish the second part of *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie*, which, in addition to Elizabeth, praised other Protestant hero-monarchs including Edward VI and Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, as well as figures like Jane Grey and Philip Sidney.

Clarke's life of Elizabeth is by some way the longest biography in the volume. The first analogy it contains is a reference to Daniel's preservation from the lions' den. The reference largely reproduces the published account of the prayer Elizabeth offered at her coronation:

shee made a solemne thankesgiving to God, who had delivered her no lesse mercifully, and mightily, from her imprisonment in that place, then Daniel from the Lions Den: that had delivered her from those dangers wherewith she was environed, and overwhelmed, to bring her to the joy and honour of that day.³⁷

It is worth comparing Clarke's retelling with the original account of Elizabeth's prayer, which I analysed in Chapter 2:

O Lord, almighty and everlasting God, I geve thee most hearty thanks, that thou hast beene so mercifull unto me, as to spare me to behold this joyful day. And I acknowledge, that thou hast dealt as wonderfully, and as mercifully with me, as thou didst with thy true and faythful servant Daniel thy Prophet, who thou deliveredst out of the denne from the cruelty of the greedy and raging Lyons: even so was I overwhelmed, and onely by thee delivered.³⁸

Clarke kept the essence of the prayer, but made the connection between God saving both

vestments), and tended to focus on repudiating unacceptable social norms (such as the theatre). See also: Peter Lake, 'William Bradshaw, Antichrist and the Community of the Godly', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 36.4 (1985), pp. 570–589.

³⁶ *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume II, The Commonwealth, 1649-1653*, ed. by Wilbur Cortez Abbott (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939), p. 324. In the same letter, Cromwell claimed that the victory 'was a high act of the Lord's Providence to us' (p. 321).

³⁷ Samuel Clarke, *The Second Part of the Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie* (London, 1650; Wing C4556), p. 191.

³⁸ [Richard Mulcaster], *The Quenes Majesties Passage through the Citie of London to Westminster the Day before her Coronacion* (London, 1558/9; STC 7589.5), sigs. E4r–E4v.

Daniel and Elizabeth more overt: while Elizabeth claimed that she had been treated ‘mercifully’ like Daniel, Clarke has Elizabeth claim she was delivered ‘no lesse mercifully’ than Daniel. The subtle distinction places Elizabeth on an equal footing with Daniel. Up until this point in the biography, Clarke had largely focused on Elizabeth’s poor treatment under Mary I; indeed, he began the biography by lamenting that ‘under the reign of her sister Queen Mary, she met with so many afflictions, that she well deserved the title of Elizabeth the Confessor’.³⁹ So while he was, in essence, repeating the Foxean narrative (Clarke claims that some of his information was ‘Collected out of the Book of Martyrs’), the analogy served to remind his readers of Elizabeth’s providential protection, and in doing so, reinforced the applicability of the past in the present. It is also possible to read a critique of Charles’s treatment by Cromwell and the Parliamentarians here, with Clarke inviting his readers to link Elizabeth’s performative preparation of martyrdom with the image of Charles the Martyr that *Eikon Basilike* perpetuated and encouraged.⁴⁰

Biblical analogy returned in Clarke’s treatment of the Spanish Armada. This section is highly technical—Clarke goes into considerable detail describing the ships and artillery in both the English and Spanish navies—and also discusses the various commanders Elizabeth had appointed. His treatment of Elizabeth’s role, however, involves an application of the English Deborah type:

Our Queene besides her Navy, prepared a land Army under the Earle of Leicester Lieuetenant Generall, which met at Tilbury in Essex, consisting of twenty two thousand foot [soldiers], and one thousand five hundred Horse: her selfe like another Deborah, was Generall of the Army ... [and] in briefe, God fighting from heaven by the winds against them, and prospering the English in their little nimble shippes, this Invincible Armado was so shattered, torne, dispersed.⁴¹

Like Deborah, Elizabeth attended the battle (or got as near as she could) and oversaw the preparations of her captain (the Old Testament does not have lieutenant-generals). Just as God had helped the Israelites in their battle against the Canaanites, He was on the side of the English and ensured they were victorious. Clarke has here stretched the truth of Elizabeth’s activities at Tilbury somewhat: while the armour-clad Elizabeth of modern film and television adaptations does not make an appearance here, Elizabeth only arrived at Tilbury on 8 August 1588, and reviewed the troops (of which there were probably only 4,000, rather than the 22,000 Clarke claimed) the next day—she had little to do with the practical preparations of the

³⁹ Clarke, *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie*, p. 176.

⁴⁰ See: Elizabeth P. Skerpan, ‘Rhetorical Genres and the *Eikon Basilike*’, *Explorations in Renaissance Culture*, 11 (1985), pp. 99–111; Andrew Lacey, ‘Texts To Be Read: Charles I and the *Eikon Basilike*’, *Prose Studies*, 29.1 (2007), pp. 4–18; and Richard Helgerson, ‘Milton Reads the King’s Book: Print, Performance, and the Making of a Bourgeois Idol’, *Criticism*, 29.1 (1987), pp. 1–25.

⁴¹ Clarke, *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie*, pp. 212–213.

English forces. This line, however, seems to refer to the most-cited version of the Tilbury speech, in which Elizabeth declared that she would be ‘general, judge, and rewarder of every one of your virtues in the field’.⁴² To Clarke’s mind, Elizabeth was a Deborah, and thus a judge, and was also the ‘Generall of the Army’ and the ‘rewarder’ of her troops—even though many soldiers remained unpaid for years after battle. Given the themes he touched on, the (attempted) invasion of the Spanish Armada was a key opportunity for Clarke to invoke a biblical analogy.

The other biblical reference in Clarke’s biography cast Elizabeth as a contemporary David. As he summarised the life of the last Tudor monarch, Clarke wrote that ‘She had warriers [sic] like to the worthies of David’.⁴³ Clarke is here referring to ‘the mighty men whom David had’—2 Samuel 23:8–39 names thirty-seven men who served David as military officers (and were known for their bravery and skill), and whom he wished to remember on his deathbed.⁴⁴ Elizabeth is thus like David in that she had been blessed by God to be surrounded by able and mighty commanders who could lead her troops into battle on her behalf, and to help defend England. Clarke here reiterates Elizabeth’s militant defence of England’s Protestantism—David is largely remembered for his various military victories—and again demonstrates how the Bible provided historical precedent for contemporary events.

The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie thus made use of three interwoven Elizabeth analogies: Clarke reworked Elizabeth’s own prayer at her coronation procession to demonstrate that God had preserved her just as He had preserved Daniel; he claimed she was a contemporary Deborah, demonstrated in her actions at Tilbury during the height of the Spanish Armada; and he suggested that God had blessed her to be a David, insofar as he had given her worthy warriors who would command her armies for her and defend England’s Protestantism. That Clarke invoked three separate Elizabeth analogies suggests that these typologies were central to the way that Clarke remembered Elizabeth, and were a key device for understanding her reign. In the year after the Regicide, while the Wars of the Three Kingdoms continued to rage around him, Clarke looked back on Elizabeth’s life and reign as an example that should be emulated, and as a reminder of the providential favour the country could once again receive if its ruler emulated England’s Deborah.

The providential favour that Clarke believed England had received both under Elizabeth, and because of its Protestantism, was a recurring theme throughout the Commonwealth, and became especially pronounced in the Protectorate. In his speech

⁴² *Collected Works*, p. 326.

⁴³ Clarke, *The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie*, p. 217.

⁴⁴ See: Nadav Na’aman, ‘The List of David’s Officers’, *Vetus Testamentum*, 38.1 (1988), pp. 71–79.

delivered on 4 September 1654 at the commencement of the First Protectorate Parliament, Cromwell was very clear about what he saw as the role ‘the providence of God’ had played in the events that had led England to its current position. He made clear that MPs should be under no illusions concerning the providential favour England had received, telling them that ‘the only parallel of God’s dealing with that I know in the world ... [is] Israel’s bringing out of Egypt through a wilderness, by many signs and wonder towards a place of rest’.⁴⁵ For the Lord Protector, now that England was through this ‘wilderness’, it was time for the nation to engage in a period of ‘healing and settling’. This ‘healing and settling’ would be achieved, according to Cromwell, through the true worship of God—both at home, and abroad.⁴⁶ For many, including Cromwell, Elizabeth provided an example of true worship, and commentators employed England’s Deborah as a tool of counsel, and to exhort their readers to emulate the ‘justice and righteousness’ of Elizabethan England.⁴⁷

The English Deborah and the Protectorate

As the Anglo-Spanish War raged on, and the political settlement of the Commonwealth continued to be hotly debated and contested (especially concerning the rule of the Major-Generals), writers invoked Elizabeth analogies in order to counsel Cromwell on how to be ‘a ruler & a govenour over the people’ according to God’s will, with England’s Deborah serving as a key typological device in the monarchless Commonwealth.

Like his contemporaries, Thomas Violet understood the didactic power of Elizabeth analogies, including them in his *Proposals Humbly Presented to His Highness Oliver, Lord Protector of England* (1656) in order to critique Cromwell’s actions. Violet was a goldsmith who, after some scrapes with the law, turned ‘informer’, spent large sums of his own money tracking down and prosecuting people engaged in currency debasing and speculation. In late 1652, he began an investigation into the owners of the ships *Samson*, *Salvador*, and *George*, claiming they were illegally exporting silver.⁴⁸ Violet claimed to have borrowed £675 to pursue the case, and even though the owners of the vessels were successfully prosecuted in the Court of Admiralty, and the value of the recovered bullion was over £300,000, Violet did not recoup his outlay, and he

⁴⁵ *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume III*, pp. 434–435.

⁴⁶ Cromwell told MPs that ‘truly, I believe ... you have upon your shoulders the interest of all the Christian people in the world’. *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume III*, p. 434.

⁴⁷ *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume III*, p. 438.

⁴⁸ These actions may have been motivated by Violet’s anti-Semitism. Violet’s belief that Jews ‘taint and adulterate the blood of Christians’ is described in a letter he wrote to James Butler, Duke of Ormonde, on 10 August 1660. Bodleian Libraries, MS Carte 31, fol. 19. See also: Ariel Hessayon, “‘The Great Trappaner of England’: Thomas Violet, Jews and crypto-Jews during the English Revolution and at the Restoration”, in *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland*, ed. by Michael Braddick and David Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 210–230.

claimed that this was because Cromwell squandered the funds on the army.⁴⁹ This event seems to have prompted the publication of the *Proposals*: one of the long sub-titles requested ‘the calling to a true and just Accompt all ... Persons that have been entrusted with the Publick Revenue’.⁵⁰ Given that the parliament first met on 17 September, it is likely the petitions in the pamphlet were first presented around this time.⁵¹

The pamphlet and its petitions clearly had a personal *raison d’être*—the reason Violet believed that those persons ‘entrusted with the Publick Revenue’ needed to be held to ‘Accompt’ likely referred to the (apparent) mismanagement of the fines that prevented him from recouping his expenses. Violet, however, invoked the memory of Elizabeth to justify his grievances, and he made that invocation part of his strategy for counselling Cromwell. The pamphlet employs the example of England’s Deborah on the very first page of the dedicatory epistle:

Queen Elizabeth (that glorious Queen, and England’s Deborah) used to say, Give mee my People’s hearts, and wee shall not need to ask their purses: and this Maxime never deceived her. With what eas[e] shee got aids from the Nation in Parlament, the Records of her Reign shew: The chief point that made the People so free to grant in those daies, was, they knew by forty four years. experience, shee was sparing and frugal her self, and God blessed her with a wise and prudent Counsel.⁵²

Violet was keen to emphasise Elizabeth’s memory: there are more than thirty references to the Queen in the pamphlet, but the invocation of Deborah at the Queen’s first mention seems particularly significant, given that it focuses on Elizabeth the ‘fiscally prudent’, rather than Elizabeth the Protestant heroine. As with Thomas Adams’s invocation of Deborah in 1633, which was analysed in Chapter 3, Violet seems to be drawing on the idea of ‘Deborah with her estates, consulting for the good government of Israel’ from Elizabeth’s coronation procession. Such a reading is bolstered by the fact that Cromwell and his supporters saw the plight of the Israelites as analogous to that of England during the Civil War, with many of their grievances directed at the lack of ‘good government’ under Charles.⁵³ Likewise, the reference to ‘wise and prudent Counsel’ may hint that Violet thought Cromwell was either not listening to good counsel, or that he had not been ‘blessed’ with such counsel, preventing England (and the

⁴⁹ Anita McConnell, ‘Violet, Thomas (d. 1662/3)’, *ODNB*.

⁵⁰ The title page also called attention to the work he had done for the Commonwealth, with the account including ‘A Narrative of the Proceedings in the Court of Admiraltie against the Silver-Ships, Sampson, Salvador, and George.’ Thomas Violet, *Proposals Humbly Presented to His Highness Oliver, Lord Protector of England, &c. and to the High Court of Parliament now assembled* (London, 1656; Wing V585), sig. A1r.

⁵¹ Violet’s actions during this period, and his attempt to recoup his expenses, are discussed in: Amos Tubb, *Thomas Violet, A Sly and Dangerous Fellow: Silver and Spying in Civil War London* (Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield, 2018), pp. 100–102.

⁵² Violet, *Proposals Humbly Presented to His Highness*, sigs. B1r–B1v.

⁵³ Coffey, *Exodus and Liberation*, discusses the Exodus as typology on pp. 4–6.

Commonwealth) from experiencing ‘good government’.

Violet then described how ‘that glorious Queen got such [a] reputation, for good husbanding and prudent managing her Revenues’, and how, ‘after 44 years reign, this glorious Queen dyed, rich in Jewells, rich in Money and Plate’. This is a blatant misrepresentation of the historical reality, given that at Elizabeth’s death, the Crown was £400,000 in debt.⁵⁴ Violet’s point, however, is rhetorical; while he mentioned Elizabeth’s monetary riches, the more significant claim was that ‘above all, [she died] rich in the Love and Estimation of her Loyal People’. This seems to be the crux of the dedication: Cromwell was neglecting the people of England, and he should return to the example of England’s Deborah. Violet claimed, ‘My daily praier to God is, to keep us unanimous in this Nation of England, as wee and our Predecessors were in famous Queen Elizabeths daies’. He then counselled Cromwell directly: ‘your Highness acting Queen Elizabeth’s part, studying alwaies to enlarge your Self, to give these Nations all just and due Satisfaction’.⁵⁵ For Violet, Cromwell not only had to emulate the ‘glorious’ Elizabeth, who was England’s Deborah, but also rule more consultatively, because that was the will of God.

Violet also drew on the wise Solomon *typos* in his commemoration of Elizabeth. He reminded Cromwell that the Queen’s fame had extended ‘beyond Solomon’s, even to the farthest and greatest Monarchs in the world’, pointing out her relationships with the Ottoman Sultan and the Tsar of Russia, among others. Violet further claimed that ‘surely, (next to God’s gracious protection) her Safetie was built, as Solomon’s Throne was’—that is, like Solomon, Elizabeth had been chosen by God to succeed to the throne, and that she was preserved and protected by Him.⁵⁶ Elizabeth was thus like Solomon, in that she was providentially favoured. More importantly for Violet’s counsel to Cromwell, however, both Solomon and Elizabeth had listened to counsellors who gave ‘grave and prudent Counsel’, which meant ‘all Christendom esteemed England to have a glorious Prince, a wise Counsel of State, and the People happy in general’.⁵⁷ Violet’s use of Solomon here demonstrates the importance of biblical typologies in early modern England: Elizabeth was not merely wise, she was as wise, if not wiser, than the wisest man to have ever lived—but she also listened to

⁵⁴ By the end of James VI & I’s reign, Elizabeth’s frugality as a contrast to James the spendthrift was an entrenched trope that still has not entirely disappeared. See: Maurice Lee, Jr., ‘James I and the Historians: Not a Bad King after All?’, *Albion*, 16.2 (1984), pp. 151–163; and Julian Goodare, ‘The Debts of James VI of Scotland’, *The Economic History Review*, n.s., 62.4 (2009), pp. 926–952.

⁵⁵ Violet, *Proposals Humbly Presented to His Highness*, sigs. N1r, L2v.

⁵⁶ Violet, *Proposals Humbly Presented to His Highness*, sigs. B2v, C1v. Violet here seems to have conflated several Bible verses, especially 1 Kings 4:25 (‘And Judah and Israel dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his fig tree ... all the days of Solomon’) and 1 Chronicles 28:5 (‘He hath chosen Solomon my son to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the Lord over Israel’).

⁵⁷ Violet, *Proposals Humbly Presented to His Highness*, sig. C1v.

astute and prudent counsel, which ensured that her people flourished.

Violet's pamphlet may have gained an unexpected political relevance, given its reference to Elizabeth and England's Deborah. Without an entry in the Stationers' Register, and any notations on known surviving copies of the pamphlet, we cannot know when in 1656 the pamphlet was published.⁵⁸ It is worth noting, however, that on 23 February 1656/7, Cromwell was offered the crown by the Commons in the Humble Petition and Advice—an offer he did not reject until 8 May 1657. As contemporaries knew, and scholars have recognised, if Cromwell had accepted the Humble Petition and Advice as it was offered, it would have limited his powers—most significantly reasserting parliament's control over the levying of taxes, and a requirement that parliament meet at least every three years.⁵⁹ It seems that Violet thought that Cromwell—who had shown almost as much disdain for parliament as Charles I—could learn from Elizabeth's attitude to parliament.⁶⁰ Violet told Cromwell that Elizabeth had once said 'Give mee my People's hearts, and wee shall not need to ask their purses', most likely a paraphrasing of the Golden Speech. Cromwell should thus heed the example of England's Deborah and earn the love of his people, rather than attempting to rule in a way similar to the tyrant he had helped overthrow. If the pamphlet was published during the period in which Cromwell was debating whether or not to accept the crown, it might have alluded to Cromwell's apparent distaste for monarchy. After all, Deborah was a judge, not a monarch, and while Violet could not rewrite history and claim Elizabeth was not a monarch, he could try and negate her monarchical trappings as far as possible, emphasising her providential sending at the expense of her hereditary claim. In a speech to a House committee on 13 April 1657, Cromwell had claimed 'Truly the providence of God has laid this title [that of king] aside providentially. ... [God] hath blasted the title ... I would not seek to set up that

⁵⁸ One of the petitions is dated 29 September 1656, meaning that the pamphlet would not have been published before then. Given that the Second Protectorate Parliament first assembled on 17 September, it is unsurprising that these petitions were drawn up then.

⁵⁹ See: David L. Smith, 'Parliaments and Constitutions', in *The Oxford Handbook of The English Revolution*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), esp. pp. 252–254; Jonathan Fitzgibbons, 'Hereditary Succession and the Cromwellian Protectorate: The Offer of the Crown Reconsidered', *English Historical Review*, 128.534 (2013), pp. 1095–1128; and Patrick Little and David L. Smith, *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), esp. pp. 12–48.

⁶⁰ On 20 April 1653, Cromwell had entered the Commons to address the House. His speech became increasingly heated, before he thundered: 'I will put an end to your prating. You are no Parliament. I say you are no Parliament. I will put an end to your sitting.' He then called soldiers in, before continuing: 'For shame, get you gone, give place to honest men; to those who will more faithfully discharge their Trust. You are no longer a Parliament. I tell you, you are no longer a Parliament. The Lord has done with you. He has chosen other Instruments for carrying on his Work. Thou art a Whoremaster: Thou an Adulterer: Thou art a Drunkard and a Glutton: Thou an Extortioner. What shall we do with this Bauble? [referring to the mace] Here, take it away. It is you who have forced me upon this ... I have sought the Lord, night and day, that he would rather slay me than put me upon this work.' Charles Henry Parry, *The Parliaments and Councils of England, Chronologically Arranged, from the reign of William I to the Revolution in 1688* (London, 1839), p. 510. The similarities with Charles's failed attempt to arrest the 'Five Members' of the Commons are startling.

that providence hath destroyed and laid in the dust.’⁶¹ This diatribe against the office of king, however, did not convince those closest to Cromwell, who expected him to accept the crown; for instance, Sir Francis Russell wrote from Whitehall to his son-in-law, Henry Cromwell, the Lord Deputy of Ireland, on 27 April 1657 that ‘your father beginnes to come out of the cloudes, and it appears to us that he will take the kingly power upon him’, noting that his next letter to Henry was ‘likely to be to the Duke of Yorke’—the dukedom customarily granted to a monarch’s second son.⁶² Nevertheless, the pronouncements may have been public enough for Violet to decide to employ a Hebrew judge, rather than an Old Testament monarch, in his counsel. The use of these typologies demonstrate Violet’s belief in the relevance of the past to the present, and reinforce the counsel contained within the pamphlet: Cromwell needed to emulate England’s Deborah and rule more consultatively, because this was the will of God.

In addition to her consultative government, Elizabeth’s role in England’s return to Protestantism was an important component of the Queen’s legacy during the upheaval of the Commonwealth. Even when different strands of the godly engaged in pamphlet debates, the last Tudor monarch functioned as a stable point of reference and was an example to be emulated. The insertion of Elizabeth into contemporary religious debates is visible in William Ley’s 1656 pamphlet *Yperaspistes, or A Buckler for the Church of England*, which was a response to John Pendarves’s *Arrowes Against Babylon*. Ley was a presbyterian: in 1648, he had published a defence of presbyterianism, and he is probably the same William Ley who Cromwell directed on 2 June 1656 to hear the appeal of Thomas Fitch against his ejection from the vicarage of Sutton Courtenay.⁶³

Ley’s use of the title *Yperaspistes* is almost certainly inspired by Erasmus’s *Hyperaspistes*.⁶⁴ Erasmus, who generally avoided becoming involved in theological disputes, was convinced by humanist Catholics including Sir Thomas More and Pope Clement VII to publicly refute Luther’s teachings, particularly those pertaining to free will. Erasmus did so in 1524 with *De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio* (*Discussion of Free Will*). Luther responded in 1525 with *De servo arbitrio* (*On the Bondage of the Will*), which attacked both the treatise and Erasmus himself, claiming that he was not actually a Christian. Erasmus responded with the two-part

⁶¹ *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume IV*, p. 473.

⁶² BL Lansdowne MS 822, fol. 57r.

⁶³ *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume IV*, pp. 181–182, p. 182n. 4; William Ley, *A Brief Plat-Form of that Government which is called Presbyterial* (London, 1648; Wing L1887), sig. A1r. See also: Ruth Sewill and Elisabeth Lane, *The Free Men on Charwood* (Charlwood: Rose Garland Press, 1951), pp. 113–114.

⁶⁴ Ley’s title, *Yperaspistes*, is actually more accurate than Erasmus’s *Hyperaspistes*, but both mean ‘defenders’.

Hyperaspistes (1526 and 1527), which asserted humans' freedom of choice.⁶⁵ Like Erasmus, and as the title of the pamphlet indicates, Ley was prompted to write the defence by the publication of Pendarves's *Arrowes Against Babylon*. Pendarves was a Baptist and a Fifth Monarchist, and his pamphlet railed against the churches of England and Rome, derided presbyterians and presbyterianism, decried bishops and monarchy, and attacked Quakers.⁶⁶ Ley was not the only clergyman to respond to Pendarves; John Tickell and Christian Fowler also wrote pamphlets in defence of the English church.⁶⁷ Pendarves died in September 1656 of dysentery, which explains why he did not respond to any of these three pamphlets.

Ley's pamphlet is short, but mentions Elizabeth twice. In his response to Pendarves's fourth question—'Whether it is not the duty of all Gods people in the nationall Church and in the Parochiall pretended Churches together with their Church Ministry, to come out of Babylon and to separate &c'—Ley focused on the way that the Reformation was introduced to England, refuting Pendarves's focus on the 'grossest corruption' and 'Popish Ministry' in 'this Land in Queene Maries dayes',⁶⁸ and equating England with Israel:

There was much false worship and Idolatry in Israel, yet a good Prince was still an effectuall organ and instrument of reformation; our Godly Josiah and victorious Deborah did cast out Antichrist with all most all his trumpery ... And let none thinke that Queen Elizabeths reformation was Hipocriticall, for though some state consciences did wheele about with the times, yet there was abundance of Gods precious people in England, in King Edward and Queen Maries dayes.⁶⁹

While England may have been subject to 'Popish Ministry' during the reign of Mary I, Ley instead highlights how Elizabeth and Edward VI were sent by God to institute Protestantism in England, just as God had sent Deborah to the Israelites after they 'again did evil in the sight of the Lord'. By calling Elizabeth *our* Victorious Deborah, Ley was showing that Deborah had been sent not just for the Israelites, but for all time. The analogy also seems to have been intended to deflect criticisms of the Elizabethan Reformation, as well as criticising those who changed their religion merely for political expediency.

⁶⁵ See: James D. Tracy, 'Introduction', in *Erasmus and Luther: The Battle over Free Will*, ed. by Clarence H. Miller, trans. by Clarence H. Miller and Peter Macardle (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2012), pp. ix–xxviii; John F. Tinkler, 'Erasmus' Conversation with Luther', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 82 (1991), pp. 59–82; and James D. Tracy, 'Two Erasmuses, Two Luthers: Erasmus' Strategy in *Defense of De Libero Arbitrio*', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 78 (1987), pp. 37–60.

⁶⁶ Manfred Brod, 'Pendarves, John (1622/3–1656)', ODNB; B.R. White, 'John Pendarves, the Calvinistic Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy', *Baptist Quarterly*, 24.6 (1974), pp. 257–259.

⁶⁷ White, 'John Pendarves', pp. 259–260.

⁶⁸ John Pendarves, *Arrowes Against Babylon, or, Certaine quaries serving to a cleere discovery of the mystery of iniquity whereunto are added endeavours for reformation in saints apparrell: with some quaries for the people called Quakers* (London, 1656; Wing P1136), p. 2.

⁶⁹ William Ley, *Yperaspistes, Or A Buckler for the Church of England Against Certaine Queries Propounded by Mr Pendarvis (late Lecturer of Wanting) called Arrowes Against Babylon* (London, 1656; Wing L1888), p. 8.

The description of Elizabeth as England's victorious Deborah emphasises both the militant nature of Elizabeth's defence of England's Protestantism, and her preservation from numerous Catholic attempts on her life. At the same time, Ley has raised Elizabeth above her half-brother—while Edward may be godly, he is not victorious—thereby passing a positive judgement on Elizabeth's life and her reformation, and implicitly criticising the fact that Edward's reformation was not 'victorious', as it was undone at Mary's accession. Ley, like so many of his contemporaries in the fractured religio-political context of the Commonwealth, therefore seems to have viewed Elizabeth as both a beacon of stability and an example to be emulated.

In the course of his pamphlet, Pendarves had also questioned 'Whether the strange and wonderfull providences of God in the late Warres in England, Scotland and Ireland, have they not cleared the call to the Saints to come out of Babylon'. Ley's response to this critique, which is on the page following the Elizabeth analogy, emphasises both the role of providentialism and the past in contemporary life:

wicked men looke upon Providence by parcells, the Godly joyne past and present together, and make a golden chaine of them; as it is with words in a sentence, if we disjoyne them and forget precedent and subsequent we can make nothing of them, so in Providence, except all passages be match't together we loose the beauty & benefit of all.⁷⁰

As with other writers analysed in this chapter, Ley argued that looking to the past could reveal God's wishes for the present. But more than that, his argument might also explain why Elizabeth, a monarch, was still invoked in the Commonwealth. While Ley did temper Elizabeth's monarchical identity by linking her with Deborah, he also reminded his readers that to 'forget precedent' means 'we loose the beauty & benefit of all'. Elizabeth's life and reign, therefore, were an important precedent, and should be remembered and learned from.

The pamphlet is dedicated to Colonel William Sydenham, one of Cromwell's Councillors of State. In the dedication, Ley praised Cromwell's 'publique and seasonable redresse'—that is, the Cromwellian church settlement that allowed freedom of worship for Protestant non-episcopalians⁷¹—and thanks Sydenham for his role in 'the first dawning of [this] deliverance'.⁷² Ley evidently hoped that the pamphlet would influence the Cromwellian regime, which makes the references to Elizabeth all the more remarkable. As England's Deborah, Elizabeth was an example of a providentially favoured monarch whose legacy the

⁷⁰ Ley, *Yperaspistes*, p. 9.

⁷¹ Jeffrey R. Collins, 'The Church Settlement of Oliver Cromwell', *History*, 87.285 (2002), p. 18.

⁷² Ley, *Yperaspistes*, sig. A2r.

Commonwealth, and Cromwell more specifically, was following, and indeed should continue to follow.

Violet and Ley's use of Elizabeth analogies show how Elizabeth's memory was both an example from the past to be emulated, and a way of conceptualising the Protectorate. The use of Elizabeth's legacy was not merely confined to didactic tracts, however, and as Cromwell assumed more trappings of monarchy, the links between the situations of the Lord Protector and the last Tudor monarch were made more pronounced. A clear example of this comes from the journal of Bulstrode Whitelocke, who was sent to Sweden in 1653 as the Commonwealth's ambassador to conclude a treaty of alliance with Queen Christina.⁷³ In his first speech to the Queen, Whitelocke deflected Christina's questions about the Protectorate, and the Commonwealth's constitutional arrangements, by invoking Elizabeth's legacy. He commented on 'the present happy government under your Majesty, which remembers unto us those blessed days of our Queen Elizabeth, under whom, above forty years, the people enjoyed all protection and justice from their Prince, and she all obedience and affection from her people'. He followed this with a rather damning comment on the Stuarts: 'May this, and more, be the portion of your majesty and your successors; nor had it been lost in those who followed Queen Elizabeth, but through their own ill government.'⁷⁴ For Whitelocke, invoking the 'happy' reign of Elizabeth—even though he was born in 1605, and thus could not 'remember' anything of Elizabeth's reign—was intended to be a compliment to Christina, and to deflect from questions concerning the Civil War, Regicide, and Protectorate.⁷⁵ Like many people of the Commonwealth, Whitelocke saw the 'blessed days of our queen Elizabeth' as an example from the past to be emulated. Invoking Elizabeth's legacy was thus a way of fitting Cromwell into England's historical chain of governance, as well as making sense of an unfamiliar present.

Elizabeth's many associations with Old Testament figures also saw her feature in biblical commentaries. Since 1646, John Trapp, a non-separating presbyterian, had published 'commentaries and expositions' on the books of the Bible; in 1657, Trapp published his commentary on the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, and Psalms, which contained

⁷³ See: Edward Holberton, *Poetry and the Cromwellian Protectorate: Culture, Politics, and Institutions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 8–18; and Blair Worden, 'The "Diary" of Bulstrode Whitelocke', *English Historical Review*, 108.426 (1993), pp. 122–134.

⁷⁴ Bulstrode Whitelocke, *A Journal of the Swedish Embassy in the years 1653 and 1654*, ed. by Charles Morton, 2 vols (London, 1855), I, p. 244.

⁷⁵ A copy of the Instrument of Government arrived in Sweden during Whitelocke's visit. Christina observed that Cromwell's power as Lord Protector was 'the same with that of king', and so asked Whitelocke 'why should not his title have bin the same?' Whitelocke obfuscated, claiming both that he 'cannot satisfy your Majesty of the reasons of this title, being at so great a distance from the inventors of it' and that 'It is the power which makes the title, and not the title the power'. Whitelocke, *A Journal of the Swedish Embassy*, I, pp. 317–318.

several Elizabeth analogies.⁷⁶ The many surviving copies of the commentaries—both of the individual volumes and of the collected volumes—demonstrate the widespread use of the work; it was even reprinted in the mid-nineteenth century.

Trapp dedicated this volume of his commentaries to Edward Leigh, the author of *A Treatise of Religion and Learning* (see Appendix 2). Like Leigh, Trapp was loyal to the Church of England, although they wished to see the Church undergo some further reform (both men seemed to dislike Laudianism particularly); they both also disapproved of sectarianism, and Trapp's interest in presbyterianism has sometimes been misconstrued as puritanism.⁷⁷ Both sided with parliament during the Civil War, although Trapp was not so involved with the Protectoral regime to have suffered repercussions at the Restoration; indeed, he was considered as a candidate for the Bishopric of Hereford after Richard Baxter turned down the see. Ann Hughes has suggested that one of the reasons Trapp's work was so popular was that it drew on contemporary issues and contained many topical allusions.⁷⁸ Trapp's many references to Elizabeth thus emphasise the continued, contemporary importance of the dead Queen's memory.

Elizabeth is mentioned several times during Trapp's commentaries on the Book of Esther. In his commentary on chapter 9, verse 29, Trapp wrote that Esther had:⁷⁹

an holy zeal for God and a godly jealousie⁸⁰ over her people ... [and] This good Queen was no lesse active in her generation, then before had been Miriam, Deborah, Bathsheba, &c. and after her were ... Sophia Queen of Bohemia a Hussite, Queen Katherine Parre the Doctoresse, (as her husband merrily called her sometimes) and that matchlesse Queen Elizabeth, whose Sunny dayes are not to be passed over sleightly (saith one) without one touch upon that string, which so many yeares sounded so sweetly in our eares, without one sigh breathed forth in her sacred memory.⁸¹

⁷⁶ It is unclear when the pamphlet was published. The dedication letter, however, is dated 'Sept. 8, 1656', which means the pamphlet was likely printed in late 1656 with a 1657 date. This would mean it was published *before* the Humble Petition and Advice was presented to Cromwell on 23 February 1657.

⁷⁷ Ann Hughes, 'Thomas Dugard and His Circle in the 1630s—A "Parliamentary–Puritan" Connexion?', *The Historical Journal*, 29.4 (1986), p. 785. Trapp, like Leigh, seems to have been an advocate of Archbishop James Ussher's 'primitive episcopacy', which largely sought to merge the episcopacy with presbyteries—with bishops serving as the presiding officer—and to remove their political roles (i.e., their seats from the House of Lords). See: Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 240–256 (esp. pp. 240–241); and William M. Abbott, 'James Ussher and "Ussherian" Episcopacy, 1640–1656: The Primate and His Reduction Manuscript', *Albion*, 22.2 (1990), pp. 237–259. I thank Professor Ford for sharing his expertise on this subject with me.

⁷⁸ Ann Hughes, 'Trapp, John (1601–1669)', *ODNB*.

⁷⁹ Esther 9:29: 'Then Esther the queen, the daughter of Abihail, and Mordecai the Jew, wrote will all authority, to confirm the second letter of Purim.'

⁸⁰ Trapp is using 'jealous' here in a largely obsolete way—these queens were 'jealous' in that they were 'Zealous or solicitous for the preservation or well-being of something possessed or esteemed; vigilant or careful in guarding; suspiciously careful or watchful'. See: *OED*, s.v. 'jealous, *adj.*'

⁸¹ John Trapp, *A Commentary or Exposition Upon the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job and Psalms* (London, 1657; Wing T2041) sig. Bb4r (p. 191). While page numbers are given for convenience, the commentaries for each Book of the Bible are separately paginated.

Esther, the Persian queen consort, is at the centre of this list of favoured women—a list that stretched back to the early part of the Old Testament, and continued into the recent past. Esther is described as the successor of Miriam (the prophetess and Moses' sister), Bathsheba (the wife of David and mother of Solomon), and Deborah, with Sophia of Bavaria (1376–1428; who was for a time a protector of Jan Hus), Katherine Parr, and Elizabeth being 'modern' Esthers.⁸² In linking figures of the Bible with those of the recent past, Trapp emphasised how typological models recurred throughout human history: Esther had been sent not just to protect the Jews from Haman, but was a *typos* for all human history—a *typos* that Elizabeth embodied.⁸³

Elizabeth is again linked to biblical figures in Trapp's commentary on the Book of Job. In the Commonwealth period, the Book of Job often served as a reminder that God's people must endure 'affliction' and be patient, and this was a theme that both Royalists and Parliamentarians drew on.⁸⁴ This theme is visible both in Trapp's commentary, and his use of Elizabeth's memory. Trapp split his commentary on Job 29:20 into two parts. The first part focuses on the first clause of the verse, 'My glory was fresh in me'. Job is here recounting his blessings in his life before he was subjected to God's tests, and the chapter was usually glossed in relation to the gifts God grants to those He favours. For Arthur Jackson, a royalist-presbyterian writing in 1658, the verse meant that Job's 'prosperity, wisdom and strength was daily increased' by God; Joseph Caryl, a puritan who had preached before the Long

⁸² Revisionist scholarship of late is demonstrating what Trapp is referring to here: that Katherine Parr had 'an holy zeal for God and a godly jealousy over her people'. See: Janel Mueller, 'A Tudor Queen Finds Voice: Katherine Parr's *Lamentation of a Sinner*' in *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, ed. by Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 15–47; Micheline White, 'The Psalms, War, and Royal Iconography: Katherine Parr's *Psalms or Prayers* (1544) and Henry VIII as David', *Renaissance Studies*, 29.4 (2015), pp. 554–575; and Janel Mueller, 'Devotion as Difference: Intertextuality in Queen Katherine Parr's *Prayers or Meditations* (1545)', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 53.3 (1990), pp. 171–197. Trapp's reference to Katherine as a 'Doctoresse' draws on Foxe: warned of her impending arrest for heresy, Katherine immediately went to Henry to do whatever it took to prevent her arrest (she claimed that she discussed had religion with him so as to distract him from the pain of his ulcerous leg). Henry 'tested' Katherine by claiming that 'You are become a Doctor, Kate, to instruct us, (as we take it) and not to be instructed, or directed by us'—Katherine wisely responded 'If your Majestie take it so ... then hath your Majestie very much mistaken me, who have ever bene of the opinion, to thinke it verie unseemely and preposterous for the woman to take upon her the office of an instructor or teacher to her Lorde, and husband, but rather to learne of her husbande, and to bee taught by him', which mollified Henry, who responded: 'And is it euen so sweete hart ... And tended your argumentes to no worse an ende? Then perfect friendes we are nowe againe, as ever at anye tyme heretofore'. Henry failed to communicate this reconciliation to his guards, who attempted to arrest the Queen the next day while she and Henry were walking together. John Foxe, *The First Volume of the Ecclesiasticall History containyng the actes and monumentes of thynges passed in euery kynges tyme in this realme, especially in the Church of England principally to be noted* (London, 1570; STC 11223), pp. 1424–1425.

⁸³ Trapp's use of typology throughout his commentaries is briefly discussed in: Anthony Low, 'Samson Agonistes and the "Pioneers of Aphasia"', *Milton Quarterly*, 25.4 (1991), esp. pp. 145–146. On the Esther *typos*, see: Michele Osherow, 'Crafting Queens: Early Modern Readings of Esther', in *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. by Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), pp. 143, 151.

⁸⁴ John J. Teunissen, 'The Book of Job and Stuart Politics', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 43.1 (1973), pp. 16–18. For instance, Charles I compared himself to Job in *Eikon Basilike*, and Milton depicted the parliamentarians as Job-like in *Eikonoklastes*.

Parliament, summarised this verse as meaning: ‘The Lord, by his constant kindnesse to me, kept me up in such a freshnesse of honour, power, and prosperity, that I had no cause to doubt any witherings or decay.’⁸⁵ The glossing of this verse to focus on the gifts God granted allowed Trapp to claim that God had granted Elizabeth ‘honours’ just as He had blessed figures from the Old Testament:

I had daily new accessions to mine honours: and I was herein like a Bay-tree that is alwayes green.⁸⁶ This was also Josephs happiness in Egypt; David in the Court of Saul; Mordecai’s and Daniels in the Court of Persia; and Queen Elizabeths ... The most glorious and happiest Woman that ever swayed Scepter. Among her Subjects she got a continual increase of honour and respects, by coupling mildness with Majesty, and stooping yet in a stately manner, to the meanest sort: but especially by setting up God and his sincere Service, wherever she had to do, trusting God with her precious life, (so much sought for by Popish Assassimates;) which whiles her Contemporary Henry 4. of France durst not do, he lost his life, and much of his honour.⁸⁷

Showing the interchangeable nature of past and present, Trapp not only linked Elizabeth to celebrated figures of the Old Testament, but also offered the dead Queen as an example to be emulated in the present.

This section of his *Commentary* also allowed Trapp to disparage Henri IV of France’s conversion from Protestantism to Catholicism—a conversion that eventually led to his assassination in 1610. It was widely believed that the conversion was made for political reasons rather than true belief (Henri’s quip that ‘Paris is well worth a Mass’, while almost certainly apocryphal, accurately reflects the political reality of the situation), and Elizabeth even wrote to Henri to express her dismay at his conversion.⁸⁸ Despite mentioning Elizabeth’s

⁸⁵ Arthur Jackson, *Annotations upon the five books immediately following the historicall part of the Old Testament* (London, 1658; Wing J64), p. 218; Joseph Caryl, *An Exposition with Practicall Observations continued upon the twenty-seventh, the twenty-eighth, and twenty-ninth chapters of the booke of Job* (London, 1657; Wing C771), p. 576.

⁸⁶ This paraphrasing of Job 29:20 is likely inspired by Thomas Manley’s 1652 ‘metaphrastical’ retelling of the Book of Job, which renders Job 29:20 as ‘My glory, as the bay-tree, fresh did stand’. Thomas Manley, *The Affliction and Deliverance of the Saints or, The whole booke of Job composed into English heroicall verse metaphrastically* (London, 1652; Wing M441), p. 66.

⁸⁷ Trapp, *A Commentary or Exposition*, sig. Iii1v (p. 250).

⁸⁸ See: Michael Wolfe, ‘The Conversion of Henri IV and the Origins of Bourbon Absolutism’, *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques*, 14.2 (1987), pp. 287–309; Ronald S. Love, ‘The Symbiosis of Religion and Politics: Reassessing the Final Conversion of Henri IV’, *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques*, 21.1 (1995), pp. 27–56; and Edmund H. Dickerman, ‘The Conversion of Henry IV: “Paris Is Well Worth a Mass” in Psychological Perspective’, *The Catholic Historical Review*, 63.1 (1977), pp. 1–13. Elizabeth’s distress upon hearing the news that Henri IV of France had converted to Catholicism is made clear in the letter she sent to him in July 1593. It begins: ‘Ah what griefs, O what regrets, O what groanings felt I in my soul at the sound of such news as Morlains [the French emissary] has told me’ (*Collected Works*, 370). Camden gives an account of Elizabeth’s actions before and after hearing the news: ‘Shee being full of sorrow, and much disquieted in minde, suddenly tooke her penne, and soone after this this letter unto him. ... In this her grieffe shee sought comfort out of the holy Scriptures, the writings of the holy fathers, and frequent conferences with the Archbishop, and whether out of the Philosophers also I now not. Sure I am that at this time, shee daily turned over Boethius his books *De Consolatione* and translated them handsomely into the English tongue.’ William Camden, *The Historie of the Life and Reigne of the most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth, late Queene of England*, trans. by Robert Norton (London, 1630; STC 4500.5), book 4, pp. 50–51 (sigs. Ggg1v–Ggg2r).

Nicodemianism earlier in the pamphlet—‘in Queen Maries time, shee [Elizabeth] sometimes heard divine service after the Romish religion, and was often confessed’—Trapp, like Christopher Lever in his *Queen Elizabeths Teares* (analysed in Chapter 2), reminded his readers that Elizabeth had remained a true Protestant, which is attested by the fact that despite these outward signs of Catholicism, Mary ‘did not ... believe her’.⁸⁹ This seems to have been the key for Trapp: Elizabeth was such a pious and true Protestant that she could not even pretend to be a Catholic; Henri, on the other hand, was not ‘sincere’ in his faith, which meant he ‘lost his life, and much of his honour.’ Despite Elizabeth’s deception during Mary’s reign, Elizabeth was still rewarded by God: by ‘trusting God with her precious life’, she became ‘The most glorious and happiest Woman that ever swayed Scepter’ in England. In the context of the Commonwealth, such a sentiment was meant to serve as an example that Cromwell should emulate: Elizabeth may be ‘the most glorious and happiest *Woman* that ever swayed Scepter’, but Trapp leaves room for the Lord Protector to become ‘the most glorious and happiest *Man* that ever swayed Scepter’. Trapp, writing after Cromwell had banned Book of Common Prayer services, and during a period of heightened concern that there would be attempts on Cromwell’s life, reminded the Lord Protector that should he ‘set up God’ and be ‘sincere in his Service’, God would preserve his ‘precious life’.⁹⁰

Elizabeth’s providential favour was again emphasised in Trapp’s commentary on Job 42:12.⁹¹ As the last chapter of the Book of Job, it serves as a kind of epilogue that (somewhat) explains God’s motivation for inflicting the tests on Job, and vindicates Job’s faith. Trapp used this chapter to make clear that those who pass the tests God places before them will be richly rewarded:

the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy. If he afflict any of his, it is in very faithfulness, that he may be true to their souls, it is also in great mercy, that he may do them good in the latter end ... Patient Job had all doubled to him. Joseph of a Slave became his Masters Master. Valentinian lost his Tribuneship for Christ, but was afterwards made Emperor. Queen Elizabeth of a prisoner, became a great Princesse. ... Great is the gain of Godliness.⁹²

Job, who never wavered in his faith, was rewarded by God by having all he owned before his

⁸⁹ Trapp, *A Commentary or Exposition*, sig. Cc2r (p. 19).

⁹⁰ For instance, the Gerard’s Conspiracy of 1654 was primarily concerned with ‘the assassination of the Great Usurper’ (245). See: Maurice Ashley, *Oliver Cromwell: The Conservative Dictator* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1937), pp. 212–213, 245. In 1657, a pamphlet called *Killing No Murder* (Wing T1310) was published: it advocated the assassination of Cromwell, and Cromwell was said to have taken the call so seriously that afterwards he never spent more than two nights in the same place. See: James Holstun, ‘Ehud’s Dagger: Patronage, Tyrannicide, and “Killing No Murder”’, *Cultural Critique*, 22 (1992), esp. pp. 114–137.

⁹¹ Job 42:12: ‘So the Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning: for he had fourteen thousand sheep, and six thousand camels, and a thousand yoke of oxen, and a thousand she asses.’

⁹² Trapp, *A Commentary or Exposition*, sigs. Yyy4v–Zzz1r (pp. 362–363).

trials doubled; Joseph, who had been sold as a slave by his brothers, remained faithful and was rewarded by being made the vizier of Egypt (and thus second only to the pharaoh); Valentinian remained true to his faith and was eventually rewarded by being proclaimed emperor (Trapp is mistaken in his claim that ‘Valentinian lost his Tribuneship for Christ’);⁹³ and Elizabeth endured much hardship during the reign of her half-sister Mary, and was rewarded by ascending the throne and reigning as a providentially favoured monarch. Elizabeth was not the only English monarchy whose ‘latter end’ was more blessed ‘than his end’; that Elizabeth was the only English monarch selected by Trapp to include in this list of the providentially rewarded points to the unique potency of her exemplarity.⁹⁴

According to Trapp, Elizabeth was the link between the figures of the Old Testament and the present, with God’s interventionist activities just as relevant in the present as they were in the past. Elizabeth is thus presented as a model of ‘Godliness’ that the people of Cromwell’s England should be emulating.⁹⁵ This is a model that Cromwell himself was happy to emulate: in his speech at the opening of the Second Protectorate Parliament, on 17 September 1656—the very year that this *Commentary* was published—Cromwell declared that the aim of those assembled should be to ‘encourage whatsoever is of godliness’.⁹⁶ Trapp may also be suggesting that Cromwell’s ascent to the protectorship recalls Elizabeth’s providential favour: the death of Cromwell’s father when Oliver was only 18, as well as the spiritual and health crises he endured in the late 1620s and early 1630s, may be the poor ‘beginning’ that gave way to the blessed ‘latter end’ with his becoming Lord Protector. Trapp had thus drawn a link between the last Tudor monarch and the Lord Protector, with Cromwell helping England ‘promove [sic] purity and godliness’ just as Elizabeth had done.⁹⁷

Elizabeth’s memory was a familiar, and potent, reference for Trapp’s readers. In recalling Elizabeth’s memory, however, Trapp often linked the Queen to the Old Testament figures she had been routinely compared with in order to draw a link between the biblical past and the present. The volume’s dedication to Leigh provides some of the clearest evidence of

⁹³ See: *OCD*, s.v., ‘Valentinian I’. Neither Valentinian II nor Valentinian III were persecuted in this way, either.

⁹⁴ For instance, Alfred the Great was often ill during his childhood (he may have suffered from Crohn’s disease), and had to live through the partial-deposition of his father, and the reigns of his three elder brothers; Edward I clashed with his father, and was taken hostage by barons as part of the Second Barons’ War; Edward III was used as a pawn by his mother, Isabella of France, during her fight against her husband Edward II; the fourteen-year-old Richard II had to deal with the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381; Henry VI ascended the throne at only nine months; and Edward V inherited the throne at the age of twelve during the turbulent period of the Wars of the Roses, and was believed to have been murdered on the orders of his uncle, Richard III.

⁹⁵ In an earlier volume, Trapp recalled ‘the happy dayes of that incomparable Elizabeth, not to be passed over slightly, without one sigh breathed forth, now after 40 years, in her sacred memory.’ John Trapp, *A Clavis to the Bible. Or A new comment upon the Pentateuch* (London, 1649; Wing T2038), sig. Rrrr3v. The quote is on page 134 of the commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy (the pagination is reset for every different Book).

⁹⁶ *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume IV*, p. 277.

⁹⁷ *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume IV*, p. 402.

the way that these religio-political texts were building on, and being informed by, each other. Trapp's commentaries are indisputably didactic and polemic in their intention—the title page claims that the volume 'will yield both pleasure and profit to the Judicious Reader.'

This common recourse to Elizabeth analogies suggests that Elizabeth's life and reign were viewed through a didactic lens that turned her into a potent educative device that could counsel, critique, and warn those in power. With his commentaries, Trapp used Elizabeth's legacy to show the applicability of the past to the present, and to give example to both Cromwell and his readers of the work of providence in their everyday life. The religio-political climate of the Commonwealth was one of the most providentially charged in English history: while Cromwell certainly had clear views about the role of providence in his life, he was not an outlier in this respect.⁹⁸ Elizabeth's reign served as an indisputable example of the way that God intervened in human affairs. In the case of Elizabeth, God had defended England from expansionist Catholics, and had protected the Queen from numerous assassination attempts—in other words, providence had been defending *England*. In a nation that was still badly wounded by a devastating Civil War, the work of providence was much more difficult to discern, and the various threats to the stability of an unfamiliar Protectorate made discerning God's will even more important, albeit difficult.⁹⁹ What else was the offer of the crown to Cromwell but an attempt to return to the familiar, providentially favoured past? Elizabeth's

⁹⁸ See: Coffey, *Exodus and Liberation*, pp. 7–8, 43–55; and Worden, *God's Instruments*, pp. 33–34, 51–62.

⁹⁹ Discerning God's will could be particularly difficult in turbulent times, as in addition to *rewarding* His favoured with victories, God also *punished* His favoured by allowing the 'wicked' to be temporarily victorious; for every victory in the Old Testament (like David's, Deborah's, or Joshua's), there were also stories of when the Jews were defeated as punishment (such as the stories about Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, or Pharaoh)—indeed, the stories in Judges 3, 4, 6, 10, and 13 all begin with some form of 'and the Israelites did wrong in the eyes of the Lord, and He delivered them into the hands of their enemies.' In 1644, Joseph Caryl had to admit in a sermon to the Commons that 'Successes and Events cannot make a bad Cause just or good'; in 1651, the General Assembly of the Scottish Kirk, writing after the defeat at the Battle of Dunbar, reminded the faithful 'That often tymes in the Lords Holy Providence; wicked men, in most wicked courses; even agaynst Gods own People, may have much prosperitie, for a tyme, for the tryall and humbling of his own, and the greater judgement upon their Enemies, when they have filled up the measure of their iniquitie'; and Cromwell's opponents in the First Protectorate Parliament twice criticised his increasingly authoritarian stance, reminding the Lord Protector in September 1654 'That the providences of God are like a two-edged sword, which may be used both ways; and God in his providence, doth often permit of that which he doth not approve', and again in November that 'To say, that now he hath it by Providence; that argument is but like to a two-edged sword'. Joseph Caryl, *The Saints Thankfull Acclamation at Christs Resumption of his Great Power and the initials of his Kingdome* (London, 1644; Wing C787), sig. A1r; *A solemn warning to all members of this kirk from the Commission of the Generall Assemblie with an act for censuring such as act or comply with the sectarian armie now infesting this kingdom* (Aberdeen, 1651; Wing C4269), pp. 6–7; 'Guibon Goddard's Journal', in *Diary of Thomas Burton Esq: Volume 1, July 1653–April 1657*, ed. by John Towill Rutt (London, 1828), pp. xxx, lxix. More than one seventeenth-century writer admitted that the mere possession of power was read providentially, and was thus legitimate. According to Richard Saunders, 'tis enough to satisfy us touching a Power that tis ordained of God, when Providence hath set it up', and Thomas Carre said of those in power in 1651: 'they are in possession of the Power, and it is not my part to enquire how, nor to dispute the equity thereof. The Power is in them, and I, for my part with be subject.' Richard Saunders, *Plenary possession makes a lawfull power: or Subjection to powers that are in being proved to be lawfull and necessary* (London, 1651; Wing S756), p. 14; Thomas Carre, *A Treatise of Subjection to the Powers* (London, 1651; Wing C640A), p. 17. See also: Worden, *God's Instruments*, pp. 51–53; and Calum S. Wright, 'Conflicts of Conscience: English and Scottish Political Thought, 1637–1653' (PhD thesis, Birkbeck, University of London, 2018), pp. 166–168, 189–190.

legacy, and typological readings of her reign, were familiar, and were seen as an indisputable source of stability that proved God was on England's side. Cromwell had already declared that he hoped England could now enjoy a period of 'healing and settling', and it is not difficult to see Trapp engaging with this concept through his use of the English Deborah typology to counsel (and criticise) both Cromwell and the English.¹⁰⁰

Elizabeth as England's Deborah also served as a useful didactic tool for George Swinnock's *The Gods are Men* (1657). Swinnock was a firebrand puritan nonconformist, and the pamphlet is a version of a sermon he delivered at the commencement of the Hertfordshire Assize on 15 March 1656/7.¹⁰¹ The sermon was based on Psalm 82:6–7—'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'—and being a sermon delivered to the Assize judges, Swinnock's (unsurprising) message to the judges was

execute justice impartially, Live among your inferiours exemplarily, Walk with God humbly, Work for God zealously, Mind the power of sanctity, and know a crucified Saviour. In a word, let true righteousness towards men, and reall holiness towards God, be your work while ye live.¹⁰²

Such sentiments, as Barbara Shapiro has observed, were a common theme of Assize sermons.¹⁰³ The sermon also spoke against the swearing of oaths, and emphasised how magistrates 'are the Bulwarks of the Countrey under God', reinforcing both Swinnock's puritanism, and his commitment to the Commonwealth's (and indeed Cromwell's) religious settlement.¹⁰⁴

The sermon itself contains no reference to Elizabeth. The last Tudor monarch is referred to, however, in the dedicatory epistle of the published version of the sermon, alongside a reference to the Queen as England's Deborah. The opening sentence of the dedication to John Beresford, the High Sheriff of Hertfordshire, proclaimed: 'It is reported of Queen Elizabeth (that Deborah of our Nation) that in a letter to the King of France she should use this expression, That if there were any unpardonable sin, it must be ingratitude.'¹⁰⁵ Recalling Elizabeth's letter to Henri IV seems, however to have been a rhetorical device

¹⁰⁰ *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume III*, p. 435.

¹⁰¹ E.I. Carlyle, rev. by Stephen Wright, 'Swinnock, George (c.1627–1673)', ODNB.

¹⁰² George Swinnock, *The Gods are Men: Or, The Mortality of Persons in places of Magistracy. As it was Explained and Applied in a Sermon Preached at the Assize holden at Hertford for that county, on March 15. 1656/7* (London, 1657; Wing S6276), p. 38.

¹⁰³ Barbara Shapiro, 'Political Theology and the Courts: A Survey of Assize Sermons c.1600–1688', *Law and Humanities*, 2.1 (2008), pp. 1–28.

¹⁰⁴ Swinnock, *The Gods are Men*, p. 6. See also: Capp, *England's Culture Wars*, pp. 93–94.

¹⁰⁵ Swinnock, *The Gods are Men*, sig. A2r. Swinnock cites Camden's *Annales* as his source for the anecdote about Elizabeth. According to Camden, Elizabeth told Henry IV in 1598: 'If there be any sinne in the world against the holy Ghost, it is ingratitude'. Camden, *The Historie of the Life and Reigne*, book 4, p. 120 (sig. Ppp4v).

designed to appeal to his audience by invoking a familiar concept. What goes beyond this Aristotelian rhetorical device of using the familiar to introduce a specific point, however, is the invocation of the Deborah *typos*: Swinnock made a deliberate decision to conflate Elizabeth and Deborah, even though it appears to be completely extraneous to his point. This decision is made all the more significant when the political context of the sermon and its publication is considered. Preached on 15 March 1657, Swinnock's sermon was delivered only three weeks after Cromwell had been offered the crown by the monarchical Remonstrance of Sir Christopher Packe, which served as a precursor to the Humble Petition and Advice.¹⁰⁶ Even more importantly, Swinnock penned the dedication to Beresford on 1 June 1657—less than a month *after* Cromwell formally rejected the offer of the crown. Swinnock could thus have his pamphlet published safe in the knowledge that England was to remain a republic, with a 'magistrate' at its head rather than a king. It therefore seems that the reference to Elizabeth as a Deborah here was intended to emphasise what had been a recurring theme throughout the 1650s: that Elizabeth may have been a Queen, but she ruled as a contemporary Deborah, which served both to distance Elizabeth from the negative views monarchy was subjected to during the Commonwealth, and to offer her as an example that Cromwell and the rest of the protectoral regime should emulate. In his dedication, Swinnock wrote that 'The favourable and extraordinary acceptance which this Sermon obtained when it was heard, moveth me to hope that through the blessing of Heaven, it will be profitable when it shall be read.'¹⁰⁷ There can be little doubt that he intended his sermon to have a didactic purpose, and despite being dedicated to a Hertfordshire sheriff, the pamphlet's London publication, coupled with the fact that Swinnock was, in September 1657, appointed one of the commissioners for the public faith in Hertfordshire, suggests that Swinnock saw a link between Deborah, Elizabeth, and Cromwell, and sought to prove this to the Lord Protector for the benefit of the Commonwealth.

Elizabeth and Cromwell in 1658

In 1658, *Vindiciae Magistratum, or, A Sober Plea for Subjection to [the] Present Government* used biblical figures to link Cromwell and Elizabeth. The pamphlet, which was written by 'C.D.', was published by Baptist printer Henry Hills.¹⁰⁸ Given the favour that Hills received from Cromwell—in 1655, along with John Field, he had secured a monopoly in printing English

¹⁰⁶ Little and Smith, *Parliaments and Politics*, pp. 12–15, 19–21, 152; Woodford, *Perceptions of a Monarchy Without a King*, pp. 5–7.

¹⁰⁷ Swinnock, *The Gods are Men*, sigs. A2v–A3r.

¹⁰⁸ See: I. Gadd, 'Hills, Henry, senior (c.1625–1688/9)', ODNB.

bibles and psalms—it is unsurprising that this is a tract advocating loyalty to the Commonwealth’s ‘Governour’, Cromwell. Thomason annotated his copy of the pamphlet with ‘June’, indicating that it was published around the middle of 1658—after the Second Protectorate Parliament was dissolved on 4 February, but before Cromwell’s decline was hastened by the death of his favourite daughter, Elizabeth, on 6 August.

The pamphlet largely consists of catechetical questions and answers concerning the country’s government, using precedent from the Bible and classical history to exhort readers to be loyal to Cromwell. Such a format is indicative of the way that pamphlets, in the post-1642 period, used pointed theatrical styles and language to make their didactic point, with Commonwealth pamphlets functioning as a kind of closet drama.¹⁰⁹ It is not hard to imagine people reading the pamphlet aloud, with different ‘characters’ reading the objections and the answers. This format, according to Marta Straznicky, ‘focuses the tensions and points of contact between public and private realms in a way that simultaneously involves retreat and engagement in public culture.’¹¹⁰ The pamphlet is almost certainly part of the period’s religio-political conflicts, and its question-and-answer format may have encouraged a wider dissemination.¹¹¹

The tract is anti-monarchy, or at least pro-kingless-Commonwealth, and expanded on the notion of kingship being ‘blasted’ by God that had previously been expounded by Cromwell. Objection two posited: ‘But it may be by some objected, God was angry with the Israelites for asking a King, and therefore it seems it was not his Ordinance that there should be Kings.’¹¹² The answer to this objection emphasises

He was not angry with them for desiring Governours, for they had Governours before sent of God, and the very King they had afterward God gave them him, ... But he was angry with the cause of their request ... [because] they conceived more hope in a King then in God that had been such a King to them so many years.¹¹³

The answer, however, also provides reasons for people to subject themselves to the present government, noting ‘Men must needs be subject, because God hath here bound mens consciences to subjection’, and ‘Because Governours are heads of the people, and therefore as

¹⁰⁹ David Scott Kastan, ‘Performances and Playbooks: The Closing of the Theatres and the Politics of Drama’, in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 181. See also: Janet Clare, ‘General Introduction: The Theatre and Cultural Revolution’, in *Drama of the English Republic, 1649–60* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 18–21.

¹¹⁰ Marta Straznicky, *Privacy, Playreading, and Women’s Closet Drama, 1550–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 3.

¹¹¹ Heidi C. Craig, ‘Missing Shakespeare, 1642–1660’, *English Literary Renaissance*, 49.1 (2019), pp. 120–121.

¹¹² C.D., *Vindiciae Magistratum; Or, A Sober Plea for Subjection To Present Government. According to the Command and Special Direction of God Himself, in His Holy Scriptures* (London, 1658; Wing D12), p. 10.

¹¹³ *Vindiciae Magistratum*, p. 10.

members it is agreeable they should submit, and be ruled and guided', before declaring 'Because God hath ordained Rulers, and commanded subjection, therefore we cannot with a good conscience despise or resist them.'¹¹⁴ The author also uses the example of Judges, asking 'Why was not that [system] best of all, that they were free from any Lord or Ruler that might possibly have tyrannized over them? Seeing they were the chosen people of God, and had grace enough to govern themselves?'¹¹⁵ This system, however, was unsustainable: 'they were led away to Idolatry, and they dwelt secure and careless, having no Magistrate to keep them in any politick order or discipline, either to offend or defend an Invader'.¹¹⁶ Such 'carelessness' is why God had installed Cromwell, and the pamphlet makes clear repeatedly that there is 'No man fitter to be a Governour'.¹¹⁷ The Protectorate was thus ordained by God, and it was His will that Cromwell was the Lord Protector—which is why Cromwell had been successful in the Civil War, and why England continued to be victorious during the Anglo-Spanish War.¹¹⁸ Significantly, the pamphlet's author has not specifically 'blasted' the office of king, but rather focused on the unsuitability of many of the office's incumbents. Such hedging was likely meant to endorse Cromwell's rejection of the crown, while also addressing the issue of succession. Given that Cromwell had accepted the right to nominate his own successor, the use of 'governor' here further stressed that whoever succeeded Cromwell would do so on merit, rather than through hereditary right only. This section, however, also paves the way for Elizabeth's subsequent invocation.

The first mention of Elizabeth in the pamphlet emphasised Cromwell as her successor. Reiterating the role of providence in Cromwell becoming Lord Protector, the author presented his readers with an 'Argument for Submission to present Authority', claiming 'I shall otherwise render my self exceeding unthankfull to, and very unmindfull of, the Lords wonderfull actings and workings for us, and our Nation: And to our present Governour, whom he hath made so eminently instrumental therein.'¹¹⁹ The pamphlet then linked Cromwell with the last Tudor monarch:

¹¹⁴ *Vindiciae Magistratum*, pp. 10, 11.

¹¹⁵ *Vindiciae Magistratum*, p. 35.

¹¹⁶ *Vindiciae Magistratum*, p. 36.

¹¹⁷ In his speech at the opening of the Second Protectorate Parliament, Cromwell had declared 'I am by the voice of the people the Supreme Magistrate'. The author of the pamphlet seems to be drawing on this, while also alluding to the stories from the Book of Judges that began with 'and the children of Israel cried unto the Lord'. *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume IV*, p. 277.

¹¹⁸ Indeed, on 14 June 1658, the combined Commonwealth and French force defeated the Spanish army at the Battle of the Dunes and captured the city of Dunkirk. See: James Inglis-Jones, 'The Battle of the Dunes, 1658: Condé, War and Power Politics', *War in History*, 1.3 (1994), pp. 249–277. The victory was part of the reason Cromwell declared 'a day of publick thanksgiving' on 21 July in a proclamation dated 3 July (*A Declaration of His Highnesse the Lord Protector for a day of publick thanksgiving*; Wing C7067)—a proclamation that was printed by Henry Hills and John Field.

¹¹⁹ *Vindiciae Magistratum*, p. 75.

he [Cromwell] of all men now living, that so eminently have had to do with all overtures as he hath had, is said (by such as have all along had the nearest acquaintance with his judgement and practise) to succeed that excellent Queen, as in her other Vertues, so in desert of that most Christian Motto, (*semper idem* [sic]) to be always the same.¹²⁰

Elizabeth's motto was apparently so ubiquitous that the author did not need to specifically name Elizabeth, showing the dead Queen's cultural capital. Like other tracts published during the Commonwealth, this pamphlet downplays Elizabeth's monarchical status and instead focuses on her 'virtuous' and providential rule. The reference to Elizabeth's motto, *semper eadem*, hints at the way that typology was used to make sense of unfamiliar situations. It also invokes St Paul's description of Christ: 'Jesus Christ [is] the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever.'¹²¹ For this pamphlet's author, the similarity in temperament and virtue between Elizabeth and Cromwell thus demonstrated a link that had to be read typologically.

Elizabeth is mentioned again near the end of the pamphlet. In the aftermath of the failed assassination attempt against Cromwell by Miles Sindercombe and his group of disaffected Levellers in January 1657, the author, after discussing both the need to obey 'wicked' masters and the circumstances when 'Evil Princes' should be challenged, posited the objection: 'But doth not this give encouragement to destroy Princes, to such as can get a sufficient party, to set up themselves in their places?'¹²² The pamphlet then gave examples from the Old Testament as to why Cromwell should not be rebelled against, and why God would protect him:

Nothing less, for as ye have heard ... they that thus rebelliously and murtherously resist, shall receive to themselves damnation. Indeed, God sharpens his Arrows of Judgement against such ... and therefore it is that David, though established by God to reign over Israel, and Saul God had forsaken, and ... though brought twice into Davids power to effect it, ... David saith, The Lord shall smite him, or his day shall come to die, ... but God forbid that I should stretch forth my hand against the Lords Anointed, for who can stretch forth his hand against the Lords Anointed, and be guiltless? ...

And therefore hath God made that promise of protection, No weapon forged against them shall prosper; and made it good to David, Solomon, and most of the good Princes, and in our Land to Queen Elizabeth, and to our now Governour, blessed be the Lord! although all the ways and means that Men and Devils could invent have been attempted, as is notoriously known.¹²³

God was thus responsible for removing those He has 'forsaken'. It also bolstered Cromwell's own position, casting him as a David who had been 'established by God to reign over' the Commonwealth (with Charles as the Saul 'God had forsaken'). This is the only occasion in the

¹²⁰ *Vindiciae Magistratum*, p. 78.

¹²¹ Hebrews 13:8.

¹²² *Vindiciae Magistratum*, p. 112.

¹²³ *Vindiciae Magistratum*, pp. 112–113.

pamphlet that Elizabeth is mentioned by name, but like the first invocation of her memory, it served to link Cromwell to the Old Testament figures strongly associated with the Queen. The author's invocation of Elizabeth demonstrates the role of providence in seventeenth-century politics: just as none of the many assassination attempts against Elizabeth were successful, neither would any planned against Cromwell succeed. Cromwell was thus a contemporary David, Solomon, and Elizabeth, combining providential favour with divine protection.

This pamphlet, then, showed how Elizabeth was a typological device that was used to conceptualise Cromwell's rule—a device that was itself fused with Elizabeth analogies. The author of *Vindiciae Magistratum* did not merely link Elizabeth and Cromwell; instead, he drew a line from the kings of the Old Testament to Elizabeth, and connected it to the Lord Protector. This link also served as counsel for the Lord Protector, reminding him that it was not enough to merely be like Elizabeth—he had to instead actively rule like these 'good Princes'.

While the pamphlet was explicit in its belief that God appointed Cromwell, the author nevertheless sought to emphasise the legacy of the 'excellent' Elizabeth. The pamphlet also emphasised the more radical Protestant yearning for the kingship of Christ, while also acknowledging the stability that the image and legacy of Elizabeth granted. Many of the justifications offered for the Regicide and the abolition of the monarchy spurned long-standing literary and political conventions. On the one hand, Milton's *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (for instance) rejected the long-held view that tyrants were imposed by God as a punishment for sin, and thus had to be endured.¹²⁴ Conversely, the author of this pamphlet cautioned against moving against a king that God had 'forsaken', even though this is precisely what Cromwell and the Parliamentarians had done during the Civil War. In a religio-political moment where long-held beliefs such as these were being challenged, Elizabeth was employed as a stable point of reference, with her reign an example to be emulated in the 'healing and settling' of the present.

Biblical Analogies and the Protectoral Succession

That biblical analogy was applicable to both monarchs and non-royal heads of state is visible in the way that Oliver Cromwell was commemorated at his death, and the way that he was linked to his son and successor, Richard. Although, as Laura Lunger Knoppers notes, 'imbuing Oliver with the full trappings of monarchy was a risky way of bolstering the regime of his son', it was part of the monarchical direction that the Protectorate took after Oliver's

¹²⁴ Neufeld, 'Doing Without Precedent', p. 334.

second investiture as Lord Protector in Westminster Abbey on 26 June 1657.¹²⁵ After Oliver's death on 3 September 1658, Richard lost no time in securing his succession. In his first speech to the officers of the army, delivered in early October, he pre-empted some of the concerns that would be levelled against him, and addressed his fitness for the role directly. He confessed that 'It is my disadvantage that I have beene soe little amongst you, and am not better knowne to you', and admitted that 'It might have pleased God, and the nation too, to have chosen out a person more fitt and able for this worke then I am'.¹²⁶ Richard, however, did not allow these obstacles to weaken him. Invoking the doctrine of providence that pervaded the Commonwealth, Richard linked himself to his father, claiming that, 'God hath raised me up in my Fathers stead and put me in the same relation towards this nation and you, as he stood in', before asserting the role of providence in his accession: 'God hath done herein as it pleased him, and the nation by his providence hath put things this way'.¹²⁷ Just as James VI & I had described the role of providence in his accession to the throne at the death of Elizabeth, Richard linked himself to his predecessor, while also emphasising God's hand in his succession. In late 1658, it really did seem that 'God hath raised' Richard Cromwell up as Lord Protector.¹²⁸

The monarchical direction of the Protectorate, as well as the belief in Richard's providential succession, is visible in Henry Dawbeny's celebratory tract, which contained thirty examples of how Oliver was a second Moses.¹²⁹ Despite being published shortly before the collapse of Richard's Protectorate in April 1659, Dawbeny's use of the Moses analogy drew on Oliver's own conception of his providential role in England, which was frequently compared to the Exodus—'Just as Moses had led the children of Israel out of Egyptian bondage, so Cromwell himself felt called to liberate the people of God from tyranny over conscience'.¹³⁰ It also drew on Richard's own view of his father. Richard, at the opening of his first session of parliament as Lord Protector on 27 January 1659, is supposed to have said of his father: 'he died full of days, spent in great and sore travail; yet his eyes were not waxed

¹²⁵ Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645–1661* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 158, 107.

¹²⁶ BL Add MS 4159, fols. 238v, 239v. The speech was drafted by John Thurloe, the Secretary of State, but was corrected and annotated by Richard himself.

¹²⁷ BL Add MS 4159, fols. 238v, 240r.

¹²⁸ See: Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell*, pp. 136–137; Blair Worden, *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 152–153; David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 382; and Fitzgibbons, 'Hereditary Succession and the Cromwellian Protectorate', pp. 1095–1128.

¹²⁹ Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell*, p. 155.

¹³⁰ John Coffey, 'England's Exodus: The Civil War as a War of Deliverance', in *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*, ed. by Charles W.A. Prior and Glenn Burgess (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), p. 268.

dim, neither was his natural strength abated, as it was said of Moses.¹³¹

The pamphlet, however, is not merely a panegyric for the deceased Lord Protector: it made a claim for the continuation between the various heads of state in seventeenth-century England, and appealed to the example of Elizabeth to do so. In the epistle to the reader, Dawbeny provides an extremely useful commentary on the religio-political purpose of biblical analogy, and made clear the links between the Cromwells and their monarchical predecessors:

many Parallels we finde in Print, between some of our late Kings, how well deserving, I say not; and some of those holy Princes, and Prophets of Gods own people, as David, Solomon, Josiah, Hezekiah, &c. and one very expresse Parallel, between Queen Elizabeth of famous Memory, and that great Princesse and Prophetesse Deborah. Then why should not our late incomparable Prince, and Protector stand as well placed in line Parallel, with that glorious Patriarch Moses?¹³²

Dawbeny, rather neatly, explains both the function of biblical analogy, and the special link between Elizabeth and Deborah. That Deborah is a ‘very expresse Parallel’ for Elizabeth not only agrees with the surviving evidence (this thesis, for example, cites more examples of Elizabeth as Deborah than any other Old Testament figure), but also highlights how the Old Testament judge was viewed as *the* prime parallel for the last Tudor monarch. In Dawbeny’s mind, Elizabeth *was* a Deborah, and this explicit conflation explains the analogy’s appearance throughout the seventeenth century.

Deborah was not a ‘Princesse’—an Old Testament judge combined the modern-day roles of head of state, head of government, commander-in-chief, chief justice, and head of the church—but the idea of Deborah as a prophetess and princess clearly prefigured Elizabeth as Queen of England and Supreme Governor of the Church of England (and Defender of the Faith).¹³³ In praising Oliver as a Moses, Dawbeny reminded Richard of his duty to emulate the biblical figures that previous rulers—both monarchical and protectoral—had embodied. Elizabeth in particular, both as a Deborah and ‘of famous memory’, was the primary figure Richard needed to emulate, and given the fragmentation that was already plaguing his

¹³¹ William Cobbett, *The Parliamentary History of England, from the Earliest Period to the year 1803, Volume III: A.D. 1642–1660* (London, 1808), sig. 5Fr (column 1538). The speech is recorded in the diary of MP Thomas Burton, but as Cobbett notes, ‘There is no mention at all in the Journals of any Speech made to both houses by the Protector at this time’.

¹³² H[enry] Dawbeny, *Historie and Policie Re-viewed, in The Heroick Transactions of His Most Serene Highnesse, Oliver, late Lord Protector; from his cradle, to his tomb* (London, 1659; Wing D448), sigs. a3v–a4r.

¹³³ I am prepared here to read Dawbeny’s use of ‘princess’ to mean the feminine form of ‘prince’—that is, in medieval and early modern Europe a monarch or sovereign was referred to as both prince and king interchangeably. For instance, Elizabeth referred to herself as king, queen, and prince in her Golden Speech, and when it was published in 1659, she was also described in its preface as a ‘gracious Princess’. See: Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*, 2nd edn (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2013), p. 121. On the role of the Old Testament judges (and their modern-day equivalents), see: Joy A. Schroeder, *Deborah’s Daughters: Gender, Politics, and Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 4.

protectorate, this example could not have been more relevant.

Dawbeny's comparisons between Oliver Cromwell and Moses are also important. That neither Cromwell was compared to a monarch is unsurprising, showing both the thought that went into the assigning of typologies in the early modern period, and that different aspects of a biblical figure's story could be accentuated. Dawbeny, however, was not clear on *how* Oliver was like Moses (the thirty parallels are general rather than specific). The use of the 'Patriarch' epithet does suggest a familial focus—that is, England is a family, with Oliver at the head, which itself draws on the ideal that the family was a 'little' commonwealth.¹³⁴ He may also have been relying on the more recent use of the term to denote a 'founder', an applicable descriptor given that Oliver was largely responsible for the foundation of the Commonwealth, and was the first Lord Protector.¹³⁵

The pamphlet, which was dedicated to the new Lord Protector, also made use of the well-established trope of paralleling contemporary successions with ones from the Bible. In the dedicatory epistle, Dawbeny wrote that Richard, 'our Second Joshua', had succeeded Oliver, 'our second Moses'.¹³⁶ This sentiment was shared in sermons preached after Cromwell's death: on 13 October 1658, Samuel Slater preached that 'Moses, it is true, is dead, but we have a Joshua succeeding him, let us pray, that what the other happily begun, this may more happily finish, and bring the accomplishment of all your right-bred hopes'.¹³⁷ Likewise, Thomas Harrison, Oliver's chaplain in Dublin, asked

shall not the Israelites then mourne for a Moses? shall not wee mourne for our Moses? ... So the days of weeping and mourning for Moses were ended, And Joshua the Son of Nun was full of the spirit of Wisdome, for Moses had layd his hands upon him (and solemnly designed him for the Government) and the Children of Israel hearkened unto him, and did as the Lord commanded Moses.¹³⁸

¹³⁴ For instance, Robert Cleaver claimed 'A Householde is as it were a little common wealth, by the good government wherof, Gods glorie may be advaunched', while William Gouge wrote 'a familie is a little Church, and a little commonwealth, ... it is as a schoole wherein the first principles and grounds of government and subjection are learned: whereby men are fitted to greater matters in Church or commonwealth'. [Robert Cleaver], *A Godlie Forme of Householde Government for the Ordering of Private Families, according to the direction of Gods word* (London, 1598; STC 5383), p. 13; William Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties* (London, 1622; STC 12119), p. 18. See also: John Witte, Jr. and Justin J. Lattrell, 'The Little Commonwealth: The Family as Matrix of Markets and Morality in Early Protestantism', in *Spirit and Capital in an Age of Inequality*, ed. by Robert P. Jones and Ted A. Smith (New York: Routledge, 2017), pp. 3–21; and Margo Todd, 'Humanists, Puritans and the Spiritualized Household', *Church History*, 49.1 (1980), pp. 18–34. The term was popularised in the scholarship by John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), although other than quoting from Gouge in an epitaph, Demos does not discuss the concept.

¹³⁵ OED s.v., 'patriarch, *n.*', 4b. The first example the OED cites is from 1650.

¹³⁶ Dawbeny, *Historie and Policie Re-viewed*, sig. A4r.

¹³⁷ Samuel Slater, *The Protectors Protection, or, The Pious Prince guarded by a Praying People* (London, 1659; Wing S3968), p. 58.

¹³⁸ Thomas Harrison, *Threni Hybernici: or, Ireland sympathising with England and Scotland, in a sad lamentation for the loss of their Josiah* (London, 1659; Wing H916A), pp. 3–4. This is a different Thomas Harrison to the Major-General of the same name, who was one of the signatories of Charles's death warrant, and was the first of the regicides to be hanged, drawn, and quartered at the Restoration. Also, as the title of Harrison's published version of the sermon

Joshua succeeded Moses as the leader of the Israelites after the latter's death, so the parallel is logical, and as Knoppers has noted, invoking 'Moses and Joshua exemplified succession by appointment and merit, not simply by heredity.'¹³⁹ Like the analogies that gloss over David and Solomon's less-than-exemplary endings, these connections avoid mentioning the fact that Moses was never able to enter the Promised Land, and that it was Joshua who led the conquest of Canaan—perhaps alluding to Dawbeny's hopes for Richard's tenure as Lord Protector. While Oliver had assumed most of the trappings of monarchy by the time of his death, that Richard's succession was conceptualised in a similar way as the Elizabeth I/James VI & I succession emphasises both the important iconographic role such analogies played in the weeks after a head of state's death, and the legitimacy that such links could offer to the new ruler.¹⁴⁰ Like the pamphlets published at Charles's accession, Dawbeny's pamphlet was intended to be 'a little History of your most Renowned Father; who should it come to for Licence, Approbation, Countenance, and Priviledge, but your Sacred self, who are the Compendium of his incomparable Life, and the living Epitome of all his Perfections, and are growing up very speedily, to be as great a Volume.'¹⁴¹ Biblical analogies had been part of most early modern successions, but Dawbeny specifically invoked Elizabeth as Deborah here. While he compared the Oliver/Richard succession with the succession between Moses and Joshua, he still alerted his readers (and Richard, presumably), to the 'expresse' parallel between Elizabeth and Deborah. Elizabeth as Deborah the Judge was a precedent for the Lords Protector, with Oliver as Moses and Richard as Joshua accentuating the kingless-commonwealth with succession (supposedly) based on merit rather than hereditary right. These typologies made sense of a world turned upside down, emphasising the applicability of the past in the present. They combined both the recent past of Elizabeth's reign with the ancient past of pre-monarchical Israel to show that Richard's succession was merely the next part of God's plan.

Elizabeth Analogies between 1650 and 1659

In 1659, as Lord Protector Richard Cromwell's grip on power looked increasingly fragile, William Guild's treatise, *The Throne of David*, was posthumously published. Guild's printer

makes clear, he depicts Cromwell as a contemporary Josiah: 'But what a mercy is it to have a Josiah indeed, a Prince cordially studious of Religion and Reformation, whose heart akes and trembles for the Ark of God' (p. 6).

¹³⁹ Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell*, p. 137.

¹⁴⁰ Also in 1658, Thomas Mayhew figured the protectoral succession in much the same way that the succession from Elizabeth to James was depicted, writing after Cromwell's death: 'Thus warlike David gaine the Hebrew Crown, / And for Successor left a Solomon.' Thomas Mayhew, *Upon the death of his late highness, Oliver lord protector of the Common-Wealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, and the dominions and territories thereunto belonging* (London, 1658; Wing M1445A), p. 1.

¹⁴¹ Dawbeny, *Historie and Policie Re-viewed*, sig. A5v.

obviously saw the relevance of the unpublished manuscript, especially given that on 22 April 1659 Richard Cromwell had dissolved parliament. Even more tantalising is the fact that Thomason's copy of the pamphlet is dated 'May 28th', which is just three days after Richard resigned as Lord Protector. The end of another Lord Protector's reign was thus a key opportunity for reflection on England's political system.

Guild, who died in 1657, was a Church of Scotland minister, and had, in his retirement, increasingly reflected on the damage the Civil War had caused.¹⁴² While certainly a royalist, Guild seemed to take issue with rulers—both monarchical and republican—who cared only for their position and engaged in unjust wars. In his commentary on 2 Samuel, Guild offered King David as

A worthy example of a pious and prudent Prince, which serves to condemne them who for their own standing and preferment, care not to involve Kingdomes, and Commonwealths into most cruell warres, and to shed oceans of blood with the expence also of millions of Christian men's lives.¹⁴³

To Guild's mind, both Royalists and Parliamentarians were to blame for the bloodshed of the last two decades. But the reasons that David should be emulated are not restricted to the (curious) claim that he was not involved in 'cruell warres'. According to Guild, David's attitude towards religion was also worthy of emulation:

David in the first entry to his kingdome, takes in hand the abolishing of Idolatry and reformation of religion in Jerusalem, to teach all Princes and Magistrates the like practise to follow: this was commanded to Joshua, and who have done so, have ever prospered: as David, Jehosaphat, Josiah and Hezekiah, Constantine, Theodosius, Valentinian, and that late worthy Queen Elizabeth. And who have neglected the same have been punished, as the examples of the Idolatrous Kings of Judah and Israel can witness.¹⁴⁴

As had been the case throughout the Commonwealth, Elizabeth's reign was offered as an exemplary model. Like these biblical and classical monarchs, Elizabeth had been concerned with 'the abolishing of Idolatry' from the very start of her reign. Significantly, it is Elizabeth (not Henry VIII or Edward VI) who is remembered for the 'reformation of religion' in England—given Henry's many parallels with David, and Edward's various conflations with Josiah and Hezekiah, their omission is surely a deliberate decision. Elizabeth's reign, and particularly her defence of English Protestantism in the face of 'idolatrous' and expansionist Catholics, was an important part of both the last Tudor monarch's legacy, and the way that her reign was given contemporary relevance.

¹⁴² R.P. Wells, 'Guild, William (1586–1657)', ODNB.

¹⁴³ William Guild, *The Throne of David, or An exposition of the Second of Samuells wherein is set downe the Pattern of a Pious and Prudent Prince* (Oxford, 1659; Wing G2212), p. 210.

¹⁴⁴ Guild, *The Throne of David*, p. 108.

As this chapter has shown, the Regicide did not do away with the counsel that Elizabeth's reign could offer, and commentators invoked the life and legacy of the dead Queen during the tenures of the two Lords Protector. Both Oliver and Richard Cromwell were exhorted to emulate England's Deborah in order to successfully rule over the people of the Commonwealth with God's approval. Despite the Commonwealth's ostensibly republican government, the last Tudor monarch was viewed as a model that any leader should emulate. Commentators and polemicists believed that Elizabeth as Deborah (or as Daniel, David, Esther, or Solomon) was both relevant enough to deserve invocation, and suitably distant from the Stuart monarchs (as the emphasis on Deborah's non-monarchical role as a judge demonstrates) to be an example that both Cromwells could—and should—follow. The recourse to these favoured Old Testament figures during the Commonwealth is also why this chapter has emphasised that the concept (or doctrine) of providence had not, as Sharpe claimed, 'lost its edge'.¹⁴⁵

During the Commonwealth, Elizabeth seems to have been generally remembered positively, which partially explains her continued appearances. In addition to Oliver Cromwell, who himself referred to 'Queen Elizabeth of famous memory', commentators seem to have largely shared John Timson's view in 1654 that 'the memory of Queen Elizabeth in this Nation is blessed'.¹⁴⁶ Between 1649 and 1659, at least six pamphlets were published whose titles claimed to retell the history of Elizabeth's life and reign (or parts thereof).¹⁴⁷ Some of these were reprintings, such as the 1651 reissuing of Francis Bacon's *The Felicity of Queen Elizabeth*, and some were printed multiple times: Robert Naunton's *Observations on the late Queen Elizabeth* first appeared in 1641, and was reprinted in 1642 and 1650, before being reissued in 1653 with a woodcut portrait of Elizabeth.¹⁴⁸ In addition, many pamphlets used Elizabeth's reign as a point of reference—such as Andrewes Burrell's *A Declaration Discovering and Advising how Englands Sea Honour may be regained, and maintained as in the happy Raigne of Queene Elizabeth, of*

¹⁴⁵ Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England*, p. 196.

¹⁴⁶ John Timson, *The Bar to Free Admission to the Lords Supper Removed: or, A Vindication of Mr Humfrys Free Admission to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper* (London, 1654; Wing T1293), p. 155.

¹⁴⁷ The six pamphlets are: Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia, or, Observations on the late Queen Elizabeth, her times, and favourites* (London, 1650; Wing N252); *A Brief Narration of the Mysteries of State carried on by the Spanish Faction in England, since the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to this day for the supplanting of the Magistracy and Ministry, the Laws of the Land, and the Religion of the Church of England* (The Hague, 1651; Wing X2); *Papa Patens, or, The Pope in his Colours: B[e]ing a Perfect Relation of his bloody designs and practises ag[a]inst the Kingdoms of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, since the beginning of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1652; Wing P278); Francis Bacon, *The Felicity of Queen Elizabeth, and Her Times* (London, 1651; Wing B297); Dudley Digges, *The Compleat Ambassador: Or, Two Treaties of the Intended Marriage of Queen Elizabeth of Glorious Memory* (London, 1655; Wing D1453); and Francis Osborne, *Historical Memoires of the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James* (London, 1658; Wing O515).

¹⁴⁸ Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia: Or, Observations on the late Queen Elizabeth, Her Times, and Favourites* (London, 1653; Wing N253). The woodcut is a poor copy of the famous engraving by Crispin van de Passe the Elder from 1592. See: Roy C. Strong, *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 113.

Famous Memory,¹⁴⁹ and the 1651 reprint of Fulke Greville's *The Life of the Renowned Sir Philip Sidney ... Together with a short account of the maxims and policies used by Queen Elizabeth in her government*¹⁵⁰—or used Elizabeth's own words, such as the new edition in 1652 of Thomas Sorocold's *Supplications of Saints: A Book of Prayers and Praises*, which contained 'three Most Excellent Prayers, made by the late Famous Queen Elizabeth'.¹⁵¹ Elizabeth's life and reign was clearly of great interest to the people of the Commonwealth (whether as counsel or history), and this chapter has shown that Elizabeth analogies formed an important, yet understudied, component of this popular memory.¹⁵²

Richard's resignation as Lord Protector helped set in motion a chain of events that culminated in Charles II's restoration in May 1660. Between Richard's resignation and the Restoration, Elizabeth appeared in numerous publications. Of particular significance is that in late December 1659, Elizabeth's Golden Speech was reprinted for the first time since 1647.¹⁵³ This printing of the speech, which is unique in that it was printed as a broadside, rather than as a pamphlet, included a preface that clearly explained why the example of Elizabeth should be looked to:

the Majesty, prudence and virtue of this Royal Queen might in general most exquisitely appear; as also that her Religious Love, and tender respect which she particularly, and constantly did bear to her Parliament in unfeigned sincerity, might (to the shame, and perpetual disgrace and infamy of some of her Successors) be nobly and truly vindicated, and proclaimed, with all grateful recognition to God for so great a Blessing to his poor people of England, in vouchsafing them heretofore such a gracious Princess, and magnanimous Defendor of the Reformed Religion, and heroick Patroness of the liberty of her Subjects in the freedom and honour of their Parliaments; which have been under God, the continual Conservators of the Splendour, and wealth of this Common-wealth against Tyranny, and Oppression.¹⁵⁴

Elizabeth's speech to her last parliament was offered up as pointed critique for rulers—both

¹⁴⁹ Andrewes Burrell, *A Cordiall for the Calenture and those other diseases which distempers the Seamen. Or, A Declaration Discovering and Advising how Englands Sea Honour may be regained, and maintained as in the happy Raigne of Queene Elizabeth, of Famous Memory* (London, 1648/9; Wing B5970).

¹⁵⁰ Fulke Greville, *The Life of the Renowned Sir Philip Sidney. With the true Interest of England as it then stood in relation to all Forrain Princes: And particularly for suppressing the power of Spain stated by him. ... Together with a short Account of the Maxims and Policies used by Queen Elizabeth in her Government* (London, [1651]; Wing B4899).

¹⁵¹ First published in 1612, the 1652 edition claimed to be 'The 30[th] Edition'. The three prayers composed by Elizabeth are: the 'Prayer of Thanksgiving for the overthrow of the Spanish Navy sent to invade England, Anno Dom. 1558 [sic]', 'Queen Elizabeths Prayer for the success of her Navy, Anno Dom. 1596', and 'Queen Elizabeths Prayer for her Navy, 1597'. Thomas Sorocold, *Supplications of Saints: A Book of Prayers and Praises* (London, 1652; Wing S4705A), pp. 165–170.

¹⁵² While this is by no means an exhaustive search, it is revealing that an EEBO search restricted to the phrase 'Queen Elizabeth' between 1649 and 1659 returns 2593 mentions in 1047 pamphlets.

¹⁵³ Thomason's copy is annotated 'xber [December] 27 1659', the day after the reconvened Long Parliament assembled at Westminster. That this printing is called *The Golden Speech of Queen Elizabeth*, and claims 'This Speech ought to be set in Letters of Gold', is the origin of its ascribed name.

¹⁵⁴ *The Golden Speech of Queen Elizabeth to her last Parliament, 30 November, anno Domini, 1601* (London, 1659; Wing E528), p. 1.

monarchical and protectoral—who were guilty of not defending ‘this Common-wealth against Tyranny, and Oppression.’¹⁵⁵ The use of ‘Common-wealth’ in this broadside is likely deliberately vague: published around the time the Long Parliament was reconvened, it could refer to the republican-style commonwealth that England been for the past decade, or it could also refer to the general idea of the ‘common-weal’, or common good, which the monarch was principally responsible for preserving.¹⁵⁶ Either way, Thomas Milbourn, the printer, judged that it was the prime moment to reacquaint the English with Elizabeth’s speech from 1601.¹⁵⁷ As this chapter has shown, because of the ‘perpetual disgrace and infamy of some of her Successors’, it was the reign of Elizabeth that writers repeatedly turned to in order to counsel the Lords Protector. The recourse to Elizabeth’s memory suggests that the dead Queen was generally viewed as the supreme example of a providentially favoured and exemplary English ruler—a ruler that both kings and lords protector should emulate. Elizabeth’s memory, however, was inextricably bound up with the biblical figures with whom she was so often compared: during the Commonwealth, Elizabeth was held up as another link in the chain between the figures of the biblical past and the present. Elizabeth was remembered as a contemporary Deborah, Daniel, David, Esther, and Solomon, which meant that her life and reign could be used as counsel and critique for the Lords Protector. This counsel, however, took on particular importance during the Commonwealth. England’s existence as a republic was entirely unprecedented, and the Regicide had done away with a political system that had lasted almost a millennium. In an unfamiliar world, the life and reign of Elizabeth could serve as a source of familiarity and stability, and writers were able to make sense of a world that had been turned upside down by linking the Lords Protector with Elizabeth to both explain what the country had been through, and to conceptualise how to please God and retain His providential favour.

¹⁵⁵ Patrick Collinson, ‘Elizabeth I and the Verdicts of History’, *Historical Research*, 76.194 (2003), pp. 481–482. Collinson, however, incorrectly claims that excepting the 1679 version, the speech that was reprinted was ‘always just the bare text of the speech, without comment but for the queen’s engraved portrait’ (p. 481).

¹⁵⁶ See: Ethan H. Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 275; Steve Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, c.1550–1640* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), pp. 55–56; and David Armitage, ‘The Cromwellian Protectorate and the Languages of Empire’, *The Historical Journal*, 35.3 (1992), pp. 531–555.

¹⁵⁷ Virtually nothing is known about Thomas Milbourn. His royalist sympathies, however, are suggested by the royal favour he received at (and following) the Restoration; he printed at least two proclamations for Charles II, and one for James II, and he printed several ballads praising the accession and reign of William III and Mary II.

Conclusion

Elizabeth Analogies in Seventeenth-Century England and Beyond

In about 1675, Andrew Marvell wrote ‘A Dialogue between the Two Horses’—a biting satire on Charles I and Charles II. Both kings were depicted by equestrian statues, and the poem describes an imagined conversation between the two horses the kings sit astride.¹ The two monarchs’ difficult relationships with parliament, as well as the spectre of popery (both that which had supposedly led to the Civil War, and the Catholicism of Charles II’s heir presumptive, James, Duke of York), feature prominently.² Marvell was also concerned about Charles II repeating the mistakes of his father: ‘Tho Father and Sonne are different Rodds, / Between the two Scourges wee find little odds. / Both Infamous Stand in three Kingdoms votes, / This for picking our Pocketts, that for cutting our Throats.’ The dialogue ended with a reflection on how England used to be ruled, and a plea to return to the past:

Ah! Tudor, ah! Tudor, we have had Stuarts enough;
None ever Reign’d like old Bess in the Ruff.

That the pre-Caroline past was not far enough back to drawn example from is made clear when one horse asks, ‘when things shall be mended?’, to which the response was ‘When the Reign of the Line of the Stuarts is ended.’³ History was clearly in danger of repeating itself, and Marvell asserted that a return to the policies of Elizabeth was the only way to prevent the country once again descending into civil war.⁴

Marvell’s invocation of Elizabeth’s memory may not include a biblical analogy, but it is a neat way of encapsulating how the last Tudor monarch’s memory was viewed in the century after her death. Like many of the apologists, commentators, and writers analysed in this thesis, returning to the reign of Elizabeth, and emulating the example she offered, could solve, it was believed, virtually any contemporary problem or dilemma. This thesis has demonstrated that the memory of Elizabeth I was routinely invoked during the Jacobean, Caroline, and

¹ The statue of Charles I is at Charing Cross (it was hidden during the Commonwealth, and was put back on display in 1675). Charles II’s was at Woolchurch, in front of St Mary Woolchurch Haw—it was moved in the 1730s, and no longer survives.

² Annabel Patterson, ‘Andrew Marvell and the Revolution’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Writing the English Revolution*, ed. by N.H. Keeble (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 108–109.

³ [Andrew Marvell], ‘A Dialogue Between two Horses’, in *The Second Part of the Collection of Poems on Affairs of State* (London, 1689; Wing S2302), p. 5. The poem circulated in manuscript form before being published posthumously.

⁴ The dialogue ends with the horses hoping for a return to a kingless commonwealth. Charles I’s horse says ‘England, Rejoyce, thy Redemption draws nigh; / Thy oppression together with Kingship shall dye’, to which Charles II’s horse replies: ‘A Commonwealth a Common-wealth wee proclaim to the Nation; / The Gods have repented the Kings Restoration.’ It is possible to here detect a larger yearning for the governmental style of Elizabeth—after all, in the strictest sense, ‘Kingship’ excludes Elizabeth.

Commonwealth periods in order to critique, counsel, warn, and rebuke both the nation's leaders and the populace more generally. Many of these invocations of Elizabeth's memory took the form of an Elizabeth analogy, with the last Tudor monarch conflated with a biblical antecedent in order to suggest a divinely sanctioned course of action in the present.

Elizabeth analogies were an important part of Jacobean religio-political discourse. In the aftermath of James's non-ideal accession (according to the norms of hereditary monarchy), biblical analogies—especially ones that depicted the Solomonic James succeeding the Davidic Elizabeth—were used to present James as Elizabeth's legitimate successor. In doing so, commentators and apologists brushed away any potential legal issues surrounding James's claim, and instead presented the succession as another example of God's intervention in English history. As James's reign progressed, Elizabeth analogies were used to both emphasise England's providential favour (especially in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot), and to urge James to adopt a more militant form of (expansionist) Protestantism. Commentators expressed dismay that James was seeking a Catholic marriage for one of his sons, and that the King had failed to commit troops to defending Protestants in both Bohemia and the Palatinate. In expressing this dismay, writers often conflated the last Tudor monarch with a number of Old Testament figures (especially Deborah) to prove that God *wanted* England to intervene on the continent on behalf of Protestants, and that Elizabeth's reign showed that a Catholic marriage would be contrary to God's plan for England. No matter the crisis, it would appear that Elizabeth provided an example of how the situation should be handled.

During the reign of Charles I, when the threat of Catholicism was personified in the King's consort, commentators increasingly depicted England as the new Israel, with the English blessed to be God's new chosen people. This depiction, which remained potent through both the Personal Rule and the Civil War, expanded the relevancy of Elizabeth, with England's Deborah used to bridge the gap between contemporary England and the ancient past of the Old Testament. For a range of writers, Elizabeth had defended England from invasion, and represented an idealised version of religious reformation. Despite stymying a range of puritan reforms, in the context of Archbishop Laud and Charles's (perceived) popish sympathies, Elizabeth was held up as an example of providential Protestantism. Increasingly, Elizabeth's religious settlement was viewed as needing to be 'perfected' in the present, and puritans used the legacy of Elizabeth to push for the final vestiges of popery to be removed from the Church of England.

The view that England was a new Israel, and that Elizabeth represented a form of providential Protestantism, continued into the Commonwealth, with Elizabeth held up as an

example of religious reform. Despite the Commonwealth's republican-style government, Elizabeth remained a potent tool for commentators and pamphleteers who wished to impart advice and critique to the two Lords Protector. Elizabeth's widespread association with Deborah the judge seems to have had a particular utility in the Commonwealth: as a judge, not a monarch, Deborah not only was a typology of divinely favoured republican-like rule, but also legitimised a system of government ostensibly based on providential intervention, and not hereditary right. Just as Oliver Cromwell admitted that 'Queen Elizabeth of famous memory' provided an important example of good, godly governance, it seems that a range of commentators likewise recognised the utility of the typology of England's Deborah.

The Elizabeth analogies invoked between 1603 and 1659 all respond to specific contemporary concerns, and in doing so, they invoke Elizabeth's memory in different ways. Nevertheless, there are three key threads that can be found weaving their way through the Elizabeth analogies analysed in this thesis. The first was Elizabeth's conflation with England's Protestantism, and the providential way that England was freed from the 'tyranny' of Rome. This conflation was routinely brought to the fore when Protestantism was viewed as being under threat: whether this be at home, such as the 'danger' posed by a Catholic match for princes Henry and Charles, or Laud's 'popish' innovations; or abroad, when Protestants in Bohemia and the Palatinate were under attack. It is also visible in the various expansionist policies that Cromwell pursued during the Commonwealth. Elizabeth analogies generally perpetuated the view (either implicitly or explicitly) that England had been blessed because of its Protestantism, and it was therefore the duty of England's ruler to advance the cause of Protestantism at home, and abroad—just as Elizabeth had done. While Elizabeth analogies generally emphasise the intervention of providence that had allowed Elizabeth to ascend to the throne and to return England to Protestantism, throughout the entire period analysed in this thesis, Elizabeth's memory was also invoked to justify further religious reform. A variety of commentators claimed that England's reformation was 'incomplete' at Elizabeth's death, and that the final vestiges of popery still needed to be cleansed from the Church of England. Puritan writers increasingly co-opted Elizabeth's memory in the 1640s and 1650s to push for further godly reform, even though the Queen had made clear her disdain for puritanism. Increasingly, it was the imagined idea of Elizabeth as contained within the English Deborah typology that godly agitators used to support their argument.

The second thread is related to the first: Elizabeth analogies were increasingly tied up with virulent expressions of anti-Catholicism, with Elizabeth's many victories over, and deliverances from, 'wicked' Catholics conflated with Old Testament victories (like Deborah's

and Judith's) and deliveries (like Daniel's and Esther's). These victories and deliveries were routinely offered as irrefutable proof that God wanted England both to remain a Protestant nation, and to expand (and defend) Protestantism in the face of the 'wicked' Romish tyrants. That Elizabeth functioned as an icon of anti-Catholicism in the decades after her death is fairly well established in the scholarship: what is generally missing from these studies, however, is an acknowledgement that this anti-Catholicism was often expressed through Elizabeth analogies, and that these analogies were a particularly potent form of counsel and critique that writers believed England's rulers could not ignore.

The final thread relates to the applicability of the past to the present. As writers made explicit during James's reign, and continued to imply throughout the Caroline and Commonwealth periods, contemporary turmoil was often the result of the 'unthankfulness' of the English, which manifested in (perceived) divergences from Elizabethan policy; successful policies (such as the defence of England's Protestantism) were viewed as being favoured by God, which meant they should continue to be emulated in the present. The planned, and then actual, marriage of a Stuart to a Catholic princess and the 'popish' innovations of Laud, for instance, were key examples of this 'unthankfulness'. Increasingly, however, this divergence from Elizabeth's example was conflated with the poor relationship between England's rulers and their parliaments. James, Charles, and Oliver Cromwell were all criticised for their tempestuous relationship with parliament, with England's Deborah, and the associated typology of Deborah consulting with her estates for the good governance of the commonwealth, routinely invoked to show what the relationship with parliament should look like. Even though the historical Elizabeth at times also had a turbulent relationship with her parliaments, her government was viewed as being more consultative than that of her successors.⁵ This idealised view resulted in, and continued to feed, attempts to hark back to Elizabeth's reign—a desire perhaps best exemplified in the continued reprinting of the Queen's so-called 'Golden Speech' from 1601.

⁵ James and Charles's personal rules were the longest in England since Henry VIII's reign. When the Short Parliament assembled, MPs sought to prevent another period of personal rule by appealing to statutes from the reign of Edward III that stipulated that parliaments should be called annually (4 Edward III, c. 14; 36 Edward III, c. 10). When MPs debated their various grievances against Charles, John Pym claimed that 'The intermission of Parliaments have beene a true cause of all these evils to the Commonwealth'. Despite her sometimes tempestuous relationship with parliament, Elizabeth's longest break between parliaments was four years, and their frequency increased as her reign continued. It thus seems unsurprising that this example was appealed to, especially when combined with the Deborah typology. The depiction of Elizabeth as an idealised queen-in-parliament is an area ripe for further research. *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640*, ed. by Esther S. Cope (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977), p. 155. See also: Pauline Croft, 'The Debate on Annual Parliaments in the Early Seventeenth Century', *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 16.1 (1996), pp. 163–174 (although Croft incorrectly claims that James and Charles's personal rules 'had been the longest since the fourteenth century').

These three threads all characterise Elizabeth's post-Restoration memory. As an avatar of anti-Catholicism, an example of religious reform, and a precedent of consultative and godly governance, Elizabeth remained an icon that commentators and polemicists could draw on to counsel the restored Stuart monarchs. As I suggested in the Introduction, however, the Restoration seems to bring about a change in the way that Elizabeth is remembered, and one of the avenues of further research that this thesis has opened up relates to Elizabeth's religio-political memory post-1660. As John Watkins has observed, a variety of commentators and apologists hoped that Charles would restore the nation by basing 'his reign on sound Elizabethan precedents'.⁶ These 'precedents', following the Restoration, seem to be far more generalist and metonymic invocations of Elizabeth's memory. For instance, the 'Letter of Government', written just before the Restoration by William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, used the reign of Elizabeth to 'urgently and directly' influence 'the policies of the monarch'.⁷ For Newcastle, in order for Charles II to avoid the mistakes of his father and grandfather, the new King needed to emulate the 'astute manner of her [Elizabeth's] government', allowing England to return to the 'glory days' of Elizabethan England, which would result in 'Feastinge daylaye ... in Merrye Englande, for Englande Is so plentifull off all provitiones, that iff wee doe nott Eate them theye will Eate Use [sic], so wee feaste in our Defense'.⁸ One of the most striking aspects of Cavendish's 'Letter' is the explicit conflation of Elizabeth with the Elizabethan period, and the implication that the example she offered should be emulated in order that the crises of the Civil War and Commonwealth not be repeated. Newcastle's observations here emphasise a key difference between Elizabeth's memory pre- and post-Restoration. At the Restoration, Charles I (and even James VI & I to some extent) were acknowledged—not only in satires like Marvell's 'A Dialogue', but also by Royalists such as the Cavendishes—as bearing some responsibility for the crises that culminated in the Regicide and the Commonwealth, hence the need to go back further into England's past.

Newcastle's view was not isolated. In a sermon preached on 30 May 1660—'the day after his Majesties most happy, joyfull and Triumphant Entrance into London'—Anthony Walker, a loyalist clergyman, presented Elizabeth as an example of the 'happiest times' that Charles II should be emulating:

⁶ John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 108.

⁷ Claire Jowitt, 'Imperial Dreams? Margaret Cavendish and the Cult of Elizabeth', *Women's Writing*, 4.3 (1997), p. 389.

⁸ Jowitt, 'Imperial Dreams?', p. 390; William Cavendish, 'Letter of Government', in *A Catalogue of Letters and Other Historical Documents Exhibited in the Library at Welbeck*, ed. by S. Arthur Strong (London: John Murray, 1903), p. 226.

And it is obvious that for the most part, the longest reigns have been the happiest times, as David's, Solomon's, Augustus, Queen Elizabeth, &c. Therefore if you love the ease and safety of the people pray that such hazards may be rare and few, by the long continuance of them who sit upon the Throne.⁹

Elizabeth, who had been the contemporary embodiment of kings David and Solomon, was thus presented as the most recent English example of a divinely favoured monarch. Likewise, in a broadside ballad also from 1660 called *Englands Day of Joy and Rejoycing*, the author cited the example of Elizabeth's reign as an example of good parliamentary governance:

And now a Free Parliament doth sit,
with honour great, all men compleat,
To settle peace now in the land,
I pray to God they may prevail,
with fervent zeal: and not to fall,
... to maintain the good old cause,
As heretofore time hath been,
In Elizabeths days our maiden Queen,
For we no good laws have had,
This twenty years to make us glad.¹⁰

Crucially, the mention that England had 'no good laws' for twenty years rebuked both the Commonwealth and the MPs of the Long Parliament—meaning that Charles II's own father was not an example to be emulated.

Commentators in 1660, therefore, seem to be making a deliberate decision to return to Elizabethan England not only to help the new regime avoid the mistakes of the period 1603 to 1659, but also to prevent England ever descending into such turmoil again. Before 1660, Elizabeth was remembered as *an* example of good monarchical government; post-1660, Elizabeth was increasingly remembered as *the* example of good monarchical government. Using the work contained within this thesis, scholars could examine this shift, and provide analysis of both the continuities and changes visible in the way Elizabeth analogies were invoked before and after the Restoration.

Elizabeth analogies did remain an important part of religio-political discourse in the period between the Restoration and the so-called Glorious Revolution of 1688–1689—especially during the Exclusion Crisis (1679–1681).¹¹ Indeed, during the Crisis, Elizabeth was increasingly employed as an avatar of anti-Catholicism, whose reign was used a proof that

⁹ Anthony Walker, *God save the King: or Pious and loyal joy, the subjects duty, for their sovereign's safety* (London, 1660; Wing W303), p. 13.

¹⁰ *Englands Day of Joy and Rejoycing, or, Long lookt for is come at last, or, The True manner of proclaiming Charls [sic] the Second King of England, &c. this eighth day of this present May, to the ever honored praise of General Monck, being for the good of his country and the Parliament* (London, 1660; Wing E2955A), single sheet.

¹¹ On the use of Elizabeth's memory during and immediately after the Revolution, see: Tony Claydon, *The Revolution in Time: Chronology, Modernity, and 1688–1689 in England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), pp. 225–233.

God neither wanted England to have a Catholic monarch, nor that the nation should return to Rome. As Michael Dobson and Nicola Watson have observed, during the Crisis, Elizabeth was routinely depicted as ‘a non-Papist saint ... a figure for a unanimous national identification with the true Church.’¹² Such a view is visible in several of the Elizabeth analogies of the period. For instance, Benjamin Harris’s *The Protestant Tutor, Instructing Children to Spel and read English, and Grounding them in the True Protestant religio[n]* (1679) was an extremely popular Exclusionist tract that went to great lengths to describe the threat the Duke of York’s Catholicism represented. Harris included ‘A Little Book of Martyrs, Or, The History of the Kings of England, with an Account of the Cruelties exercised by the Pope and his Clergy’ in the pamphlet. Many of the examples were copied almost verbatim from John Taylor’s *The Booke of Martyrs* (1616, 1635; analysed in Chapter 3), showing not only that Harris was recycling already-existing anti-Catholic rhetoric, but also that Elizabeth was viewed as having a timeless relevance. The elegy on Elizabeth claimed:

The Almighty guards his Servants still.
And he at last did hear her sighs and moan,
And rais’d her to a high triumphant Throne.
This Royal Deborah, this Princely Dame,
Whose Actions made the World admire her Name,
As Judiths Fame was in Bethulia spread,
For cutting off great Holofernes Head;
So our Elizabeth bravely did begin,
To conquer and o’rthrow the Man of Sin.
She purg’d the Land of Popery agen.
She liv’d belov’d of God, admired of men,
She made the Anti-Christian Kingdom quake,
She made the Mighty Power of Spain to shake.¹³

To Harris’s mind, God had sent Elizabeth, and her reign was proof that England should never countenance a Catholic monarch. Similar sentiments can be found in James Salgado’s broadside ballad, *A Song upon the Birth-day of Queen Elizabeth* (1680):

Let Protestants with thankful hearts remember
This Royal day, the seventeenth [sic] of November.
This is the day wherein that Glorious Star
Did first in Englands Horizon appear:
When Englands Deborah drew her first breath,
Whose Life was life to Protestants, and death
To Popish Rebels ...
I mean Elizabeth, that Noble Queen,

¹² Michael Dobson and Nicola J. Watson, *England’s Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 71.

¹³ Benjamin Harris, *The Protestant Tutor, Instructing Children to Spel and read English, and Grounding them in the True Protestant religio[n], and Discovering the Errors and Deceits [o]f the Papists* (London, 1679; Wing P3843), pp. 115–116.

Who us from Popish Bondage did redeem.¹⁴

17 November was actually Elizabeth's accession day (her birthday was 7 September). Salgado thus conflated the rebirth of Protestant England with Elizabeth's accession. In both of these examples, England's Deborah was used to advocate for the Duke of York's exclusion, and to emphasise the favour England had received for its Protestantism. These are just two of the many extant post-1660 Elizabeth analogies, and understanding the way that they offered critique and warning to the restored Stuart monarchs is an avenue ripe for further research.

Elizabeth analogies also seem to be responsible—at least partly—for the long-lasting legacy of the last Tudor monarch in popular culture. The failed invasion of the Spanish Armada still holds a powerful place in the British collective cultural memory. As the frontispiece of Carleton's *A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercie* (Appendix 1) shows, England's Deborah was closely associated with the victory, and this association continued throughout the seventeenth century. In addition to those examples analysed in the preceding chapters (such as John King's in Chapter 2 and Samuel Clarke's in Chapter 4), a broadside from 1688 recounted how 'In 1588, The Spanish Armado invaded the Kingdom; the Design being no less than the Conquest of England; at which time Q[ueen] Elizabeth ... with a Masculine Spirit, like another Deborah, came and took a view of her Army.'¹⁵ Likewise, in a sermon by John March, preached in November 1692, but only published in 1699, readers were reminded how in recalling the reign of 'Queen Elizabeth, our English Deborah, we shall find Anger, and Wrath, and Rage enough'—perpetuated by Catholics—which was exemplified in 'the Invasion of 88, [which] proclaimed their Wrath and Malice to the full'.¹⁶ The image of Elizabeth as England's Deborah may only be familiar today in academic circles, but it is not difficult to see how the providential victory of the English over the Armada under England's Deborah morphed, as the decades went by, into the myth of British exceptionalism that still pervades British public discourse—especially in the aftermath of the 2016 Brexit vote.¹⁷

¹⁴ James Salgado, *A Song upon the Birth-day of Queen Elizabeth, the Spanish Armado; the Gun-Powder-Treason, and the Late Popish Plot* (London, 1680; Wing S373), single sheet.

¹⁵ *Queen Elizabeth's Opinion concerning Transubstantiation, Or the Real Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament; with some Prayers and Thanksgivings composed by Her in Imminent Dangers* (London, 1688; Wing E532), single sheet.

¹⁶ John March, *Sermons Preach'd on several Occasions, by John March, BD. Late Vicar of Newcastle upon Tyne. The last of which was Preach'd the Twenty Seventh of November, 1692. Being the Sunday before he Died* (London, 1699; Wing M583), pp. 74–75. On this analogy, see: Aidan Norrie, "'Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise, and Chaste' – Queen Elizabeth I's Biblical Analogies After Her Death", *Royal Studies Journal*, 2.2 (2015), p. 40.

¹⁷ See: Jonathan Charteris-Black, *Metaphors of Brexit: No Cherries on the Cake?* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), p. 67; Edoardo Campanella and Marta Dassù, *Anglo Nostalgia: The Politics of Emotion in a Fractured West* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 76–77; John Todd, *The UK's Relationship with Europe: Struggling over Sovereignty* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), p. 46; Oliver J. Daddow, 'Euroscepticism and the Culture of the Discipline of History', *Review of International Studies*, 32.2 (2006), pp. 319–320; and Jeremy Black, *English Nationalism: A Short History* (London: Hurst & Co., 2018), pp. 68–70.

The reflex-like recourse to biblical analogy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is not a part of contemporary political discourse—the rise of both constitutional monarchy and secularism have largely killed it off—but vestiges of the device can still be detected. The most obvious is the continued use of the Jezebel typology as a (predominantly sexual) slander against women.¹⁸ The use of the typology as a slander is not, however, merely confined to ‘high culture’: in ‘Drain the Swamp’ (2016), an episode of the satirical comedy slasher television series *Scream Queens*, a mother, who vehemently disapproves of her son’s new girlfriend, washes her hands of her son, telling his girlfriend, ‘He’s no son of mine. He’s all yours, Jezebel.’ The use of this typology is not that far removed from its use as a slander against a succession of female kings in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe. For instance, in his November 1586 speech urging that Mary, Queen of Scots, be executed in the aftermath of the Babington Plot, MP Job Throckmorton exhorted Elizabeth to act so ‘that Jezabel may lyve no longer to persecute the prophetes of God’.¹⁹ Likewise, Spanish soldier and playwright Cristóbal de Virués, in a tract published in 1609, railed against Elizabeth, describing her as an ‘Ungrateful Queen, unworthy of that name, / damned excommunicated Jezebel’ because of her Protestantism and persecution of Catholics.²⁰

Similarly, and in an example of the way that typologies could be used as a shorthand for attributes, the typology of the ‘doubting Thomas’—drawing on the story in the Gospel of John where Thomas the Apostle did not believe that Jesus was truly resurrected—still retains contemporary currency, even if the adjective ‘doubting’ demonstrates that an invocation of Thomas alone would not be sufficient for the point to be made.²¹

Biblical analogies have neither the power nor the pervasiveness in contemporary culture that they did in the decades after Elizabeth’s death. Nevertheless, as Michael Fabricant’s decision to associate Theresa May’s ‘deliverance’ from the 1922 Committee with

¹⁸ See: Janet Howes Gaines, *Music in the Old Bones: Jezebel Through the Ages* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1999), esp. Part Two, ‘The Eternal Jezebel’.

¹⁹ *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I: Volume II, 1584–1589*, ed. by T.E. Hartley (London: Leicester University Press, 1995), p. 232.

²⁰ Cristóbal de Virués, *Obras Tragicas y Liricas* (Madrid, 1609), p. 209v. Original Spanish: ‘Ingrata Reina, de tal nombre indina, / maldita Gezabel descomulgada’.

²¹ Some recent examples of the typology are: Tommy Wilkes, ‘European stocks gain on EU election relief and auto shares surge’, *Reuters*, 27 May 2019, <https://uk.reuters.com/article/global-markets/global-markets-european-stocks-gain-on-eu-election-relief-and-auto-shares-surge-idUKL8N23327M>; Muchaneta Chimuka, ‘Mask wearing a forgotten lot’, *The Herald*, 23 October 2020, <https://www.herald.co.zw/mask-wearing-a-forgotten-lot/>; Kristie Pladson, ‘Corporate Germany has a woman problem and the pandemic is making it worse’, *Deutsche Welle*, 26 October 2020, <https://www.dw.com/en/corporate-germany-has-a-woman-problem-and-the-pandemic-is-making-it-worse/a-55396602>; ‘With a mock delivery, Hawaii hospitals gear up for the arrival of COVID-19 vaccines’, *Hawaii News Now*, 5 December 2020, <https://www.hawaiinewsnow.com/2020/12/05/with-mock-delivery-hawaii-hospitals-gear-up-arrival-covid-vaccines/>; and Sam Waswa, ‘Let’s Not Lose Focus as We Await Covid19 Vaccine—Museveni’, *Chimp Reports*, 22 December 2020, <https://chimpreports.com/lets-not-lose-focus-as-we-await-covid19-vaccine-museveni/>.

the preservation of Daniel from the lions' den suggests, examples from the Bible still provide a useful frame of reference today. What Fabricant probably did not know, however, was that this analogy had a history in England that stretched back over 460 years to Elizabeth I's coronation procession, when the Queen publicly acknowledged that God had 'dealt as wonderfully, and as mercifully with me, as thou didst with thy true and faythful servant Daniel thy Prophet'—an analogy that helped to shape the Queen's memory in the centuries after her death.

Appendix 2

Pamphlets Containing Elizabeth Analogies, 1603–1659

This thesis has analysed a wide range of Elizabeth analogies that appeared in print between 1603 and 1659. While every attempt has been made to include as broad a range of materials as possible, the sheer number of examples I have located cannot be discussed in one thesis. This Appendix provides a list of all the pamphlets I have uncovered that contain an Elizabeth analogy, or somehow link Elizabeth to a biblical figure, and notes the biblical figure/s with which Elizabeth is associated. This list makes no claim to be exhaustive, although my search has been thorough. Only the first printing of a pamphlet is included, except when subsequent editions contain substantial changes or additions.

Titles with an asterisk indicate a pamphlet analysed in the thesis.

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
Burhill, Robert. 'A Panegyricall Invitatory to our excellent King, on the late visit of Elizabeth, formerly our Queen, to Oxford'. In <i>Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimae et beatissimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliae, Francia, & Hiberniae Reginae</i> [The Funeral Rites of the University of Oxford in Most Honoured Memory of the Most Serene and Blessed Elizabeth, Lately Queen of England, France and Ireland] (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018).	x													
* Clapham, Henoch. <i>Three Partes of Salomon his Song of Songs, expounded</i> (London, 1603; STC 2772).	x													
* Davies, John. <i>Microcosmos: The Discovery of the Little World, with the Government thereof</i> (Oxford, 1603; STC 6333).				x										
Etkins, Richard. 'To A Certain Person'. In <i>Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimae et beatissimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliae, Francia, & Hiberniae Reginae</i> (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018).	x									x				
* Fletcher, Robert. <i>A Briefe and Familiar Epistle, shewing his Majesties Most Lawfull, Honourable and Just Title to All His Kingdoms</i> (London, 1603; STC 11086).	x			x										
* Hayward, John. <i>Gods Universal Right Proclaimed. A sermon preached at Paules Crosse, the 27 of March 1603, being the next Sunday after her Majesties departure</i> (London, 1603; STC 12984).				x										
Higges, Nicholas. 'The Descent of the Heavenly Spheres in Order to Snatch Away Godly Elizabeth, The Most Serene Ruler, Queen of England, France, and Ireland'. In <i>Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimae et beatissimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliae, Francia, & Hiberniae Reginae</i> (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018).	x													

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
Holland, Thomas. 'On the Death of Elizabeth, Late Most Blessed Queen of England, France, and Ireland'. In <i>Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimae et beatissimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliae, Franciae, & Hiberniae Reginae</i> (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018).	x			x										
Johnson, George. 'Funeral Song'. In <i>Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimae et beatissimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliae, Franciae, & Hiberniae Reginae</i> (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018).		x		x			x	x			x			Melchizedek, Jonah, Elijah, Job
Lane, John. <i>An Elegie Upon the Death of the High and Renowned Princesse, Our Late Sovereigne Elizabeth</i> (London, 1603; STC 15189).	x				x									
Mavericke, Radford. <i>Three Treatises Religiously Handled and named according to the severall subject of each Treatise</i> (London, 1603; STC 17683a.5).	x								x			x		
<i>The Poores Lamentation for the Death of our late dread Sovereigne the High and Mightie Princesse Elizabeth, late Queene of England, France and Ireland</i> (London, 1603; STC 7594).							x				x	x		Lot
Rowlands, Samuel. <i>Ave Caesar. God save the King. The joyfull Ecchoes of loyall English hartes, entertayning his Majesties late arrivall in England. With an Epitaph upon the death of her Majestie our late Queene</i> (London, 1603; STC 21364).	x									x				
Thorne, William. 'Lamentation of Jeremiah'. In <i>Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimae et beatissimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliae, Franciae, & Hiberniae Reginae</i> (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018).	x													
<i>Weepe with Joy: A Lamentation, for the losse of our late Sovereigne Lady Queene Elizabeth, with joy and exultation for our High and Mightie Prince, King James, her lineall and lawfull Successor</i> (London, 1603; STC 7605.3).				x		x								

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
* Willet, Andrew. <i>Ecclesia Triumphans: That is, The Joy of the English Church, for the happie Coronation of the most vertuous and pious Prince, James</i> (Cambridge, 1603; STC 25676).	x													
* Yonge, John. 'Elisabethæ cum Davide Comparatio' ['A Comparison of Elizabeth with David']. In <i>Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimæ et beatissimæ Elizabethæ, nuper Angliæ, Franciæ, & Hiberniæ Reginæ</i> (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018).				x										
* Stoughton, William. <i>An Assertion for True and Christian Church Policy</i> ([Middelburg?], 1604; STC 23318).	x			x										
* Sutcliffe, Matthew. <i>A Full and Round Answer to N.D. alias Robert Parsons the Noddie his foolish and rude Warne-word</i> (London, 1604; STC 23465).	x													
Hutton, Thomas. <i>Reasons for Refusal of Subscription to the booke of Common praier under the hands of certaine ministers ... With an Amswere [sic] at Severall times returned them in publike conference and in diverse sermons upon occasion preached ... by Thomas Hutton</i> (Oxford, 1605; STC 14035).	x													
King, John. <i>A Sermon Preached in Oxford: the 5. Of November 1607</i> (Oxford, 1607; STC 14985).	x													
* Lever, Christopher. <i>Queen Elizabeths Teares: Or, Her resolute bearing the Christian Crosse, inflicted on her by the persecuting hands of Steven Gardner Bishop of Winchester, in the bloodie time of Queen Marie</i> (London, 1607; STC 15540).			x											
King, John. <i>A Sermon Preached in St. Maries at Oxford: the 24. of March being the day of his sacred Majesties inauguration and Maundie Thursday</i> (Oxford, 1608; STC 14987).				x									x	Gideon, Asa
* Gainsford, Thomas. <i>The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seventh, Concerning the Unitie of Great Brittain</i> (London, 1610; STC 11526).	x													

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
Draxe, Thomas. <i>The Christian Armorie: Wherein Is Contained All manner of spirituall munition, fit for secure</i> * <i>Christians to arme themselves withall against Satans assaults, and all other kind of crosses, temptations, troubles, and afflictions</i> (London, 1611; STC 7182).	x				x					x				
Rollenson, Francis. <i>Sermons Preached Before His Majestie. 1. The Bridegromes Banquet. 2. The Triumph of Constance. 3. The Banishment of Dogges.</i> (London, 1611; STC 21264).	x													
Leigh, William. <i>Queene Elizabeth, Paraleld in Her Princely Vertues, with David, Josua, and Hezekia</i> (London, 1612; STC 15426).	x			x		x		x			x			
Speed, John. <i>The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine</i> (London, 1612; STC 23041).	x			x										
Mason, Francis. <i>Of the Consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England: With their Succession, Jurisdiction, and other things incident to their calling</i> (London, 1613; STC 17597).													x	
Price, Daniel. <i>David His Oath of Allegiance to Jerusalem. The Sermon Preached on Act Sunday last in the morning, in St. Maries in Oxford</i> (Oxford, 1613; STC 20291).	x													
Price, Sampson. <i>Londons Warning by Laodicea's Luke-warmnesse. Or A Sermon Preached at Paules-crosse, the 10. of October, 1613</i> (London, 1613; STC 20333).	x													
Willet, Andrew. <i>A Treatise of Salomons Mariage, Or, A Congratulation for the Happie and Hopefull mariage betweene the most illustrious and Noble Prince Frederike the V. Count Palatine of Rhine ... And the most grations and excellent Princessse, the Ladie Elizabeth, sole daughter unto the High and Mighty Prince James, by the grace of God, King of great Britaine, France and Ireland</i> (London, 1613; STC 25705).													x	

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
* Norden, John. <i>A Load-Starre to Spiritual Life. Or, A Christian Familiar motive to the most sweet and heavenly exercise of Divine Prayer. With Prayers for Morning and Evening. Written to stir up all men to watchfulnesse and reformation of their carnall and corrupt lives</i> (London, 1614; STC 18612).	x													
Champney, Anthony. <i>A Treatise of the Vocation of Bishops, and other Ecclesiasticall Ministers</i> (Douai, 1616; STC).													x	
Taylor, John. <i>The Booke of Martyrs</i> (London, 1616; STC 23731.3).	x									x				
Price, Daniel. <i>Maries Memoriall. A Sermon Preached at St. Maries Spittle on Monday in Easter weeke being Aprill 1. 1616</i> (London, 1617; STC 20297).	x													
Daborne, Robert. <i>A Sermon Preached in the Cathedrall Church of the Citie of Waterford in Febr. 1617. before the Right Honorable the Lord President of Munster, and the State</i> (London, 1618; STC 6183).									x					
Favour, John. <i>Antiquitie Triumphant Over Noveltie</i> (London, 1619; STC 10716).	x													
King, John. <i>A Sermon of Publicke Thanks-giving for the happie recoverie of his Majestie from his late dangerous sicknesse</i> (London, 1619; STC 14983).	x													
* Taylor, Thomas. <i>A Mappe of Rome: Lively Exhibiting Her Mercilesse Meeknesse, and cruell mercies to the Church of God: Preached in five Sermons, on occasion of the Gunpowder Treason</i> (London, 1619; STC 23837).	x													
* King, John. <i>A Sermon at Paules Crosse, on behalfe of Paules Church, March 26. 1620</i> (London, 1620; STC 14982).	x													
Wither, George. <i>The Songs of The Old Testament, Translated into English Measures, preserving the Naturall Phrase and genuine Sense of the holy Text</i> (London, 1621; STC 25923).	x													
Taylor, John. <i>A Memorial of all the English monarchs, being in number 150 from Brute to King James in heroyicall verse</i> (London, 1622; STC 23773).	x									x				Susannah

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
* Rogers, Nehemiah. <i>A Strange Vineyard in Palaestina: In An Rxposition of Isaiabs Parabolical Song of the Beloved, discovered, to which Gods Vineyard in this our Land is Paralleld</i> (London, 1623; STC 21199).	x													
Camden, William. <i>The Historie of the Life and Death of Mary Stuart Queene of Scotland</i> (London, 1624; STC 24509a)					x					x				
Carleton, George. <i>A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercy</i> (London, 1624; STC 4640).	x													
Primrose, Gilbert. <i>Panegyrique a tres-grand et tres-puissant prince, Charles Prince de Galles</i> (Paris, 1624; STC 5027).													x	
Camden, William. <i>Annales: The True and Royall History of the famous Empresse, Elizabeth, Queene of England, France, and Ireland etc. True faith's defrendresse of Divine renowne and happy Memory</i> , trans. by Abraham Darcie (London, 1625; STC 4497).					x					x			x	
Herring, Theodore. <i>The Triumph of the Church over Water and Fire. Or A Thankfull Gratulation for that Miraculous Deliverance of the Church and State of Great Britaine, from the Romish Tophet [Hell]: or, that barbarous and savage Powder-plot</i> (London, 1625; STC 13204).	x													
* Horne, Robert. <i>The Shield of the Righteous: Or, The Ninety first Psalme, expounded, with the addition of doctrines and uses Verie necessarie and comfortable in these dayes of heavinesse, wherein the pestilence rageth so sore in London, and other parts of this kingdome</i> (London, 1625; STC 13825).					x									Jacob
Jerome, Stephen. <i>Englands Jubilee, Or Irelands Joyes ... for King Charles his Welcome</i> (London, 1625; STC 14511.5).	x													
Purchas, Samuel. <i>Purchas His Pilgrimes. In Five Bookes. ... The Third Part</i> (London, 1625; STC 20509).	x													
* Lever, Christopher. <i>The Historie of The Defendors of the Catholique Faith</i> (London, 1627; STC 15537).										x			x	

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
Purchas, Samuel. <i>Purchas His Pilgrimes. In Five Bookes. ... The Fourth Part</i> (London, 1626; STC 20508.5).	x													
Wilson, John. <i>A Song or, Story, for the Lasting Remembrance of divers famous works, which God hath done in our time</i> (London, 1626; STC 22922).	x													
Eedes, Richard. <i>Three Sermons Preached by that learned and reverend divine, Doctor Eedes, sometimes dean of Worcester, for their fitnessse unto the present time, now published by Robert Horn</i> (London, 1627; STC 7527).														Rebecca
[Sharpe, James]. <i>The Triall of the Protestant Private Spirit. Wherein Their Doctrine, making the sayd Spirit the sole ground & meanes of their Beliefe, is confuted</i> (Saint-Omer, France, 1630; STC 22370).														Jeroboam
Vicars, John. <i>Englands Hallelujah. Or, Great Brittaines gratefull retribution, for Gods gracious benediction In our many and most famous deliverances, since the halcyon-dayes of ever-blessed Queene Elizabeth, to these present times</i> (London, 1631; STC 24697).	x													
Rogers, Nehemiah. <i>The Wild Vine: Or, An Exposition on Isaiab's Parabolicall Song of the Beloved</i> (London, 1632; STC 21200).	x													
Adams, Thomas. <i>A Commentary or, Exposition upon the Divine Second Epistle Generall, written by the Blessed Apostle St. Peter</i> (London, 1633; STC 108).	x													
Rogers, Francis. <i>A Sermon preached on September the 20. 1632. In the Cathedrall Church of Christ at Canterbury, at the Funerall of William Proud, a Lieutenant Collonell, slaine at the last late siege of Masticke</i> (London, 1633; STC 21175).				x										
Ridley, Thomas. <i>A View Of The Civile And Ecclesiasticall Law: And wherein the Practice of them is streitned, and may be releevd within this Land</i> (Oxford, 1634; STC 21055.5).	x													

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
* Taylor, John. <i>The Booke of Martyrs. Wherein are set downe the names of such Martyrs as suffered persecution, and laid downe theire lives for witnesse-bearing unto the Gospell of Christ Jesus; drawne downe from the Primitive Church, to these later times, especially respecting such as have suffered in this Land under the tyranny of Antichrist, in opposition to Popish Errours</i> (London, 1635; STC 23732.8).	x									x				
Reynolds, Edward. <i>The Shieldes of the Earth. A Sermon Preached Before ... the Assizes holden at North-hampton</i> (London, 1636; STC 20932).	x													
Mason, Francis. <i>Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae; Sive De legitimo eiusdem ministerio, id est, de episcoporum successione, consecratione, electione & confirmatione; item, de presbyterorum, & diaconorum ordinatione</i> [On the Consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England] (London, 1638; STC 17599).		x											x	
Vaughan, William. <i>The Church Militant, Historically Continued from the Yeare of our Saviours Incarnation 33. untill this present, 1640</i> (London, 1640; STC 24606).	x													
Burges, Cornelius. <i>Another Sermon Preached to the Honorable House of Commons now assembled in Parliament, November the fifth, 1641</i> (London, 1641; Wing B5668).	x													
* Burges, Cornelius. <i>The First Sermon, Preached to the Honourable House of Commons now assembled in Parliament at their Publique Fast. Novemb. 17. 1640.</i> (London, 1641; Wing B5671).	x													
<i>Certaine Modest Observations and Considerations of the true Protestants of the Church of England</i> (London, 1641; Wing C1706).													x	
De La March, John. <i>A Complaint of the False Prophets Mariners upon the drying up of their Hierarchicall Euphrates. As it was preached publicly in the Island of Garnezey before a sett order of Ministers, expounding in their successive turnes the Revelation of St. John</i> (London, 1641; Wing L202).											x			

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
Jackson, John. <i>The True Evangelical Temper. Wherein Divinity, and Ecclesiastical History, are interwoven, and mixed, both to the profit and delight of the Christian Reader, and modestly, and soberly fitted to the present grand concerns of this State, and Church</i> (London, 1641; Wing J76B).	x													
<i>Leicester's Common-Wealth. Conceived, spoken and published with most earnest proestation of dutifull goodwill and affection towards this Realme</i> (London, 1641; Wing L969).	x													
* <i>Leycesters Ghost</i> ([London], 1641; Wing R1837A).	x													
Hill, Thomas. <i>The Trade of Truth Advanced. In A Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons, at their Solemne Fast, July 27. 1642</i> (London, 1642; Wing H2031).	x													
Rogers, Daniel. <i>Matrimoniall Honour: Or, The mutuall Crowne and comfort of godly, loyall, and chaste Marriage</i> (London, 1642; Wing R1797).	x													
Sclater, William. <i>Papisto-Mastix; or, Deborah's Prayer against Gods Enemies, Judg. 5, 31. Explicated and Applyed, In the Cathedrall of Saint Peter in Exon, November the fift, 1641</i> (London, 1642; Wing S919).	x													
<i>The Clergyes Bill of Complaint, Or, Submissive suite of one in the behalf of all the Orthodox and great Sorrow-suffering Church-men throughout England</i> (Oxford, 1643; Wing C4644).	x			x										
[Douglas,] Lady Eleanor. <i>To the Most Honorable the High Court of Parliament Assembled, &c. Samsons Legacie</i> ([London, 1642/3; Wing D2015)												x		
* <i>The Sea-Mans Protestation Renewed, Confirmed, and Enlarged</i> (London, 1643; Wing S2193).	x													
<i>Secrets Discovered. In Englands Complaint or Outcry against the High and Mighty Lords, the States Generall of the United Provinces, for their perfidious, deceitfull, and unthankfull proceedings against the welfare of this Kingdom</i> (London, 1643; Wing S2354).					x									

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
* Wilson, Thomas. <i>Jerichoes Down-Fall as it was presented in a sermon preached in St. Margarets Westminster before the honourable House of Commons at the late solemne fast, Septemb. 28, 1642</i> (London, 1643; Wing W2948).	x													
Saltmarsh, John. <i>Dawnings of Light: Wherein the true Interest of Reformation is opened in generall; and in particular, in this Kingdome, for the establishment of weaker judgements</i> (London, 1644; Wing S476A).									x					Asa, Ezra
Brinsley, John. <i>A Looking-Glasse for Good Women</i> (London, 1645; Wing B4717).	x													
Philalathes. <i>The Causes and Cures of an Unwilling Warre, Or, Justice awakened from Gownes to Guns</i> ([London], 1645; Wing C1535).	x													
* Hibernicus, Mercurio-Mastix. <i>A Muzzle for Cerberus, and his three whelps Mercurius Elencticus, Bellicus, and Melancholicus</i> (London, 1648; Wing M3166).	x		x			x								Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego
Philaethes, Hieron. <i>Mercurius Militans, with his Hags haunting Cruelty, and his Bays crowning Clemency; Historically suited to our long wished Peace</i> (London, 1648; Wing M1768).	x													
* Veridicus. <i>O Friends! No Friends, to King, Church and State</i> (London, 1648; Wing O14).	x													
Rainolds, John. <i>The Prophetie of Haggai, Interpreted and applyed in sundry Sermons by the Famous and Judicious Divine, John Rainolds</i> (London, 1649; Wing R143). [Thomason's copy is dated 1648]											x			
Resbury, Richard. <i>The Tabernacle of God with Men</i> (London, 1649; Wing R1136A).	x													
* Clarke, Samuel. <i>The Second Part of the Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie</i> (London, 1650; Wing C4556).	x		x	x										
Gerbier, Charles. <i>Elogium Heroinum: Or, The Praise of Worthy Women</i> (London, 1651; Wing G583).	x													
Fuller, Thomas. <i>Two Sermons</i> (London, 1654; Wing F2476).														Boaz, Ruth, Naomi
Leigh, Edward. <i>A Treatise of Religion and Learning</i> (London, 1656; Wing L1013).	x													

Pamphlet	Biblical Figure													
	Deborah	Abraham	Daniel	David	Esther	Hezekiah	Joseph	Joshua	Josiah	Judith	Moses	Samuel	Solomon	Other/s
* Ley, William. <i>Yperaspistes, Or A Buckler for the Church of England Against Certain Queries Propounded by Mr Pendarvis (late Lecturer of Wanting) called Arrowes Against Babylon</i> (London, 1656; Wing L1888).	x													
* Violet, Thomas. <i>Proposals Humbly Presented to His Highness Oliver, Lord Protector of England, &c. and to the High Court of Parliament now assembled</i> (London, 1656; Wing V585).	x												x	
* Swinnock, George. <i>The Gods are Men: Or, The Mortality of Persons in places of Magistracy. As it was Explained and Applied in a Sermon Preached at the Assize holden at Hertford for that county, on March 15. 1656/7</i> (London, 1657; Wing S6276).	x													
Symons, Henry. <i>The Lord Jesus His Commission (Under the Broad Seal of His Highnes the Royal & Real Lord Protector of Heaven and Earth) as Man, to be the alone Judge of Life and Death in the Great and General Assize of the World</i> (London, 1657; Wing S6360A).				x		x								Jehoshaphat
* Trapp, John. <i>A Commentary or Exposition Upon the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job and Psalms</i> (London, 1657; Wing T2041).	x		x	x	x		x						x	Job
* D, C. <i>Vindiciae Magistratum; Or, A Sober Plea for Subjection To Present Government. According to the Command and Special Direction of God Himself, in His Holy Scriptures</i> (London, 1658; Wing D12).				x									x	
* Dawbeny, H[enry]. <i>Historie and Policie Re-viewed, in The Heroick Transactions of His Most Serene Highnesse, Oliver, late Lord Protector; from his cradle, to his tomb</i> (London, 1659; Wing D448).	x													
Guild, William. <i>The Throne of David, or An exposition of the Second of Samuells wherein is set downe the Pattern of a Pious and Prudent Prince</i> (Oxford, 1659; Wing G2212).				x		x			x					Jehoshaphat

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Bodleian Libraries, Oxford

MS Carte 31.

British Library, London

Additional MS 4159.

Additional MS 22925.

Additional MS 34217.

Additional MS 37507.

Additional MS 44848.

Cotton MS Titus C VII.

Harley MS 39.

Harley MS 6090.

Lansdowne MS 38.

Lansdowne MS 822.

Lansdowne MS 865.

Royal MS 14 A XIX.

Cambridge University Library

‘A Discourse: Touchinge a Marriage Between Prince Henry of England and a daughter of Savoye’, Additional MS 9276, item 15 (no foliation).

MS Gg.III.34.

The Cecil Papers, Hatfield House Archives

MS 33/28.

MS 187/11.

MS 201/143.

MS 201/145.

Leeds University Library

Hester Pulter, ‘Upon the Imprisonment of his Sacred Majesty, That Unparalleled Prince, King Charles the First’, Brotherton Collection, MS Lt q 32.

The National Archives, Kew

SP 12/1.

SP 12/41.

SP 12/283a.

SP 14/2.

SP 14/67.

SP 14/113.

SP 14/187.

SP 16/2.

SP 16/106.

SP 16/474.

SP 16/481.

SP 16/482.

SP 16/484.

SP 16/485.

SP 16/486.

SP 16/488.

SP 16/506.

SP 16/515/1.

SP 52/40.

SP 94/23.

Printed Primary Sources

Adams, Thomas. *A Commentary or, Exposition upon the Divine Second Epistle Generall, written by the Blessed Apostle St. Peter* (London, 1633; *STC* 108).

Adams, Thomas. *Five Sermons Preached Upon Sundry Especiall Occasions* (London, 1626; *STC* 115).

Aristotle. *Physics*, ed. and trans. by P.H. Wicksteed and F.M. Cornford, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014).

Articles of Accusation and Impeachment of the House of Commons, and all the Commons of England against William Pierce Doctor of Divinitie and Bishop of Bath and Wells (London, 1642; Wing A3832).

- Augustine. *Confessions*, ed. and trans. by Carolyn J.B. Hammond, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016).
- Aylmer, John. *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjects, agaynst the late blowne Blaste, concerninge the Government of Wemen* (London, 1559; STC 1005).
- Bacon, Francis. *The Works of Francis Bacon, Volume 12: The Letters and The Life 5*, ed. by James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath (Cambridge, 1869).
- Barton, William. *The Choice and Flower of the Old Psalms* (London, 1645; Wing B1000A).
- Barton, William. *Hallelujah, Or Certain Hymns, Composed out of Scripture, to celebrate some special and Publick Occasions* (London, 1651; Wing B1002).
- Belchier, Dabridgcourt. *Hans Beer-Pot, His Invisible Comedie, Of See me, and See me not* (London, 1618; STC 1803).
- Bernard, Richard. *A Key of Knowledge for the Opening of the Secret Mysteries of St Johns Mystical Revelation* (London, 1617; STC 1955).
- Biondi, Francis, and Henry Carey. *An History of the Civill Warres of England betweene the two howses of Lancaster and Yorke* (London, 1641; Wing B2936).
- Burges, Cornelius. *The First Sermon, Preached to the Honourable House of Commons now assembled in Parliament at their Publique Fast. Novemb. 17. 1640.* (London, 1641; Wing B5671).
- Burges, Cornelius. *Prudent Silence: A Sermon Preached in Mercers Chappel, to the Lord Mayor and City, Jan. 14, 1648, shewing the great sin and mischief of destroying kings, deborting from taking away our late sovereign, and deterring all from like wickedness* (London, 1660; Wing B5677).
- Burton, Henry. *The Baiting of the Popes Bull* (London, 1627; STC 4137.3).
- Burton, Henry. *Israels Fast. Or, A Meditation Upon the Seventh Chapter of Joshuah, A faire Precedent for these Times* ([London], 1628; STC 4147).
- Calendar of Assize Records: Essex Indictments, James I*, ed. by J.S. Cockburn (London: HMSO, 1982).
- Calendar of Assize Records: Kent Indictments, James I*, ed. by J.S. Cockburn (London: HMSO, 1980).
- Calendar of Assize Records: Surrey Indictments, James I*, ed. by J.S. Cockburn (London: HMSO, 1982).
- Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, Volume 10, 1603–1607*, ed. by Horatio F. Brown (London: HMSO, 1900).
- Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, Volume 11: 1607–1610*, ed. and trans. by Horatio F. Brown (London: HMSO, 1904).
- Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, Volume 12, 1610–1613*, ed. and trans. by Horatio F. Brown (London: HMSO, 1905).

- Camden, William. *The Historie of the Life and Reigne of the most Renowmed and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth, late Queene of England*, trans. by Robert Norton (London, 1630; STC 4500.5).
- Carre, Thomas. *A Treatise of Subjection to the Powers* (London, 1651; Wing C640A).
- Caryl, Joseph. *An Exposition with Practicall Observations continued upon the twenty-seventh, the twenty-eighth, and twenty-ninth chapters of the booke of Job* (London, 1657; Wing C771).
- Caryl, Joseph. *The Saints Thankfull Acclamation at Christs Resumption of his Great Power and the initials of his Kingdome* (London, 1644; Wing C787).
- Cavendish, William. 'Letter of Government', in *A Catalogue of Letters and Other Historical Documents Exhibited in the Library at Welbeck*, ed. by S. Arthur Strong (London: John Murray, 1903), pp. 223–226.
- Cawdry, Robert. *A Treasurie or Store-House of Similies: Both pleasaunt, delightfull, and profitable, for all estates of men in generall* (London, 1600; STC 4887).
- Chamberlayne, Edward. *The Present Warre Parallel'd. Or, A briefe Relation of the five yeares Civil Warres of Henry the Third* (London, 1647; Wing C1846).
- Charlemagne: Translated Sources*, ed. and trans. by P.D. King (Lambrigg: P.D. King, 1987).
- Charles I [and John Gauden]. *Eikon Basilike* (London, 1648/9; Wing E269).
- Clapham, Henoch. *Three Partes of Salomon his Song of Songs, expounded* (London, 1603; STC 2772).
- Clarke, Samuel. *The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons in this Later Age* (London, 1683; Wing C4538).
- Clarke, Samuel. *The Second Part of the Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie* (London, 1650; Wing C4556).
- [Cleaver, Robert]. *A Godlie Forme of Householde Government for the Ordering of Private Families, according to the direction of Gods word* (London, 1598; STC 5383).
- Cobbett, William. *The Parliamentary History of England, from the Earliest Period to the year 1803, Volume III: A.D. 1642–1660* (London, 1808).
- Commons Debates, 1621*, ed. by Wallace Notestein, Frances Helen Relf, and Hartley Simpson, 7 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935).
- Commons Debates 1628, Volume III: 21 April–27 May 1628*, ed. by Robert C. Johnson, Mary Frear Keeler, Maija Jansson Cole, and William B. Bidwell (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977).
- Commons Debates 1628, Volume IV: 28 May–26 June 1628*, ed. by Mary Frear Keeler, Maija Jansson Cole, and William B. Bidwell (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978).
- A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Year 1783, Volume 1*, ed. by T.B. Howell (London, 1816).
- The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625–1660*, ed. by Samuel Rawson Gardiner (Oxford, 1899).

- The Copie of a Leter, Wryten by a Master of Arte of Cambrige, To His Friend in London* ([Paris?], 1584; STC 5742.9).
- Cornwallis, Charles. *A Discourse of The most Illustrious Prince, Henry, Late Prince of Wales* (London, 1641; Wing C6329).
- Cotton, John. *A Briefe Exposition with Practicall Observations Upon The Whole Book of Ecclesiastes* (London, 1654; Wing C6413).
- Craig, Thomas. *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England* (1602; London, 1703).
- D., C. *Vindiciae Magistratuum; Or, A Sober Plea for Subjection To Present Government. According to the Command and Special Direction of God Himself, in His Holy Scriptures* (London, 1658; Wing D12).
- Davies, John. *Microcosmos: The Discovery of the Little World, with the Government thereof* (Oxford, 1603; STC 6333).
- Dawbeny, H[enry]. *Historie and Policie Re-viewed, in The Heroick Transactions of His Most Serene Highnesse, Oliver, late Lord Protector; from his cradle, to his tomb* (London, 1659; Wing D448).
- De Loque, Bertrand. *Discourse of Warre and Single Combat*, trans. by John Eliot (London, 1591; STC 16810).
- De Salazar, Juan. *Politica Española* (Logroño, 1619).
- Decrees of the Ecumenical Council, Volume I: Nicaea I to Lateran V*, ed. and trans. by Norman P. Tanner (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990).
- Dekker, Thomas. *The Whore of Babylon* (London, 1607; STC 6532).
- Deloney, Thomas. *The Garland of Good Will. Divided into three parts: Containing many pleasant Songs, and pretty Poems, to sundry new Notes* (London, 1628; STC 6553.5).
- Devereux, Robert, Earl of Essex. *To Maister Anthonie Bacon. An Apologie of the Earle of Essex, against those which falsly and maliciously taxe him to be the onely hinderer of the peace, and quiet of his country* ([London, 1600]; STC 6787.7).
- The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford*, ed. by D.J.H. Clifford (1990; Stroud: The History Press, 2009).
- Die Mercurii: 5 Maii. 1641* (London, 1641; Wing E2609A).
- Draxe, Thomas. *The Christian Armorie: Wherein Is Contained All manner of spirituall munition, fit for secure Christians to arme themselves withall against Satans assaults, and all other kind of crosses, temptations, troubles, and afflictions* (London, 1611; STC 7182).
- Draxe, Thomas. *The Churches Securitie, Together with the Antidote or preservative of ever waking Faith* (London, 1608; STC 7183).
- Drummond, William. *The History of Scotland, From the year 1423 until the year 1542* (London, 1655; Wing D2196).
- Elder, John. *The Copie of a letter sent in to Scotlande, of the arivall and landyng, and moste noble marriage of the moste Illustre Prynce Philippe, Prynce of Spaine, to the most excellent Princes Marye Quene of England* (London, 1555; STC 7552).

- Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).
- Englands Day of Joy and Rejoycing, or, Long lookt for is come at last, or, The True manner of proclaiming Charls the Second King of England, &c. this eighth day of this present May, to the ever honored praise of General Moncke, being for the good of his country and the Parliament* (London, 1660; Wing E2955A).
- Erasmus of Rotterdam. *The Paraphrase of Erasm[us] Roterdame upon [the] epistle of sai[n]t Paule unto his discypyle Titus, lately translated into englysshe and fyrste a goodly prologue*, trans. by Leonard Cox (London, 1534; STC 10503).
- Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae, Volume I: Documenta hagiographica*, ed. by Paul Riant (Geneva, 1876).
- Fenwicke, John. *England's Deliverer. The Lord of Hosts Her Strong God, none like to Him* (Newcastle, 1651; Wing F721).
- Fletcher, Robert. *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle, shewing his Majesties Most Lawfull, Honourable and Just Title to All His Kingdoms* (London, 1603; STC 11086).
- Foxe, John. *The First Volume of the Ecclesiasticall History contaynyng the actes and monumentes of thynges passed in euery kynges tyme in this realme, especially in the Church of England principally to be noted* (London, 1570; STC 11223).
- Gainsford, Thomas. *The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seventh, Concerning the Unities of Great Brittain* (London, 1610; STC 11526).
- Garter, Bernard. *The Joyfull Receyving of the Queenes most excellent Majestie into hir Highnesse citie of Norwich* (London, 1568; STC 11627).
- Gibbon, Charles. *A watch-woorde for warre Not so new as necessary: published by reason of the disperced rumors amongst us, and the suspected comming of the Spanyard against us* ([London], 1596; STC 11492).
- A Godly Medytacyon of the christen sowle, concerninge a loue towardes God and hys Christe, compyled in frenche by lady Margarete quene of Nauerre, and aptely translated into Englysh by the ryght vertuose lady Elyzabeth daughter to our late souerayne Kyng Henric the VIII* (Wesel, 1548; STC 17320).
- The Golden Speech of Queen Elizabeth to her last Parliament, 30 November, anno Domini, 1601* (London, 1659; Wing E528).
- Goodman, Godfrey. *The Court of King James the First*, ed. by John S. Brewer, 2 vols (London, 1839).
- Gouge, William. *Of Domesticall Duties* (London, 1622; STC 12119).
- Gower, John. *Mirour de l'Omme (The Mirror of Mankind)*, trans. by William Burton Wilson, rev. by Nancy Wilson Van Baak (East Lansing, MI: Colleagues Press, 1992).
- 'Guibon Goddard's Journal', in *Diary of Thomas Burton Esq: Volume 1, July 1653–April 1657*, ed. by John Towill Rutt (London, 1828).
- Guild, William. *The Throne of David, or An exposition of the Second of Samuells wherein is set downe the Pattern of a Pious and Prudent Prince* (Oxford, 1659; Wing G2212).

- Hall, Joseph. *An Holy Panegyrick. A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse upon the anniversarie Solemnitie of the happie Inauguration of our Dread Sovereigne Lord King James, Mar. 24, 1613* (London, 1613; STC 12673).
- Hampton, William. *A Proclamation of Warre from the Lord of Hosts. Or Englands warning by Israels ruine: Shewing the miseries like to ensue upon us by reason of Sinne and Securitie* (London, 1627; STC 12741).
- Harington, John. *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown (A.D. 1602)*, ed. by Clements R. Markham (London, 1880).
- Harris, Benjamin. *The Protestant Tutor, Instructing Children to Spel and read English, and Grounding them in the True Protestant religio[n], and Discovering the Errors and Deceits [o]f the Papists* (London, 1679; Wing P3843).
- Harris, Malachi. *Brittaines Hallelujah Or A Sermon of Thanksgiving For the happy Pacification in Brittain* ([Hamburg], 1639; STC 12807).
- Harrison, Thomas. *Threni Hybernici: or, Ireland sympathising with England and Scotland, in a sad lamentation for the loss of their Josiah* (London, 1659; Wing H916A).
- Hastings, Francis. *A Watch-Word to all Religious and True Hearted English-men* (London, 1598; STC 12927).
- H[aydon], W[illiam]. *The True Picture and Relation of Prince Henry His Noble and Vertuous disposition, Containing Certaine Observations and Proofes of his towardly and notable Inclination to Vertue, of the Pregnancie of his Wit, farre above his Age, comprehended in sundry of his witty and pleasant Speeches* (Leiden, 1634; STC 12581).
- Hayward, John. *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed. A sermon preached at Paules Crosse, the 27 of March 1603, being the next Sunday after her Majesties departure* (London, 1603; STC 12984).
- Her Majesties most Princelie answeere, delivered by her selfe at the Court at White-hall, on the last day of November 1601* (London, 1601; STC 7578).
- Hering, Theodor. *The Triumph of the Church over Water and Fire* (London, 1625; STC 13204).
- Heywood, Thomas. *The Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine the most Worthy Women of the World: Three Jewes, Three Gentiles, Three Christians* (London, 1640; STC 13316).
- Hibernicus, Mercurio-Mastix. *A Muzzgle for Cerberus, and his three whelps Mercurius Elencticus, Bellicus, and Melancholicus* (London, 1648; Wing M3166).
- Hill, Thomas. *The Trade of Truth Advanced. In A Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons, at their Solemne Fast, July 27. 1642* (London, 1642; Wing H2031).
- The History of William of Newburgh*, in *The Church Historians of England, Volume IV, Part II*, ed. and trans. by Joseph Stevenson (London, 1856).
- Horne, Robert. *Of the Rich Man and Lazarus: Certaine Sermons* (London, 1619; STC 13823).
- Horne, Robert. *Points of Instruction for the Ignorant: As also, An Exposition on the ten Commandements, and the Lords Prayer, by Questions and Answeres* (London, 1617; STC 13824).

- Horne, Robert. *The Shield of the Righteous: Or, The Ninety first Psalme, expounded, with the addition of doctrines and uses Verie necessarie and comfortable in these dayes of heavinesse, wherein the pestilence rageth so sore in London, and other parts of this kingdome* (London, 1625; STC 13825).
- Howell, James. *A German Diet: Or, The Ballance of Europe* (London, 1653; Wing H3079).
- The Humble Petition of Richard Cromwell, late Lord Protector of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to the Councel of Officers at Walingford House* (London, 1659; Wing H3480).
- Hutchinson, Lucy. *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, ed. by Julius Hutchinson (London, 1806).
- Jackson, Arthur. *Annotations upon the five Books immediately following the Historicall Part of the Old Testament* (London, 1658; Wing J64).
- James VI & I. *His Majesties Speech in this last Session of Parliament as neere his very words as could be gathered at the instant* (London, 1605; STC 14392).
- [James VI & I]. *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus. Or, An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1607; STC 14400).
- Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 3, 1620–1628* (London, 1802).
- The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General in Ireland and Master of Requests, for the Years 1593-1616, together with Notes in another Hand, for the Years 1642-1649*, ed. by Harold Spencer Scott (London: The Royal Historical Society, 1902).
- The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, From the First Recess of the Long Parliament to the Withdrawal of King Charles from London*, ed. by Willson Havelock Coates (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942).
- Kaye, William. *God's Gracious Presence with His Highness Richard Lord Protector of Great Brittain and Ireland* (London, 1658; Wing K36).
- King, John. *A Sermon at Paules Crosse, on behalfe of Paules Church, March 26. 1620* (London, 1620; STC 14982).
- Lane, John. *An Elegie Upon the Death of the High and Renowned Princesse, Our Late Sovereigne Elizabeth* (London, 1603; STC 15189).
- Laud, William. *The Works*, ed. by William Scott (Oxford, 1847).
- Lelandi, Joannis. *Antiquarii De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea, Volume 4*, ed. by Thomas Hearne (London, 1770).
- The Levellers Remonstrance, sent in a letter to his excellency the Lord Gen: Cromwel: concerning the government of this commonwealth, his wearing of the crown of honour, and preservation of the lawes, liberties, and priviledges thereof* (London, 1652; Wing L2136A).
- Lever, Christopher. *The Historie of The Defendors of the Catholique Faith* (London, 1627; STC 15537).
- Lever, Christopher. *Queen Elizabeths Teares: Or, Her resolute bearing the Christian Crosse, inflicted on her by the persecuting hands of Steven Gardner Bishop of Winchester, in the bloodie time of Queen Marie* (London, 1607; STC 15540).

- Ley, William. *Yperaspistes, Or A Buckler for the Church of England Against Certaine Queries Propounded by Mr Pendarvis (late Lecturer of Wanting) called Arrowes Against Babylon* (London, 1656; Wing L1888).
- Leycesters Ghost* ([London], 1641; Wing R1837A).
- The Life and Death of Our Late most Incomparable and Heroique Prince, Henry Prince of Wales. A Prince (for Valour and Vertue) fit to be Imitated in Succeeding Times* (London, 1641; Wing C6330).
- [Luther, Martin]. *An Exposition of Salomons Booke called Ecclesiastes or the Preacher* (London, 1573; STC 16979).
- Lydgate, John. 'Henry VI's Triumphal Entry into London', in *Mummings and Entertainments*, ed. by Claire Sponsler (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2010), pp. 29–41.
- M., E. *Protection Perswading Subjection: Or A Word of Peace to the well-affected* (London, 1654; Wing M20).
- Maidstone, Richard. *Concordia (The Reconciliation of Richard II with London)*, ed. by David R. Carlson, trans. by A.G. Rigg (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2003).
- Manley, Thomas. *The Affliction and Deliverance of the Saints or, The whole booke of Job composed into English heroicall verse metaphrastically* (London, 1652; Wing M441).
- March, John. *Sermons Preach'd on several Occasions, by John March, BD. Late Vicar of Newcastle upon Tine. The last of which was Preach'd the Twenty Seventh of November, 1692. Being the Sunday before he Died* (London, 1699; Wing M583).
- Marten, Anthony. *An Exhortation, to Stirre up the mindes of all her Majesties faithfull Subjects, to defend their country in this dangerous time, from the invasion of Enemies* (London, 1588; STC 17489).
- [Marvell, Andrew]. *The Second Part of the Collection of Poems on Affairs of State* (London, 1689; Wing S2302).
- Mavericke, Radford. *The Practice of Repentance. Or, A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse, the fifteenth of September last passed* (London, 1617; STC 17682).
- Mavericke, Radford. *Three Treatises Religiously Handled and named according to the severall subject of each Treatise* (London, 1603; STC 17683a.5).
- Mayhew, Thomas. *Upon the death of his late highness, Oliver lord protector of the Common-Wealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, and the dominions and territories thereunto belonging* (London, 1658; Wing M1445A).
- Milton, John. *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (London, 1649; Wing M2181).
- The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly 1643–1652*, ed. by Chad van Dixhoorn, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- [Mulcaster, Richard]. *The Quenes Majesties Passage through the Citie of London to Westminster the Day before her Coronacion* (London, 1558/9; STC 7589.5).
- Naunton, Robert. *Fragmenta Regalia: Or, Observations on the late Queen Elizabeth, Her Times, and Favourites* (London, 1653; Wing N253).

- Nigellus, Ermoldus. *In Honor of Louis*, in *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: The Lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Thégan, and the Astronomer*, ed. and trans. by Thomas F.X. Noble (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), pp. 127–186.
- Norden, John. *A Christian Familiar Comfort and Incouragement unto all English Subjects, not to dismaie at the Spanish threats* (London, 1596; STC 18604).
- Norden, John. *A Load-Starre to Spirituall Life. Or, A Christian Familiar motive to the most sweet and heavenly exercise of Divine Prayer. With Prayers for Morning and Evening. Written to stir up all men to watchfulnesse and reformation of their carnall and corrupt lives* (London, 1614; STC 18612).
- Norton, Thomas. *To the Quenes Majesties poore deceyved Subjectes of the North Countrey, drawn into rebellion by the Earles of Northumberland and Westmerland* (London, 1569; STC 18679.5).
- Overton, John. *Jacobs Troublesome Journey to Bethel: Containing a Briefe Exposition* (Oxford, 1586; STC 18924).
- Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimae et beatissimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliæ, Francia, & Hiberniæ Reginæ* (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018).
- Parker, Henry. *The Exposition and declaration of the Psalme, Deus ultionum Dominus* (London, 1539; STC 19211).
- Parker, Henry. *The True Portraiture of the Kings of England, Drawn from their Titles, Successions, Raigns and Ends* (London, 1650; Wing P429).
- Parry, Charles Henry. *The Parliaments and Councils of England, Chronologically Arranged, from the reign of William I to the Revolution in 1688* (London, 1839).
- Pendarves, John. *Arrowes Against Babylon, or, Certaine quaries serving to a cleere discovery of the mystery of iniquity whereunto are added endeavours for reformation in saints apparrell: with some quaries for the people called Quakers* (London, 1656; Wing P1136).
- Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys, Volume 8: 1667*, ed. by Robert Latham and William Matthews (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).
- Peyton, Edward. *The Divine Catastrophe of The Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts: Or, A Short History of the Rise, Reign, and Ruine Thereof* (London, 1652; Wing P1952).
- Pius V. ‘Regnans in Excelsis’, in *Elizabeth I and Her Age*, ed. by Donald Stump and Susan M. Felch (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 2009), pp. 155–157.
- Plutarch. *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*, trans. by Thomas North (London, 1579; STC 20066).
- Price, Daniel. *David His Oath of Allegiance to Jerusalem. The Sermon Preached on Act Sunday last in the morning, in St. Maries in Oxford* (Oxford, 1613; STC 20291).
- Price, Sampson. *Londons Warning by Laodicea’s Luke-warmnesse. Or A Sermon Preached at Paules-crosse, the 10. of October, 1613* (London, 1613; STC 20333).
- Proceedings and Debates of the House of Commons in 1620 and 1621*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1766).
- Proceedings in Parliament, 1610: Volume 2, House of Commons*, ed. by Elizabeth Read Foster (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966).

- Proceedings in the Opening Session of the Long Parliament, House of Commons: Volume 1, 3 November–19 December 1640*, ed. by Maija Jansson (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2000).
- Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I: Volume II, 1584–1589*, ed. by T.E. Hartley (London: Leicester University Press, 1995).
- Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640*, ed. by Esther S. Cope, with Willson H. Coates (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977).
- A Proclamation Against Excesse of Lavish and Licentious Speech of Matters of State* (London, 1620; STC 8649).
- A Proclamation Commanding all Jesuits, Seminaries, and other Priests, to Depart the Realme by a Day Appointed* (London, 1604; STC 8343).
- A Proclamation for a Generall Fast Thorowout [sic] this Realme of England* (London, 1641/2; Wing C2582).
- A Proclamation for the Suppressing of Seditious Bookes and Libelles* (London, 1584; STC 8146).
- A Proclamation Signifying His Majesties Pleasure for Dissolving the Parliament* (London, 1610; STC 8452).
- The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. by John Nichols, 3 vols (London, 1823).
- The Poores Lamentation for the Death of our late dread Sovereigne the High and Mightie Princesse Elizabeth, late Queene of England, France and Ireland* (London, 1603; STC 7594).
- The Private Journals of the Long Parliament: 3 January to 5 March 1642*, ed. by Wilson H. Coates, Anne Steele Young, and Vernon F. Snow (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982).
- Prynne, William. *Canterburies Doome* (London, 1646; Wing P3917).
- Prynne, William. *Hidden Workes of Darkenes Brought to Publike Light, Or, A Necessary Introduction to the History of the Archbishop of Canterburie's triall* (London, 1645; Wing P3973).
- Purnell, Robert. *A Little Cabinet Richly Stored with all sorts of Heavenly Varieties, and Soul-reviving Influences* (London, 1657; Wing P4237).
- Queen Elizabeth I: Selected Works*, ed. by Steven W. May (New York: Washington Square Press, 2004).
- Queen Elizabeth's Opinion concerning Transubstantiation, Or the Real Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament; with some Prayers and Thanksgivings composed by Her in Imminent Dangers* (London, 1688; Wing E532).
- Queene Elizabeths Speech to her Last Parliament* ([London], [1628]; STC 7579).
- Queene Elizabeths Speech to her Last Parliament* (London, 1642; Wing E534).
- 'Queen Elizabeth's Visit to the University of Oxford, 31 August–6 September 1566', ed. and trans. by Sarah Knight, in *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources, Volume 1: 1533 to 1571*, ed. by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 466–672.

- The Responsa Scholarum of the English College, Rome. Part One: 1598–1621*, ed. by Anthony Kenny (Bromley: Catholic Record Society, 1962).
- [Reynolds, John]. *Vox Coeli, or Newes from Heaven* ([London], 1624; STC 20946.4).
- Richardson, Samuel. *Plain Dealing: Or the unvailing of the opposers of the present government and governors* (London, 1653; Wing R1412).
- Rogers, Nehemiah. *A Strange Vineyard in Palaestina: In An R^xposition of Isaiahs Parabolical Song of the Beloved, discovered, to which Gods Vineyard in this our Land is Paralleld* (London, 1623; STC 21199).
- Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections from the Year 1638 to the Year 1641. Abridg'd and Improv'd. Volume 3* (London, 1706).
- Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters in Law, Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments, Volume 1* (London, 1721).
- Rutherford, Samuel. *Lex, Rex: The Law and the Prince. A Dispute for the just Prerogative of King and People* (London, 1644; Wing R2386).
- Salgado, James. *A Song upon the Birth-day of Queen Elizabeth, the Spanish Armado; the Gun-Powder-Treason, and the Late Popish Plot* ([London, 1680]; Wing S373).
- The Sanctity of Louis IX: Early Lives of Saint Louis by Geoffrey of Beaulieu and William of Chartres*, trans. by Larry F. Field, ed. by M. Cecilia Gaposchkin and Sean L. Field (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014).
- Saunders, Richard. *Plenary possession makes a lawfull power: or Subjection to powers that are in being proved to be lawfull and necessary* (London, 1651; Wing S756).
- The Sea-Mans Protestation Renewed, Confirmed, and Enlarged* (London, 1643; Wing S2193).
- The Seamans Protestation. Concerning, Their Ebbing and Flowing to and from The Parliament House, at Westminster* (London, 1642; Wing S2191).
- [Sharpe, James]. *The Triall of the Protestant Private Spirit. Wherein Their Doctrine, making the sayd Spirit the sole ground and meanes of their Beliefe, is confuted* (Saint-Omer, 1630; STC 22370).
- Slater, Samuel. *The Protectors Protection, or, The Pious Prince guarded by a Praying People* (London, 1659; Wing S3968).
- A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation, and Defence of Religion, the Honour and Happinesse of the King, and the Peace and Safety of the three Kingdomes of Scotland, England, and Ireland* (Edinburgh, 1643; Wing S4447A).
- A Solemn Warning To all Members of this Kirk, From the Commission of the Generall Assemblie* (Aberdeen, 1651; Wing C4269).
- Some, Robert. *A Godly Treatise containing and deciding certaine questions, mooved of late in London and other places, touching the Ministerie, Sacraments, and Church* (London, 1588; STC 22909).
- Sorocold, Thomas. *Supplications of Saints: A Book of Prayers and Praises* (London, 1652; Wing S4705A).

- Spittlehouse, John. *A Warning-piece Discharged: Or, Certain Intelligence Communicated to His Excellencie the Lord General Cromwel, with all the real and cordial officers and souldiers under his command* (London, 1653; Wing S5016).
- Stoughton, William. *An Assertion for True and Christian Church Policy* ([Middelburg?], 1604; STC 23318).
- Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603–1625*, ed. by James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).
- Sutcliffe, Matthew. *A Ful and Round Answer to N.D. alias Robert Parsons the Noddie his foolish and rude Warne-word* (London, 1604; STC 23465).
- Svenska Riksdagsakter Jämte andra handlingar som böra till statsförfattnings historia under tidehvarfvet, 1521-1718*, ed. by Emil Hildebrand and Oscar Alin (Stockholm, 1887).
- Swedish Diplomats at Cromwell's Court, 1655–1656: The Missions of Peter Julius Coyet and Christer Bonde*, ed. and trans. by Michael Roberts (London: Royal Historical Society, 1988).
- Swinnock, George. *The Gods are Men: Or, The Mortality of Persons in places of Magistracy. As it was Explained and Applied in a Sermon Preached at the Assize holden at Hertford for that county, on March 15. 1656/7* (London, 1657; Wing S6276).
- [Swinnock, George]. *The Life and Death of Mr. Tho[mas]. Wilson, Minister of Maidstone, in the county of Kent, M.A.* (London, 1672; Wing S6277).
- Taylor, Francis. *Selfe-Satisfaction Occasionally taught the Citizēns in the Lecture as St. Magnes neere London-bridge* (London, 1633; STC 23717).
- Taylor, John. *The Booke of Martyrs. Wherein are set downe the names of such Martyrs as suffered persecution, and laid downe their lives for witnesse-bearing unto the Gospell of Christ Jesus; drawne downe from the Primitive Church, to these later times, especially respecting such as have suffered in this Land under the tyranny of Antichrist, in opposition to Popish Errours* (London, 1635; STC 23732.8).
- Taylor, Thomas. *A Mappe of Rome: Lively Exhibiting Her Mercilesse Meeknesse, and cruell mercies to the Church of God: Preached in five Sermons, on occasion of the Gunpowder Treason* (London, 1619; STC 23837).
- 'Thanksgivings for the Defeat of the Spaniards', ed. by Lawrence Green and Alexander Samson, in *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources, Volume 3: 1579 to 1595*, ed. by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 424–425.
- Thorne, William. 'לירמיה קינה' [Lamentation of Jeremiah], in *Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimae et beatissimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliae, Francia, & Hiberniae Reginae* (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018), pp. 171–172.
- Thorne, William. 'Lamentation of Jeremiah', ed. by Felicity Henderson and Lawrence Green, trans. by Martin Brooke and Dana Sutton, in *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources, Volume IV: 1596 to 1603*, ed. by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 723–724.

- Timson, John. *The Bar to Free Admission to the Lords Supper Removed: or, A Vindication of Mr Humfreys Free Admission to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper* (London, 1654; Wing T1293).
- The Transcript of Registers of the United Parishes of St Mary Woolnoth and St Mary Woolchurch Haw in the City of London, from their Commencement 1538 to 1760*, ed. by J.M.S. Brooke and A.W.C. Hallen (London, 1886).
- Trapnel, Anna. *The Cry of a Stone* (London, 1654; Wing T2031).
- Trapp, John. *A Clavis to the Bible. Or A new comment upon the Pentateuch* (London, 1649; Wing T2038).
- Trapp, John. *A Commentary or Exposition Upon the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job and Psalms* (London, 1657; Wing T2041).
- Van der Noot, Jan. *A Theatre wherein be represented as wel the miseries and calamities that follow the voluptuous Worldlings, As also the greate joyes and plesures which the faithfull do enjoy* (London, 1569; STC 18602).
- Vennard, Richard. *The Right Way to Heaven: And the true testimonie of a faithfull and loyal subject* (London, 1601; BL shelfmark C.53.c.12).
- Veridicus. *O Friends! No Friends, to King, Church and State* (London, 1648; Wing O14).
- Vicars, John. *Englands Hallelujah. Or, Great Brittaines gratefull retribution, for Gods gracious benediction In our many and most famous deliverances, since the halcyon-dayes of ever-blessed Queene Elizabeth, to these present times* (London, 1631; STC 24697).
- Vicars, John. *Englands Remembrancer, or, A thankfull acknowledgement of Parliamentary mercies our English-nation wherein is contained a breife enumeration of all, or the most of Gods free favours and choise blessings multiplied on us since this Parliament first began* (London, 1641; Wing V303).
- Vicars, John. *Magnalia Dei Anglicana. Or, Englands Parliamentary Chronicle* (London, 1646; Wing V319).
- Violet, Thomas. *Proposals Humbly Presented to His Highness Oliver, Lord Protector of England, &c. and to the High Court of Parliament now assembled* (London, 1656; Wing V585).
- Virués, Cristóbal de. *Obras Tragicas y Liricas* (Madrid, 1609).
- Walker, Anthony. *God Save the King: Or Pious and Loyal Joy, The subjects Duty, for their Sovereign's Safety* (London, 1660; Wing W303).
- Weepe with Joy: A Lamentation, for the losse of our late Sovereigne Lady Queene Elizabeth, with joy and exultation for our High and Mightie Prince, King James, her lineall and lawfull Successor* (London, 1603; STC 7605.3).
- Westfield, Thomas. *Englands Face In Israels Glasse: Or, The Sinnes of both Nations, The Mercies of both Nations, The Judgements of both Nations; Delivered in eight Sermons* (London, 1646; Wing W1416).
- Whitelocke, Bulstrode. *A Journal of the Swedish Embassy in the years 1653 and 1654*, ed. by Charles Morton, 2 vols (London, 1855).
- Willet, Andrew. *Ecclesia Triumphans: That is, The Joy of the English Church, for the happie Coronation of the most vertuous and pious Prince, James* (Cambridge, 1603; STC 25676).

- Williams, John. *Great Britains Salomon: A Sermon Preached at the Magnificent Funerall, of the most high and mighty King, James, the late King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, defender of the Faith* (London, 1625; STC 25723).
- Wilson, Arthur. *The History of Great Britain, Being the Life and Reign of King James the First, Relating To what passed from his first Access to the Crown, till his Death* (London, 1653; Wing W2888).
- Wilson, Thomas. *Jerichoes Down-Fall as it was presented in a sermon preached in St. Margarets Westminster before the honourable House of Commons at the late solemne fast, Septemb. 28, 1642* (London, 1643; Wing W2948).
- Wither, George. *Britain's Remembrancer* (London, 1628; STC 25899).
- The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume II, The Commonwealth, 1649–1653*, ed. by Wilbur Cortez Abbott (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939).
- The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume III, The Protectorate, 1653–1655*, ed. by Wilbur Cortez Abbott (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1945).
- The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: Volume IV, The Protectorate, 1655–1658*, ed. by Wilbur Cortez Abbott (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947).
- Yonge, John. 'A Comparison of Elizabeth with David', trans. by Martin Brooke and Dana Sutton, in *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources, Volume 4: 1596–1603*, ed. by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 660–661.
- Yonge, John. 'Elisabethæ cum Davide Comparatio', in *Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimæ et beatissimæ Elizabethæ, nuper Angliæ, Franciæ, & Hiberniæ Reginæ* (Oxford, 1603; STC 19018), pp. 108–109.

Secondary Sources

- Alford, Stephen. *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558–1569* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Anglo, Sydney. *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992).
- Atherton, Ian. 'Sidney, Robert, second earl of Leicester (1595–1677)', ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/25525.
- Axton, Marie. *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977).
- Bailey, Rebecca A. *Staging the Old Faith: Queen Henrietta Maria and the Theatre of Caroline England, 1625–1642* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009).
- Barlow, Frank. *Edward the Confessor* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).
- Barnwell, P.S. 'Einhard, Louis the Pious and Childeric III', *Historical Research*, 78.200 (2005), pp. 129–139.
- Baron, S.A. 'Gainsford, Thomas (bap. 1566, d. 1624)', ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/10284.

- Ben-Tsur, Dalia. 'Early Ramifications of Theatrical Iconoclasm: The Conversion of Catholic Biblical Plays into Protestant Drama', *Partial Answers*, 3.1 (2005), pp. 43–56.
- Blackburn, Ruth H. *Biblical Drama Under the Tudors* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971).
- Boys, Jayne E.E. *London's News Press and the Thirty Years War* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011).
- Brading, D.A. *Mexican Phoenix: Our Lady of Guadalupe; Image and Tradition Across Five Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Bradley, E.T., rev. by Stephen Wright. 'Horne, Robert (1564/5–1640)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/13793.
- Breed, Brennan. 'Reception of the Psalms: The Example of Psalm 91', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Psalms*, ed. by William P. Brown (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 297–310.
- Brod, Manfred. 'Pendarves, John (1622/3–1656)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/21830.
- Brownlee, Victoria. *Biblical Readings and Literary Writings in Early Modern England, 1558–1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).
- Brownlee, Victoria, and Laura Gallagher. 'Introduction: Discovering Biblical Women in Early Modern Literary Culture, 1550–1700', in *Biblical Women in Early Modern Literary Culture, 1550–1700*, ed. by Victoria Brownlee and Laura Gallagher (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), pp. 1–21.
- Capp, Bernard. *The World of John Taylor the Water-Poet, 1578–1653* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- Carlson, Christina Marie. 'The Rhetoric of Providence: Thomas Middleton's *A Game at Chess* (1624) and Seventeenth-Century Political Engraving', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 67.4 (2014), pp. 1226–1264.
- Carlton, Charles. *Archbishop William Laud* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987).
- Carlyle, E.I., rev. by Stephen Wright, 'Swinnock, George (c.1627–1673)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/26845.
- Chovanec, Kevin. 'The British Pharaoh?: James I and VI and Internationalist Religious Writing at the Wedding of Friedrich V and Elizabeth Stuart', *The Seventeenth Century*, 30.4 (2015), pp. 391–409.
- Christina, Queen of Sweden: A Personality of European Civilisation*, ed. by Per Bjurström, trans. by Patrick Hort and Roger Tanner (Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1966).
- Clarke, Elizabeth. *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- Coffey, John. 'England's Exodus: The Civil War as a War of Deliverance', in *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*, ed. by Charles W.A. Prior and Glenn Burgess (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 253–280.
- Coffey, John. *Exodus and Liberation: Deliverance Politics from John Calvin to Martin Luther King Jr.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

- Coffey, John. *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558–1689* (Harlow: Longman, 2000).
- Cogswell, Thomas. *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Cogswell, Thomas. ‘A Low Road to Extinction? Supply and Redress of Grievances in the Parliaments of the 1620s’, *The Historical Journal*, 33.2 (1990), pp. 283–303.
- Cogswell, Thomas. ‘Thomas Middleton and the Court, 1624: *A Game at Chess* in Context’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 47.4 (1984), pp. 273–288.
- Colclough, David. *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Collins, Jeffrey R. ‘The Church Settlement of Oliver Cromwell’, *History*, 87.285 (2002), pp. 18–40.
- Collinson, Patrick. ‘Elizabeth I and the Verdicts of History’, *Historical Research*, 76.194 (2003), pp. 469–491.
- Collinson, Patrick. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (1967; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).
- Coope, Ursula. *Time for Aristotle: ‘Physics’ IV.10–14* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).
- Cope, Esther S. ‘Compromise in Early Stuart Parliaments: The Case of the Short Parliament of 1640’, *Albion*, 9.2 (1977), pp. 135–145.
- Corser, Thomas. *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica: Or A Bibliographical and Descriptive Catalogue of a Portion of a Collection of Early English Poetry, Volume V* (Manchester, 1873).
- Coster, Will. *Baptism and Spiritual Kinship in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002).
- Craig, Heidi C. ‘Missing Shakespeare, 1642–1660’, *English Literary Renaissance*, 49.1 (2019), pp. 116–144.
- Cramsie, John. *Kingship and Crown Finance under James VI and I, 1603–1625* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2002).
- Cranfield, Nicholas W.S. ‘Price, Sampson (1585/6–1630)’, ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/22764.
- Cranfield, Nicholas W.S. ‘Sutcliffe, Matthew (1549/50–1629)’, ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/26792.
- Crawford, Patricia. “‘Charles Stuart, That Man of Blood’”, *Journal of British Studies*, 16.2 (1977), pp. 41–61.
- Cressy, David. *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989).
- Cressy, David. *Dangerous Talk: Scandalous, Seditious, and Treasonable Speech in Pre-Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- Cressy, David. ‘The Protestation Protested, 1641 and 1642’, *The Historical Journal*, 45.2 (2002), pp. 251–279.

- Cressy, David. 'The Spanish Armada: Celebration, Myth and Memory', in *England and the Spanish Armada*, ed. by Jeff Doyle and Bruce Moore (Canberra: Australian Defence Force Academy, 1990), pp. 157–176.
- Cust, Richard. 'Charles I, the Privy Council and the Parliament of 1628', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 2 (1992), pp. 25–50.
- David, Zdenek V. 'Utraquists, Lutherans, and the Bohemian Confession of 1575', *Church History*, 68.2 (1999), pp. 294–336.
- DeCoursey, Mathew. 'Thorne, William (1568?–1630)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/27349.
- De Somogyi, Nick. 'Fletcher, Robert (fl. 1581–1606)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/9741.
- Dickinson, Janet. *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex, 1589–1601* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012).
- Dickson, Donald R. 'The Complexities of Biblical Typology in the Seventeenth Century', *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, 11.3 (1987), pp. 253–272.
- Dobson, Michael, and Nicola J. Watson. *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Dolan, Frances E. *Whore of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).
- Doran, Susan. '1603: A Jagged Succession', *Historical Research*, 93.261 (2020), pp. 443–465.
- Doran, Susan. 'Elizabeth I: An Old Testament King', in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, ed. by Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 95–110.
- Doran, Susan. *Elizabeth I and Her Circle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- Doran, Susan. 'James VI and the English Succession', in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. by Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 25–42.
- Doran, Susan, and Paulina Kewes. 'Introduction: A Historiographical Perspective', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 3–19.
- Drake, George A. 'Percy, Algernon, tenth earl of Northumberland (1602–1668)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/21923.
- Durston, Christopher. '"For the Better Humiliation of the People": Public Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving during the English Revolution', *The Seventeenth Century*, 7.2 (1992), pp. 129–149.
- Dutton, Richard. *Ben Jonson, 'Volpone' and the Gunpowder Plot* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Ehrstine, Glenn. *Theater, Culture, and Community in Reformation Bern, 1523–1555* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Ephraim, Michelle. *Reading the Jewish Woman on the Elizabethan Stage* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008).

- Evenden, Elizabeth, and Thomas S. Freeman. 'Print, Profit and Propaganda: The Elizabethan Privy Council and the 1570 Edition of Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', *The English Historical Review*, 119.484 (2004), pp. 1288–1307.
- Exum, J. Cheryl. 'Song of Songs', in *The Oxford Handbook of English Literature and Theology*, ed. by Andrew W. Hass, David Jasper, and Elisabeth Jay (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 259–273.
- Fábián, Laura. 'The Biblical King Solomon in Representations of Western European Medieval Royalty', in *The Routledge History of Monarchy*, ed. by Elena Woodacre, Lucinda H.S. Dean, Chris Jones, Zita Rohr, and Russell Martin (New York: Routledge, 2019), pp. 54–69.
- Faust, Joan. "'Sounding to Present Occasions": Andrew Marvell's "Two Songs at the Marriage of the Lord Fauconberg and the Lady Mary Cromwell"', *Marvell Studies*, 3.2 (2018), pp. 1–28.
- Fincham, Kenneth, and Nicholas Tyacke. *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Finkelpearl, P.J. 'Davies, John (1564/5–1618)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/7244.
- Fissel, Mark Charles. *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns Against Scotland, 1638–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Fitzgibbons, Jonathan. *Cromwell's House of Lords: Politics, Parliaments and Constitutional Revolution, 1642–1660* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2018).
- Foster, Elizabeth Read. 'Petitions and the Petition of Right', *Journal of British Studies*, 14.1 (1974), pp. 21–45.
- Fox, Adam. *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500–1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).
- French, Elizabeth. 'Genealogical Research in England: Maverick', *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, 69 (April 1915), pp. 146–158.
- Gajda, Alexandra. *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Galloway, Bruce. *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603–1608* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1986).
- Gaposchkin, M. Cecilia. *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008).
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603–1642: Volume 10, 1641–1642* (1884; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Gasper, Julia. *The Dragon and the Dove: The Plays of Thomas Dekker* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
- Gasper, Julia. 'Vicars, John (1580–1652)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/28264.
- Gonzalez, Joseph. 'Rewriting History: Humanist Oration at the Funeral of Gustav Vasa, 1560', *Scandinavian Studies*, 78.1 (2006), pp. 21–42.

- Grant, Teresa. 'Drama Queen: Staging Elizabeth in *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 120–142.
- Grigsby, Bryon Lee. *Pestilence in Medieval and Early Modern English Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2004).
- Groves, Beatrice. *Texts and Traditions: Religion in Shakespeare, 1592–1604* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2007).
- Hackett, Helen. *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995).
- Hadfield, Andrew. 'Shakespeare and Politics in the Time of the Gunpowder Plot', *The Review of Politics*, 78 (2016), pp. 571–588.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*, ed. and trans. by Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
- Hammer, Paul E.J. 'The Catholic Threat and the Military Response', in *The Elizabethan World*, ed. by Susan Doran and Norman Jones (New York: Routledge, 2014), pp. 629–645.
- Hammer, Paul E.J. *Elizabeth's Wars: War, Government, and Society in Tudor England, 1544–1604* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
- Hampton, Timothy. *Writing From History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).
- Hentschell, Roze. "'Paul's Work": Repair and Renovation of St Paul's Cathedral, 1561–1625', in *Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1520–1640*, ed. by Torrance Kirby and P.G. Stanwood (Leiden: Brill, 2014), pp. 361–388.
- Herrup, Cynthia. 'The King's Two Genders', *Journal of British Studies*, 45.3 (2006), pp. 493–501.
- Hill, Christopher. *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill, Volume I: Writing and Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England* (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1985).
- Hill, Christopher. *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (London: Allen Lane, 1993).
- Hirschfeld, Heather. "'Wildfire at Midnight": *The Revenger's Tragedy* and The Gunpowder Plot', *The Review of English Studies*, 68.283 (2017), pp. 60–78.
- Holmberg, Eva Johanna. *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination: A Scattered Nation* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).
- Hopkins, Lisa. *Greeks and Trojans on the Early Modern English Stage* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020).
- Hughes, Ann. 'Clarke, Samuel (1599-1682)', ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/5528.
- Hughes, Ann. 'Thomas Dugard and His Circle in the 1630s—A "Parliamentary–Puritan" Connexion?', *The Historical Journal*, 29.4 (1986), pp. 771–793.
- Hughes, Ann. 'Trapp, John (1601–1669)', ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/27665.

- Ipgrave, Julia. *Adam in Seventeenth Century Political Writing in England and New England* (New York: Routledge, 2017).
- James, Anne. *Poets, Players, and Preachers: Remembering the Gunpowder Plot in Seventeenth-Century England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016).
- Jowitt, Claire. 'Imperial Dreams? Margaret Cavendish and the Cult of Elizabeth', *Women's Writing*, 4.3 (1997), pp. 383–399.
- Kanemura, Rei. 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election?: The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, 52 (April 2013), pp. 317–342.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (1957; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).
- Kastan, David Scott. 'Performances and Playbooks: The Closing of the Theatres and the Politics of Drama', in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 167–184.
- Kastan, David Scott. 'Size Matters', *Shakespeare Studies*, 28 (2000), pp. 149–153.
- Kelsey, Sean. *Inventing a Republic: The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649–1653* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).
- Kennedy, D.E. *The English Revolution, 1642–1649* (London: Macmillan, 2000).
- Kershaw, Paul. *Peaceful Kings: Peace, Power, and the Early Medieval Political Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Kewes, Paulina, and Andrew McRae. 'Introduction', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 1–16.
- Killeen, Kevin. *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).
- King, John N. 'The Godly Woman in Elizabethan Iconography', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 38.1 (1985), pp. 41–84.
- King, John N. *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).
- Kitchen, Frank. 'Norden, John (c.1547–1625)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/20250.
- Knight, Oliver. 'The Grand Remonstrance', *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24.1 (1960), pp. 77–84.
- Knighton, C.S. 'Hill, Thomas (d. 1653)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/13305.
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger. *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645–1661* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger. 'The Politics of Portraiture: Oliver Cromwell and the Plain Style', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 51.4 (1998), pp. 1283–1319.

- Kouri, E.I. 'The Early Reformation in Sweden and Finland, c.1520-1560', in *The Scandinavian Reformation: From Evangelical Movement to Institutionalisation of Reform*, ed. by Ole Peter Grell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 42–69.
- Krantz, Susan E. 'Thomas Dekker's Political Commentary in *The Whore of Babylon*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900*, 35.2 (1995), pp. 271–291.
- Lake, Peter. 'Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603–1642*, ed. by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), pp. 72–106.
- Lake, Peter, and Michael Questier. *All Hail to the Archpriest: Confessional Conflict, Toleration, and the Politics of Publicity in Post-Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).
- Larminie, Vivienne. 'Lever, Christopher (fl. 1598–1627)', ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/16532.
- Lee, Maurice, Jr. *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990).
- Levin, Carole. *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*, 2nd edn (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2013).
- Levine, Mortimer. *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question, 1558–1568* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966).
- Light, George Evans. 'All Hopped Up: Beer, Cultivated National Identity, and Anglo-Dutch Relations, 1524–1625', *Journal x*, 2.2 (1998), pp. 159–178.
- Lindquist, Eric. 'The Failure of the Great Contract', *The Journal of Modern History*, 57.4 (1985), pp. 617–651.
- Little, Patrick. 'O'Brien, Murrough, first earl of Inchiquin (c.1614–1674)', ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/20463.
- Little, Patrick, and David L. Smith. *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Liu, Tai. 'Burges, Cornelius (d. 1665)', ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/3967.
- Loomis, Catherine. *The Death of Elizabeth I: Remembering and Reconstructing the Virgin Queen* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
- Loomis, Catherine. 'Elizabeth Southwell's Manuscript Account of the Death of Queen Elizabeth [with text]', *English Literary Renaissance*, 26.3 (1996), pp. 482–509.
- MacKinnon, Dolly, Alexandra Walsham, and Amanda Whiting. 'Religion, Memory and Civil War in the British Isles', *Parergon*, 32.3 (2015), pp. 1–15.
- Maclean, Douglas. *The Great Solemnity of the Coronation of a King and Queen According to the Use of the Church of England* (London: George Allen, 1911).
- MacLeod, Catharine. *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2012).

- Marotti, Arthur F., and Steven W. May. 'Two Lost Ballads of the Armada Thanksgiving Celebration', *English Literary Renaissance*, 41.1 (2011), pp. 31–63.
- Marshall, Peter. *Heretics and Believers: A History of the English Reformation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017).
- Marshall, Simone Celine. 'Wonder Woman and the *Nine Ladies Worthy*: The Male Gaze and What It Takes to Be a "Worthy Woman"', in *From Medievalism to Early-Modernism: Adapting the English Past*, ed. by Marina Gerzic and Aidan Norrie (New York: Routledge, 2019), pp. 21–35.
- McClure, Peter, and Robin Headlam Wells. 'Elizabeth I as a Second Virgin Mary', *Renaissance Studies*, 4.1 (1990), pp. 38–70.
- McConnell, Anita. 'Violet, Thomas (d. 1662/3)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/28329.
- McCullough, P.E. 'Price, Daniel (1581–1631)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/22745.
- McGee, J. Sears. 'Adams, Thomas (1583–1652)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/131.
- McGee, J. Sears. 'Taylor, Thomas (1576–1632)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/27083.
- McKenna, John W. 'How God became an Englishman', in *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends*, ed. by DeLloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 25–43.
- McLaren, Anne. 'Elizabeth I as Deborah: Biblical Typology, Prophecy and Political Power', in *Gender, Power, and Privilege in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Jessica Munns and Penny Richards (London: Pearson Longman, 2003), pp. 90–107.
- McMillan, Ann. 'Men's Weapons, Women's War: The Nine Female Worthies, 1400–1640', *Medievalia*, 5 (1979), pp. 113–139.
- 'Medici, Eleonora de (1591–1617)', in *Women in World History: A Biographical Encyclopedia*, ed. by Anne Commire (Waterford, CT: Yorkin Publications, 2001), p. 840.
- Memegalos, Florene S. *George Goring (1608–1657): Caroline Courtier and Royalist General* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).
- Millstone, Noah. *Manuscript Circulation and the Invention of Politics in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).
- Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Milton, Anthony. 'Willet, Andrew (1561/2–1621)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/29445.
- Morrill, John. 'The Causes and Course of the British Civil Wars', in *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution*, ed. by N.H. Keeble (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 13–31.
- Morrill, John. 'The Religious Context of the English Civil War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 34 (1984), pp. 155–178.
- Morris, Colin. *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

- Mortimer, Geoff. *The Origins of the Thirty Years War and the Revolt in Bohemia, 1618* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).
- Murphy, Martin. 'Thame, Tübingen, Kraków and Reading: The Itinerary of Leonard Cox, Humanist and Schoolmaster (c.1495-1550)', *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 64 (2015), pp. 75–95.
- Neale, J.E. *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584–1601* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1957).
- Nenner, Howard. *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603–1714* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995).
- Neufeld, Matthew. 'Doing Without Precedent: Applied Typology and the Execution of Charles I in Milton's *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 38.2 (2007), pp. 329–344.
- Nivre, Elisabeth Wågghäll. 'Writing Life—Writing News: Representations of Queen Christina in Early Modern Literature', *Renaissance Studies*, 23.2 (2009), pp. 221–239.
- Norbrook, David. 'The Emperor's New Body? *Richard II*, Ernst Kantorowicz, and the Politics of Shakespeare Criticism', *Textual Practice*, 10.2 (1996), pp. 329–357.
- Norrie, Aidan. '"Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise, and Chaste" – Queen Elizabeth I's Biblical Analogies After Her Death', *Royal Studies Journal*, 2.2 (2015), pp. 25–44.
- Norrie, Aidan. 'Elizabeth I as Judith: Reassessing the Apocryphal Widow's Appearance in Elizabethan Royal Iconography', *Renaissance Studies*, 31.5 (2017), pp. 707–722.
- North, Marcy L. 'Anonymity's Subject: James I and the Debate over the Oath of Allegiance', *New Literary History*, 33.2 (2002), pp. 215–232.
- O'Day, Rosemary. *The Routledge Companion to the Tudor Age* (New York: Routledge, 2010).
- Oldenburg, Scott. *Alien Albion: Literature and Immigration in Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014).
- Osberg, Richard H. 'The Lambeth Palace Library Manuscript Account of Henry VI's 1432 London Entry', *Mediaeval Studies*, 52 (1990), pp. 255–267.
- Osherow, Michele. '"Give ear, O princes": Deborah, Elizabeth, and the Right Word', in *Elizabeth I and the 'Sovereign Arts': Essays in Literature, History, Culture*, ed. by Donald Stump, Linda Shenk, and Carole Levin (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2011), pp. 251–259.
- Parker, Geoffrey. *Philip II*, 3rd edn (Chicago: Open Court, 1995).
- Parry, Graham. *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603–42* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1981).
- Patrides, C.A. '"The Greatest of the Kingly Race": The Death of Henry Stuart', *The Historian*, 47.3 (1985), pp. 402–408.
- Patterson, Annabel. 'Andrew Marvell and the Revolution', in *The Cambridge Companion to Writing the English Revolution*, ed. by N.H. Keeble (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 107–123.

- Peck, Dwight C. 'Introduction to *Leicester's Commonwealth*', in *Leicester's Commonwealth: The Copy of a Letter Written by a Master of Art of Cambridge (1584) and Related Documents*, ed. by Dwight C. Peck (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1985), pp. 1–62.
- Pennie, A.R. 'Rogers, Nehemiah (bap. 1594, d. 1660)', ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/23992.
- Pierce, Helen. 'Anti-Episcopacy and Graphic Satire in England, 1640–1645', *The Historical Journal*, 47.4 (2004), pp. 809–848.
- Pitts, Vincent J. *Henri IV of France: His Reign and Age* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).
- Pollmann, Judith. *Memory in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).
- Pollnitz, Aysha. *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Powell, Damian X. 'Why Was Sir Francis Bacon Impeached? The Common Lawyers and the Chancery Revisited: 1621', *History*, 81.264 (1996), pp. 511–526.
- Propp, William H. 'The Origins of Infant Circumcision in Israel', *Hebrew Annual Review*, 11 (1987), pp. 355–370.
- Pursell, Brennan C. *The Winter King: Frederick V of the Palatinate and the Coming of the Thirty Years' War* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).
- Radzinowicz, Mary Ann. 'Forced Allusions: Avatars of King David in the Seventeenth Century', in *Literary Milton: Text, Pretext, Context*, ed. by Diana Treviño and Michael Lieb (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1994), pp. 45–66.
- Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Redworth, Glyn. *The Prince and the Infanta: The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).
- Roark, Tony. *Aristotle on Time: A Study of the 'Physics'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Roberts, Michael. *The Early Vasas: A History of Sweden, 1523–1611* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968).
- Robinson-Self, Phil. *Early Modern Britain's Relationship to Its Past: The Historiographical Fortunes of the Legends of Brute, Albina, and Scota* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2018).
- Rolfe, Kirsty. 'Fatal and Memorable: Plague, Providence and War in English Texts, 1625–6', *The Seventeenth Century*, 35.3 (2020), pp. 293–314.
- Rose, Mary Beth. *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

- Roston, Murray. *Biblical Drama in England from the Middle Ages to the Present Day* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968).
- Ruigh, Robert E. *The Parliament of 1624: Politics and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971).
- Russell, Conrad. *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).
- Russell, Conrad. *King James VI and I and his English Parliaments: The Trevelyan Lectures Delivered at the University of Cambridge 1995*, ed. by Richard Cust and Andrew Thrush (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Russell, Conrad. *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).
- Russell, Conrad. 'Why Did Charles I Call the Long Parliament?', *History*, 69.227 (1984), pp. 375–383.
- Sabbagh, Dan. 'PM deploys "emotional" speech to see off threat from Brexit critics', *The Guardian*, 24 October 2018, <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2018/oct/24/pm-deploys-emotional-speech-to-see-off-threat-from-brexit-critics>.
- Scodel, Joshua. *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).
- Shapiro, Barbara. 'Political Theology and the Courts: A Survey of Assize Sermons c.1600–1688', *Law and Humanities*, 2.1 (2008), pp. 1–28.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).
- Sharpe, Kevin. *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Smart, Sara, and Mara R. Wade. 'The Palatinate Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival. An Introduction', in *The Palatinate Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival*, ed. by Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013), pp. 13–60.
- Smuts, Malcolm. 'The Making of *Rex Pacificus*: James VI and I and the Problem of Peace in an Age of Religious War', in *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*, ed. by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), pp. 371–387.
- Spedding, James. *An Account of the Life and Times of Francis Bacon*, 2 vols (London, 1878).
- Steen, Sara Jayne. 'Introduction', in *The Letters of Lady Arbella Stuart*, ed. by Sara Jayne Steen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 1–105.
- Steenbrugge, Charlotte. *Drama and Sermon in Late Medieval England: Performance, Authority, Devotion* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2017).
- Steggle, Matthew. 'Belchier, Dabridgcourt (bap. 1581, d. 1621)', ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/1983.

- Straznicky, Marta. *Privacy, Playreading, and Women's Closet Drama, 1550–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Streete, Adrian. 'Antipapal Aesthetics and the Gunpowder Plot: Staging Barnabe Barnes's *The Devil's Charter*', in *Protestant Aesthetics and the Arts*, ed. by Sarah Covington and Kathryn Reklis (New York: Routledge, 2020), pp. 99–112.
- Streete, Adrian. 'Elegy, Prophecy, and Politics: Literary Responses to the Death of Prince Henry Stuart, 1612–1614', *Renaissance Studies*, 31.1 (2017), pp. 87–106.
- Strong, Roy. *Henry, Prince of Wales, and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986).
- Strong, Roy C. *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963).
- Stump, Donald. *Spenser's Heavenly Elizabeth: Providential History in 'The Faerie Queene'* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).
- Suarez, Michael F. 'A Crisis in English Public Life: The Popish Plot, Naboth's Vineyard (1679), and Mock-Biblical Satire's Exemplary Redress', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 67.4 (2004), pp. 529–552.
- Teunissen, John J. 'The Book of Job and Stuart Politics', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 43.1 (1973), pp. 16–31.
- Thomas, Helen. 'Jacob and Esau—"Rigidly Calvinistic"?', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900*, 9.2 (1969), pp. 199–213.
- Thrush, Andrew. 'The Parliaments of 1604–1629', in *The House of Commons, 1604–1629*, ed. by Andrew Thrush (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. xxxv–lvi.
- Walsham, Alexandra. '"A Very Deborah?" The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 143–168.
- Walsham, Alexandra. 'Clapham, Henoah (fl. 1585–1614)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/5431.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Walsham, Alexandra. 'Reformed Folklore? Cautionary Tales and Oral Tradition in Early Modern England', in *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500–1850*, ed. by Adam Fox and Daniel Woolf (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 173–195.
- Walter, John. *Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Political Culture in the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).
- Warren, Nancy Bradley. 'Kings, Saints, and Nuns: Gender, Religion, and Authority in the Reign of Henry V', *Viator*, 30 (1999), pp. 307–322.
- Watkins, John. *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Wedgwood, C.V. *Oliver Cromwell and the Elizabethan Inheritance* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1970).
- Wells, R.P. 'Guild, William (1586–1657)', *ODNB*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/11720.

- White, B.R. 'John Pendarves, the Calvinistic Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy', *Baptist Quarterly*, 24.6 (1974), pp. 251–271.
- Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E. 'Introduction', in *Gendered Temporalities in the Early Modern World*, ed. by Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018), pp. 7–16.
- Williams, Franklin B., Jnr. 'Introduction', in *Thomas Rogers' 'Leicester's Ghost'*, ed. by Franklin B. Williams, Jr. (Chicago: Newberry Library and University of Chicago Press, 1972), pp. ix–xxiii.
- Williams, Franklin B., Jnr. 'Leicester's Ghost', *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, 18 (1935), pp. 271–285.
- Willie, Rachel. 'Sensing the Visual (Mis)representation of William Laud', in *What is an Image in Medieval and Early Modern England?*, ed. by Antoinina Bevan Zlatar and Olga Timofeeva (Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, 2017), pp. 183–210.
- Willie, Rachel. *Staging the Revolution: Drama, Reinvention and History, 1647–72* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015).
- Wilson, John F. *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism During the English Civil Wars, 1640–1648* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).
- Withington, Phil. 'An "Aristotelian moment": Democracy in Early Modern England', in *Popular Culture and Political Agency in Early Modern England and Ireland: Essays in Honour of John Walter*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick and Phil Withington (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2017), pp. 203–222.
- Wooden, Warren W. 'The Peculiar Peregrinations of John Taylor the Water-Poet: A Study in Seventeenth-Century British Travel Literature', *Prose Studies*, 6.1 (1983), pp. 3–20.
- Woodford, Benjamin. *Perceptions of a Monarchy Without a King: Reactions to Oliver Cromwell's Power* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2013).
- Woolf, Daniel. 'Historical Writing in Britain from the Late Middle Ages to the Eve of Enlightenment', in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Volume 3, 1400–1800*, ed. by José Rabasa, Masayuki Sato, Edoardo Tortarolo, and Daniel Woolf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 473–496.
- Woolf, Daniel. *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500–1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Woolf, D.R. *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).
- Worden, Blair. *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Worden, Blair. 'Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England', *Past and Present*, no. 109 (1985), pp. 55–99.
- Wright, Stephen. 'Draxe, Thomas (d. 1618/19)', ODNB, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/8040.
- Youngs, Frederic A., Jnr. *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

