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ABSTRACT

Kevin Chovanec, “Pan-Protestant Heroism in Early Modern England”  
(Under the Direction of Reid Barbour)

“Pan-Protestant Heroism in Early Modern England” explores transnational religious identifications in England by tracing the written response to and construction of Protestant heroes of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, among them, Willem and Maurits van Oranje, Henry Stuart, Friedrich V, and Gustavus Adolphus. Intervening in the critical conversation on early modern nation-writing and the construction of Englishness, I argue that continental figures like these profoundly shaped English identity in the early modern period. While most historians believe that nationalism and indeed the nation are constructs of a later period, Richard Helgerson, Claire McEachern, and others have posited the sixteenth century as a key moment in the construction of England. Yet this research, and even more recent multinational approaches that consider how foreigners shaped English identity, focuses too heavily on ethnic alterity and neglects the ways in which religious communion provided alternate possible identities. I argue that the transnational lens of pan-Protestant heroism uncovers literary communities and collaboration generally obscured by our nationalized conception of literature. Heroic figures attracted literary responses – in poems lionizing their accomplishments, theorizing their roles in God’s church, and eventually mourning their deaths – responses that spanned across political and linguistic borders. Protestant writers throughout Europe shared the same tropes, types, and literary genres when celebrating these idealized men. Through my research, I question the anachronistic national organization of early modern literature. I consider German, Dutch, and neo-Latin writing on these figures because English writers clearly understand
themselves to be participating in a transnational project – part of a wider pan-Protestant literary field.

Heroes posed a series of questions for English Protestants at home: what was England’s position within the Protestant church? What were English obligations to their often-suffering coreligionists on the continent? How were English and Protestant identity related? Religion has too often been read as a purely centripetal force, binding the English together, and this tendency has effaced strong, alternative collective identities. Instead, identification with pan-Protestantism and its heroes rendered early modern conceptions of foreignness especially fluid. A focus on these heroes therefore helps us uncover specific, alternative forms of early modern religious identity, trace how they changed, and understand the literary communities they cemented.
For my parents, John and Lynn Chovanec
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In reading widely in the elegiac tradition – or really any poetic tradition in the early modern period – one thing becomes particularly conspicuous: repetition. Hardly a mournful or adulatory sentiment can be expressed that has not already been said elsewhere, and likely said with more skill. Acknowledgement sections are the modern equivalent, and there’s always some anxiety that the repetition will dull the real sense of gratefulness. For, as others have said, a project this long could never have been completed without the assistance and generosity of many mentors and friends.

I feel incredibly fortunate to have ended up in a department filled with such brilliant scholars and good people. My thanks to the English Department, the Graduate School, and all the students I have had the opportunity to meet and discuss literature with at the University of North Carolina. The Renaissance faculty, especially, have been unfailingly generous with their time, insightful with their suggestions, and dedicated to their students. Megan Matchinske helped shape both my thought and identity as a scholar throughout my time at UNC. Darryl Gless was one of the kindest and most generous scholars I’ve met, and I’m grateful I was able to work with him, though too briefly. David Baker’s thoughtful engagement with my work led (and is still leading) the project in exciting directions. Mary Floyd Wilson has a great gift of being able to locate the kernel of an argument, and I learned an enormous amount about both my own work and how to engage with other scholars from our conversations (and her seminars, some of the best I’ve ever participated in, helped me not lose sight of the period’s drama). Ruth Von Bernuth
was incredibly accommodating and welcomed me into her German classes. She has always been eager to discuss my work and share her expertise, and has opened up amazing opportunities to meet German scholars and study at German libraries. Jessica Wolfe, who in addition to generously reading my work and encouraging me throughout my graduate career, has taught me more than anyone about the profession: from my first year, she has been willing to meet time and again to discuss not just scholarship, but logistics: grant writing, phone interviews, articles, and all the other minutia of scholarly life. Finally, my director, Reid Barbour, will always be my favorite scholar. His contagious passion for the field and the research, his amazing energy and enthusiasm, and his dedication to and care for his students have greatly facilitated my dissertation and, more importantly, helped me continue to love academia even during difficult stretches. If I can positively impact half as many students as he has, I will consider my career successful.

I’d like to also thank my professors at Marquette, who first made English literature so appealing. John Curran, especially, who taught a Shakespeare class in 2004 that transformed me from a Mathematics major, focusing on actuarial statistics, into an English major. This transformation had negative economic consequences, of course, but, I hope, positive moral, social, emotional, and even physical consequences. (One can only spend so many years as an actuary, calculating how likely people are to die, before his or her health suffers.)

Most importantly, I’d like to thank my wife. Coming in to graduate school, I had heard that these would be the loneliest and most difficult years of my life; but I was fortunate enough to meet her during my first semester, and they have instead been the happiest. The value of having a perceptive and kind colleague as a partner is inestimable – it improves your work, your teaching, your sanity. She deserves a dedication, but I haven’t yet written anything good enough
to dedicate to her. Maybe someday. I dedicated the dissertation to my parents, who never once tried to dissuade me from studying the Humanities, and have provided constant support, encouragement, and love.

Anyone who begins a dissertation now must be confronted with the overwhelming (and at times intimidating) deluge of scholarship already in place. Scarcely a topic, scarcely a text, has not yet been admirably and learnedly investigated. It feels like arrogance to imagine I have anything to add. And yet, conversations go on, and what luck to find so many brilliant people interested in the same things. It’s a great privilege to be able to discuss literature, to discuss religion and history, to talk about interesting or odd facets of the past. I’m thankful that there is a discussion, and I’m grateful that I have been allowed to participate.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: “BUT ONE BODY”: EARLY MODERN TRANSNATIONALISM AND ENGLISH LITERATURE ................................................................................. 1

Nationalism and Transnationalism, Modern and Early Modern ....................... 15

Who is the Church? ...................................................................................... 20

Metaphors of the Church ............................................................................. 36

Is Gods Kingdom a Nation? ......................................................................... 59

John Foxe’s Prayer for “the Church and all the States Thereof” .................... 65

Conclusion ................................................................................................. 69

CHAPTER ONE: DUTCHNESS AND THE ENGLISH NATION ......................... 74

Introduction ............................................................................................... 74

Pamphlets of the Dutch Revolt ................................................................... 83

Emblems of Unity ...................................................................................... 101

English Heroes of the Dutch Revolt ........................................................... 106

The House of Orange .................................................................................. 112

Transnationalism in *The Faerie Queene* .................................................... 130

*A Larum for London*: Anglo-Dutch Unity on the English Stage ............... 141

Conclusion ................................................................................................. 158

CHAPTER TWO: HENRY, PRINCE OF WALES, AND ISRAEL’S LOST RENAISSANCE ..................................................................................................... 160

Introduction ............................................................................................... 160
Introduction. “But one body”: Early Modern Transnational Protestantism and English Literature

With characteristic pugnaciousness, Martin Luther, embroiled in debate, succinctly and confidently defined the Christian church: “thank God, a seven-year-old child knows what the church is, namely, holy believers and sheep who hear the voice of their Shepherd.”¹ His definition, of course, never quite settles the matter, and retreats to a biblical metaphor (the sheep) rather than a simple answer. And it begs the follow-up question, who are the sheep? In other words, who constitutes the holy Christian community? For centuries, the true church had been easy to descry; it aligned perfectly with Christendom and comprised all believing Christians — essentially, at least in its conception, all the peoples of Europe. With the fragmentation caused by the Reformation, however, the contours of the church became difficult to discern. This never resulted in a lack of confidence about the church itself, which all still held to exist as a global phenomenon, but membership in that community became contested. Still, even in the face of threats of excommunication from the Roman church, reformers universally insisted on the necessity of membership in the true community. For Luther, “outside the Christian church there is no truth, no Christ, no salvation.”² Calvin stresses that “away from her bosom one cannot hope for any forgiveness of sins or any salvation.”³ It was not, therefore, that the pope’s

¹ Martin Luther, Schmalkald Articles, translated by William R. Russell (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), XII 287.
² Ibid., 85.
insistence on membership in the church was false; the pope had simply misconstrued a communion of devil-worship for the true church.

The uncertainty over the borders of the holy church prompted voluminous discussion and a series of questions about membership and belonging that, in turn, provided a foundation for early modern thinking about community. How were the visible and invisible churches related? How are particular churches connected – and relatedly, what do they owe one another? Just how few members truly belong to the Christian Church? How can the church be understood both inside and outside of time? Was the Catholic church ever a true church, and if not, what are the ramifications of England’s past Catholicism for the souls of their ancestors? In their most simple terms, each question circles the same ambiguity regarding the Christian community: who constitutes the church? The questions were so challenging and anxiety-provoking that the clergyman William Fulke could claim in 1570, “The greatest controversy that this day troubles the world is where the true church of God should be.”

Because of this conflict, the early modern period witnessed a flourishing of ecclesiological treatises. Ecclesiology constituted an international debate, and almost certainly the most prolific body of writing on community, as writers from both sides, Catholic and Protestant, attempted to prove the legitimacy of their church and often exclude their opponents. Treatises and pamphlets were written and translated across the languages of Europe. In England,

---


5 Charles Prior has examined this debate in England and Scotland. As he notes, “Defining the Church was no easy task, and the question accounted for a profound division among Protestant writers in both the English and Scottish settings, which in turn reveals the first stirrings of the religious conflicts that would emerge in the reign of Charles I.” *Defining the Jacobean Church: The Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 6.
Bale’s *Image of Both Churches* (1545) framed the debate with the apocalyptic binary drawn from Revelation, implying all humans were either in the holy church or in its antipode. For Protestants, however, though there were numerous marks of a true church, its exact membership remained forever inaccessible; no one could see inside another’s heart and discover who believed truly, or whom God had chosen. The uncertainty drove theologians and laypersons repeatedly back to the biblical metaphors in their discussions of the holy community; if the church was invisible, its members unknowable, then it could best be approached through figurative language. While the resources for the later, collective identity of nationalism may have emerged from this rhetorical matrix, I hope to demonstrate in this dissertation that Protestantism proved a less centrifugal force than proponents of an early modern English “nation” usually imagine. My claim throughout is that discussions of the church—popular, poetic, and theological—were much more likely to imply a transnational than a national community.

For many literary critics who read England as a nation and see the English as possessing an early kind of nationalism, the church plays a central role. Claire McEachern even claims that Bale’s *Image of Both Churches* provides the foundational typology of the nation.\(^6\) Certainly, the interpenetration between nation and church (the typology of the church as the nation Israel is far older than Bale) does offer a metaphoric space for the emergence of the nation. But Bale’s church, as everyone in the period realized, was comprised not of the national community but, as he quite explicitly says, “of all nacions of the earth, of al peoples of the world, and of all languages vnder heauen.”\(^7\) It was a global and, importantly for this study, multilingual community. Ironically, as Bale recognized, this vision of the church fractured the national community.

---


community, superimposing on the English nation a more true and universal division between the saved and reprobate. Despite the frequent claim that the English Protestant church enabled the construction of the English nation, when most early modern men and women heard the church discussed, it placed them inside of a transnational community. The early Reformers, breaking from Rome, were especially keen to stress this transnationalism; theirs was not just a novel, local church, but rather part of a universal true church, stretching both directions in time and drawn from all the world. In Calvin’s debate with Cardinal Sadoleto, for example, he defines the church succinctly as “the society of all the saints, a society which, spread over the whole world, and existing in all ages, yet bound together by the one doctrine, and the one spirit of Christ.”

8 Often, reformers suggested that this transnational characteristic either mitigated or even eliminated local or national identity, drawing on Paul’s claim that the church contained neither Jew nor Gentile. Heinrich Bullinger, who followed Zwingli in Zurich and, because of the early connections between English and Swiss reformers, became a powerful reforming voice in England, drives in this transnationalism repeatedly in the Of the Holy Catholic Church (contained in his widely popular Decades):

It [The Church] sends out its branches into all places of the wide world, in all times and all ages; and it comprehends generally all the faithful the whole world over. For the Church of God is not tied to any one region, nation, or kindred; to condition, age, sex, or kind: all the faithful generally and each one in particular wherever they may be, are citizens and members of this Church. St. Paul the apostle says: “There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bondman nor free, neither man nor woman: for ye be all one in Christ Jesus.”

9 In England, William Tyndale even appropriates and modernizes the same Pauline passage: “In Christ there is neither French nor English; but the Frenchman is the Englishman’s ownself, and


the English the Frenchman’s ownself.”

A transnational understanding of the church drawn from the reformers thus became orthodox in its expression in songs, hymns, treatises, and catechisms throughout Europe. In England, even Richard Hooker, who came in time to stand in for a parochial, national church, writes clearly in his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* that the church throughout the world is one: “That Church of Christ, which we properly term his body mystical, can be but one… Only our minds by intellectual conceit are able to apprehend, that such a real body there is: a body collective, because it containeth an huge multitude; a body mystical, because the mystery of their conjunction is removed altogether from sense.” Indeed, Hooker, too, draws on the Pauline passage to stress transnational unity: “be they Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, they are all incorporated into one company, they all make but one body.” Regional or national churches, for Hooker, might have their own ceremonies and traditions — as, it should be noted, Luther and Melanchthon had claimed since the beginning of Protestantism -- and this likely in time did serve to distinguish the Church of England from its continental sister churches; but at the same time, Reformed writers and preachers continually reminded religious laypersons of their greater unity in the kingdom of God. The national church represented only one particular part of the true church, another scholastic distinction that eventually, eschatologically, would become meaningless. Paul Avis notes “the reluctance of the Reformers to accept the divisions between themselves and Rome and between one protestant Church and another … Only slowly and

---


12 Ibid., 139.
reluctantly did they come to accept that division was inevitable.”

As the passage from Hooker insinuates, one of the most important metaphors for explaining this unity was the body. Quite obviously, this metaphor constitutes an important overlap between thinking about the nation and thinking about the church. In this introduction, I will attempt to lay the groundwork for the following study of transnational, pan-Protestant alliances and their impact on English literature and identity with a survey of early modern ecclesiology. I will first show that the community itself was in flux. Charles W. A. Prior has recently argued, in fact, that “ecclesiological argument was a dominant aspect of the intellectual culture in the period after the Reformation.”

Though Prior focuses particularly on debates over the visible church, an abstract ecclesiology also became a novel and contested field within theology. Using the debate between William Tyndale and Thomas More (a debate carried out by many other Reformers and Catholics on the continent), I will explore the new questions about the Christian community that the reformation raised. As we will see, the emergence of Protestant churches led to a series of uncertainties and debates over how to define the church, a venerable and prolific body of early modern research. My focus in ecclesiology will not be simply on the practical and historical aspects, which have been admirably covered in scholarship; rather, I will attempt to survey some of the most important figurative language through which English Protestants might have conceptualized their relationship to other Protestants on the continent. These metaphors at least partially solved the problems posed by the Reformation, and provided a rhetorical matrix for contemporaries to imagine community. Finally, I will explore the overlap

---


14 Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, 19.
between the nodal concepts — nation and church — which both were developing rapidly during the period (as perhaps they are in every period). Part of what made the church complex as a competitor to, and so prolific an influence on, the nation is the fact that the heavily theorized religious community demonstrates many of the features characteristic of modern and early modern nations. The church, however, was not territorially bound, and therefore presented different possibilities for collective-identity. The transnationalism inherent in the scriptural metaphors of the church not only inform how the English responded to the pan-Protestant heroes examined later in this dissertation, but it qualifies the over-easy assumption that Protestantism in England provided a straightforwardly centripetal force uniting the nation. The most committed Protestants were also the most transnational.

A discussion of the figurative language of ecclesiology will lay the foundation for my larger study of Protestant heroes in part because these heroes played key roles in the contemporary imagination of the religious community. My study will read these figures rhetorically rather than biographically, and attempt to uncover transnational facets of early modern English literature and identity that have since been obscured. Indeed, the writing on these heroes reveals several important points. The first thread of my argument, running throughout the entire dissertation, is that the language used to discuss the national community drew heavily on the rich semantic field provided by ecclesiology. As we will see in this introduction, the history and theology of the church provided a set of metaphors for thinkers and writers attempting to understand the social organization to which they and their heroes belonged: a body, a temple, a ship, a tree, etc. Embedded in these metaphors were variegated possibilities for how early moderns could understand membership in a political or religious community, and poets and preachers invoked these metaphors continually in their discussion of heroes. Heroes
not only defined these religious and political communities, in some ways their charismatic attraction founded them – as, for example, the many circles of influence around Prince Henry, who had, according to mourning poets, served as a cornerstone for the group at his court of St. James as well as for Britain as a whole, for a print coterie of knowing Spenserians as well as for the entire Pan-Protestant world. The recognition of this shared metaphorical language helps illuminate the peculiar reciprocity in the period between the nation and the transnational church. Equally, this conception of language corresponds to another foundational methodology associated with historicist criticism. Since Quentin Skinner and J. G. A. Pocock, historians have joined literary critics in a heightened sensitivity to the “polyvalence” of language. An increasing interest in politics – along with the conviction that all literature is political – has occasioned this linguistic turn. This scholarship has stressed the situated character of political language, the need to recreate context; as Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker write, the critic’s task is akin to an “archaeology of languages.” Pocock has similarly argued for the necessity of uncovering all possible political meaning inherent in the language. A nuanced examination of the language these writers use to discuss their communities can reveal much about the complexity of “the nation” and “the church” for early moderns.

The exploration of how the national community drew heavily on the language of the church allows this dissertation to contribute tangentially to recent renewed interest in “Political Theology,” the idea that the theology of the past still inheres in the supposedly secularized mechanisms of the modern state. Recently, this scholarship has begun to move from a focus on sacred kingship to instead survey the influence theology has had on citizenship and the national

---

These heroes assumed an odd Christological significance: like Christ, they both united the community and sacrificed themselves for the community. The desire for an earthly head became such a temptation that some writers could describe it as idolatry, vexing many Protestants with the apparent contradiction between the need for concrete leadership to establish the church’s visible body and their inveterate tendencies toward iconoclasm. George Wither, for example, after nearly idolizing Prince Henry in his elegy, proclaims that God had taken the heroic prince away for exactly such a fault:

[...] make to God alone thy invocation:  
Who tooke him from thee, that but late was living,  
For too much trust, unto his weaknes giving.  
[...]  
Thou tel’st him of the wicked Whore of Rome,  
As if that he were Judge to give her doome.  
But thou mightst see, were not thy sight so dim  
Thou mak’st meane-while another Whore of him:  
For what ist for a Creatures ayde to cry,  
But spirits whordome? (that’s Idolatry).  

According to Wither, God removed Henry from the English people because they had trusted too much in him, had set him up in the place of God. Placing him at the head of the religious community installed the hero in the same position as pope, another whore, and thus constituted spiritual idolatry. Without Rome, the scattered body of the church had no earthly head, and it seemed desperately to need a heroic leader to bring cohesion to the scattered and besieged Protestant peoples. Yet establishing a leader inevitably established another pope, and Protestants for over a century alternated between the desire for the safety and unity provided by an earthly leader and the fear of concomitant idolatry.


17 George Wither, Prince Henries Obsequies (London: 1612), l.88-90; l.93-98.
Disunity, exacerbated by the lack of a head, was keenly felt by early modern Protestants. The period was filled with schemes for unification, both religious and political, and the borders of relation remained constantly in flux. It seems an irony of history, in fact, that just as English Puritans were disentangling the nation from relational identity — giving the transnational Protestant (Calvinist) church precedence — the foreign intellectuals Hugo Grotius, Isaac Casaubon, and Marco Antonio De Dominis imagined a religious association — in some ways also transcending national identities — centered on the Church of England, uniting English Protestantism, which Grotius saw as moderate and irenic in the mold of Bishop Andrewes, with Arminians in the Low Countries and the moderate Greek Churches, and placing King James at the head. A Grotius-scholar’s remark on that union, however, might be extended to all the various religious unification projects of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: “it was not at all clear that the kind of union imagined by all these men was the same.”

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore some of the different ways unions were imagined, to understand the complexities and conflicts in theorizing what it meant to share religion with people not contained within the same national group or geographic borders. Metaphors of the church are central in how these unions were depicted, but they, too, were changeable and fluid, adapting to political exigencies. My contention is that much of the period’s intellectual work thinking about social and political unity was done while trying to understand one’s relation to coreligionists; this provides not only the context, but the seeds of the nationalisms that would soon emerge in the next century — or, according to literary scholars, were emerging contemporarily to religious turmoil. And much of the discussion of the English

---

relationship to the continental churches – excepting, of course, formal theological treatises – can be found in the English reception of continental religious heroes and wars.

The next thread of my argument stems from this diversity. Too often in studies of the nation, the influence of Protestantism on English nationalism has been portrayed as monolithic and unidirectional. Whether critics have focused on English or British state formation, Protestantism has generally been considered the centripetal force binding diverse peoples together into a single nation. Religion, scholars generally assume, played a leading role in the creation of England; in fact, it was “perhaps the most significant among the factors that furthered the development of English national consciousness.”19 For England, Henry VIII’s decree of religious independence from the continent galvanized a sentiment that would lead toward nationalism. According to this argument, the English recognized themselves largely in their difference from continental Catholicism, a distinctiveness which granted them an identity as a people. British historians similarly view Protestantism as the unifying force between the often warring nations, as English and Scottish writers themselves argued in the sixteenth century.20 Writers who locate nationalism later note the obvious failure of the two kingdoms to reach a religious consensus until later in the eighteenth century, when once again “Protestantism was the foundation that made the invention of Great Britain possible.” 21 Historians of Britain tend to take a longer view, but more often than not trace the roots of Britishness back to the reformation

in England and Scotland, with “Protestantism the only thread joining these three mutually constitutive processes from state-formation to empire building.”

Certainly, Protestantism was central to the way that English subjects defined themselves. Yet the uniqueness of English Protestantism has perhaps been overstated in these studies of nationalism, and, as I hope to show, Protestant religious conviction equally often opened up transnational communities that competed with the emerging nationalism. In this study, identification with a transnational church both challenges English Protestant identity and re-shapes the emerging nationalism. Allegiance to the two communities often posed an impasse, especially as the Early Stuart monarchs increasingly retreated from other Reformed Churches on the continent. The tendency of Protestants to schism was something frequently alleged by Catholic polemicists and anxiety-provoking for Protestants themselves. Once a crack appeared in the unity of the church, it seemed impossible to stop society from shattering into individual atoms. Indeed, part of the stress on the relationship between members of God’s Church stemmed from this fear. While the English of the early modern period have often been considered insular and xenophobic – and admittedly often were – this claim has overlooked the fluidity with which other Protestants might be incorporated into the English nation. Recently, critics have begun challenging these assumptions of xenophobia and investigating the multiculturalism of early modern England. As Scott Oldenburg has argued, “the earliness of the early modern period – the fact that what becomes modernity is only emergent in this period – opens up the possibility of locating other conceptions of community in competition with a culturally exclusive


nationhood, ideas about community founded on something other than common birthplace.”24

Ideas of the “foreign” were equally constructed and variable, changing along with the fortunes of the Protestant church and subject to significant debate and disagreement.

Protestants from the continent could not only be imagined as part of an English community, but the figures of this study often also stimulated complex multinational and multilingual literary communities. English writers often made a concerted effort to unite with other Protestants: Protestants from the Netherlands, the Holy Roman Empire, the various nations of Britain, and even Eastern Europe collaboratively celebrated the victories and mourned the deaths of these central figures. In the elegiac output for Gustavus Adolphus, for example, one can find a series of tropes, images, Old Testament types, and literary models that were shared across linguistic and political borders. Cosmopolitan communities at Leiden emerged to chronicle victories in the Dutch Revolt and – with too much optimism, sadly – project the greatness of the Earl of Leicester. Even the “British” Prince Henry founded a multinational community of poets and artists who created and responded to his myth. These collaborative projects can help give us some concrete sense of the shape of the transnational literary field of pan-Protestantism, an understudied part of the self-identification of early modern writers, and corroborate what Lloyd Edward Kermode has discovered on the English stage: “the alien is within English as it is being formed.”25

The belief that language itself should determine the borders of a community — even a


literary community — seems to be a modern assumption that we inevitably and somewhat anachronistically instate in the early modern period through our institutionalized national literatures. It was certainly present at the time — for example, in Spenser’s desire for “an empire of our own language,” admirably discussed by Richard Helgerson — but by no means was it as universal or as “common-sensical” as it now seems. The push toward the vernaculars began a process of literary contest, inside and outside of states, which would result eventually in nationalized literatures; but on the ground, in the moment, the triumph of “English Literature” was by no means certain. I have chosen in this dissertation, therefore, to explore contemporary German and Dutch contexts – both the vernacular and the neo-Latin poetry -- as part of the symbolic field available to English writers. Where necessary, I make distinctions between the literary milieus of various writers, but one of my goals is to stress that this project — of erecting and interpreting pan-Protestant heroes — was a collaborative venture that transcended regional, geographic, and linguistic borders. Protestant writers shared a transnational cultural imaginary. Certainly, disagreements and impasses — untranslatable moments — arose within this literary field, but a shared foundation underlay much of the period’s literature. In part, I hope this answers the recent call for “a broader critical scope, similarly unfettered by national boundaries.” More importantly, however, I have found that each of these heroes provoked a pan-Protestant literary response, and English writers understood themselves as part of a transnational community, and even participating in a pan-Protestant literary field.

My central claim is that the nebulous definition of the universal church offered by

---

26 John Kerrigan notes “the assumption of many post-eighteenth-century nationalists that language is constitutive of national consciousness was not yet entrenched.” Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics, 1603-1707 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 66.

Protestant reformers resulted in several crises of relation between the English and their coreligionists. In its very openness, however, thinkers could imagine new and experimental forms of relation, both paralleling and competing with the development of the modern nation state. Debora Shuger claims that “[t]he problem in the Renaissance concerns not only where boundaries should be placed but also their ‘thickness.’”28 Writers disagree violently over whether the borders of state or church are thicker. The exigencies of continental religious warfare often provided particularly fertile opportunities to both invent and re-imagine forms of connection, relation, and identity.

**Nationalism and Transnationalism, modern and early modern**

According to several literary scholars and historians, identity based on membership in another community – the English nation – was first beginning to assume its modern form during the period under examination. Richard Helgerson’s enormously influential *Forms of Nationhood* popularized “Englishness” as a mode of literary investigation and established the early modern period — and early modern literature, especially — as central to the formation of nationalist sentiment. According to Helgerson, in various Elizabethan and Jacobean authors we can see a first attempt to write the nation. Helgerson’s work has severed as a useful and stimulating reminder of the constructed quality of the nation — of the fact that it needed to be written. In this, Helgerson has implicitly suggested an important role for literary scholars in the understanding of nationalism, for as the term “nation writing” implies, literature became perhaps the primary means for constructing and inculcating Englishness. Many critics have since developed, challenged, and complicated his view of early modern nation writing, taking into

account ethnic and religious minorities, gender, and foreignness.\textsuperscript{29}

This body of work has been influential and cogent, but it has promoted certain blind spots. The ways in which early English identity remained pre-national and transnational have often been ignored, and the complexities of early modern religion, especially, have sometimes been flattened. After the Reformation, the establishment of a church that was both English and True (Protestant) led to a conflict over which mattered more, the Englishness or the Trueness. For some, religion may have helped the nation cohere, but for many early moderns it opened more expansive and diverse forms of community. My dissertation traces a cluster of myths associated with the early modern Protestant heroic tradition, a line of heroes which includes central national figures for several Protestant nations. Tracing this heroic tradition demonstrates how fluidly the materials of the myths (the tropes, types, and genres used to praise these figures) crossed ethnic and national lines, appropriated from neighboring peoples. The heroism of William of Orange, for example, helped shape Elizabethan Chivalry, so prized in later accounts of the English character; and the Oranges had first been appropriated and repurposed even in Netherlands nationalism, leading to the rather odd opening lines in their national anthem in which the “vader des vaderlands” highlights his foreign origins: “Wilhelms van Nassouwe / Ben ick van Duytschen Bloedt,” [I am William of Nassau, of German blood.] Of course, his prisedom of Orange, a territory in France, only made his composite national identity more

complex. Similarly, English writers fluidly adopted the half-Scottish, half-Danish Prince Henry upon his arrival in England, inserting him into debates on national character. These early modern figures thus proved especially adept at crossing national boundaries.

Transnationalism is relatively new as a concept applied to early modern studies. Perhaps the uncertain status of the nation itself has tended to slow the appropriation of transnational methodologies. Most scholars of transnationalism study modern and contemporary history, and the critical approach is connected especially with corporations. The concept was first articulated by Joseph Nye as a way of describing “‘contracts, coalitions and interactions across state boundaries’ that were not directly controlled by the central policy organs of government.”

Scholars of transnationalism differentiate their approach from international approaches – comparative history or literature, diplomatic history, the history of international relations, even global or world studies – by attempting to be less state-centered. Instead of looking at the interaction between two nations, transnational studies seeks out “contact zones” and networks involving citizens or corporations of many different nations. The church, as I will explore in this introduction, might easily be considered a privileged example of a transnational contact zone in its ability to produce a communal identity that often superseded national identity. So, too, are the multilingual communities that arose to celebrate these heroes in literature. The English, Dutch, and neo-Latin poems celebrating heroes of the Dutch revolt demand not a comparative approach, but a transnational approach, for English writers in those circles understood their writing – and in part themselves – through their participation.

Similarly, as Katherine Pence and Andrew Zimmerman have noted, transnational
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research “emphasizes the various types of flow across national boundaries in a fresh way, while questioning “the nation” as an analytical category.”"32 While I would not go as far as Sebastian Conrad, who claims that transnationalism has in some ways invalidated the discrete nation, I will argue in this dissertation that a literary blindspot to transnational projects has partially obscured even the shape of the nation. Part of Englishness in the seventeenth century, as we shall see, was explained by the Swedish King Gustavus Adolphus; part of Elizabethan Chivalry must be traced to William of Orange and the Dutch Revolt. Transnationalism, Patricia Clavin notes, is about the “fluidity of categories – national and ethnic identity, professional attribution, political affiliation and cultural attachments.”33 English identity could change quickly with events on the continent.

In the last decade, both historians and literary scholars have increasingly taken a transnational approach to telling early modern English history – for example, Jonathan Scott’s England’s Troubles. From inside English departments, studies of cosmopolitanism have flourished – for example, in the recent monographs by Robert Stillman and Margaret C. Jacob -- and literary scholars influenced by “New British History” have taken multinational approaches to deconstructing the politics of English literature, for example, Jon Kerrigan’s Archepalagic English and David Baker’s Between Nations. Scholars of the literature of empire have even occasionally embraced – or at least recognized the need for – multilingual approaches. Recent scholarship – by Peter Hulme, Emily Bartels, Barbara Fuchs, and Eric Griffin -- often influenced by post-colonialism, has widened the focus and examined how Spain, the New World, or the Ottoman Empire also shaped Englishness.
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33 Clavin, “Defining Transnationalism,” 422.
Very often, however, these past approaches have retained a fixed gaze on national borders and national identities, and scholars have therefore overlooked the extent to which Renaissance writers considered themselves part of larger, multilingual communities. Of course, literary studies have embraced transnational approaches with great success in the history of ideas: especially the emerging science, but also popular culture, politics, economics, visual art, etc. Other than science, these projects have focused mostly on the twentieth century; I will attempt to argue for its usefulness earlier in history, though I will also assert that transnationalism as a concept has a history itself, and the early modern version took a decidedly religious cast – something generally absent from later manifestations. It has been noted that a central paradox of transnationalism is the way “that transnational ties can dissolve some national barriers while simultaneously strengthening or creating others.”

In the seventeenth century, the lines between the Catholic Church and the Protestant Church often overwhelmed national borders while themselves becoming deadly solid. Perhaps the fullest example of this comes during the victories of Gustavus Adolphus during the Thirty Years War, as many English poets, anxious about their nation’s non-involvement, were eager to cast aside their national identification to join their coreligionists. “England I cast thee off,” wrote Nicholas Oldisworth. “Thou shall not be / My country any longer.” Indeed, David Trim has found that over 3,000 English and Scottish volunteers per year served in religious wars, and nothing influenced their decision to join more than a commitment to the “Calvinist international.”
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34 Ibid., 431.


Transnationalism’s main proponents argue that it “enables history to break free from the nationally determined timescales that dominate the historiographical landscape.” With increasing calls for multilingual, multinational, multigenre approaches to literature, perhaps a transnational literary approach might similarly enrich English literary scholarship.

**Who is the Church?**

The strongest transnational draw on early modern literature and identity was the religious community, despite the fact that the Reformation rendered the borders of the church increasingly uncertain. Although Reformed Ecclesiology has generally been ignored in favor of the more contentious issues of grace, justification, and predestination, historians have written extensively on English ecclesiology precisely because the Church of England took on a novel — and highly controversial — form. Because ecclesiology became a focal point for early modern English polemics, most scholars of the English reformation have addressed it. Anthony Milton offers perhaps the fullest account of the relationship between the English Church and Continental


38 Though there were a few important exceptions in the twentieth century, which were foundational for this chapter, especially Avis, *The Church in the Theology of the Reformers*.

39 Patrick Collinson has magisterially explored puritanism, and the inter-puritan debates over church governance, Episcopal versus Presbyterian, especially in the Elizabethan church. Peter Lake has extended this focus into the early Stuart period, tracing Presbyterianism, as well as several other more radical reform doctrines, through a “London puritan underground.” See The Boxmaker’s Revenge: ‘Orthodoxy’, ‘Heterodoxy’, and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart London (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001). Lake has even claimed that the disagreement about the visible church “was arguably the crucial divide in English Protestant opinion during this period.” “Calvinism and the English Church,” *Past and Present* 114 (1987): 39. Studying the same period, Prior has reconstructed the debate over the shape of the visible church and argued that scholars must “shift the focus of our understanding of religious conflict away from Arminianism and Laudianism, and toward the problem of ecclesiology and its impact on political theory, religious debate, and historical thought.” *Defining the Church*, 19. Tom Webster has located “alternate ecclesiologies” in networks of puritan-leaning clerics in the Caroline church. *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England, 1620-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). The English separatists and their conception of the church (which, it might be added, eventually won out) have also merited significant scholarship: Stephen Brachlow, for example, documents the rise of religious radicalism in Elizabethan England and argues that the opinions of the civil war years do not connect directly back to positions in the Jacobean church, in which distinctions between future Presbyterians and future Congregationalists remained blurred.
churches in his *Catholic and Reformed*. Milton has surveyed the diverse opinion regarding the structure of the Church of England, a unique “dynamic mass of shifting positions” made possible, he argues, by the flexibility of the Elizabethan settlement. English clergymen came to understand their own church through its relationship to the continental churches. Though Elizabethan Calvinists stressed their close ties to the Reformed churches on the continent, theologians in the Stuart period began distancing themselves from the Reformed and reframing the relationship between the Church of England and Roman Catholicism. Tracking several decades, Milton demonstrates how this gradual change occurred and how the puritan position became marginalized. While Milton offers a convincing overview of clerical opinion, he focuses mostly on the practical ecclesiology – the form the English church takes. My interest is less systematic and more diffuse, as I hope to include the ways that English men and women, poets and laymen, could imagine their relationship with coreligionists.

Historians’ studies of the English ecclesiology tend to isolate the Church of England in a way that early moderns might have found puzzling. The Anglocentric biases truncate ecclesiology, focusing only on the visible while ignoring the English reformers insistence that they were part of a larger religious community. While it is true that the national church in England took on unique ceremonies and traditions, and thus in its material expression might be disconnected from continental forms, all English theologians recognized themselves as part of the same church as (some) Christians on the continent. When scholars have discussed English connections with foreign churches, these have usually been in the very pragmatic realms of actual experience — ceremonies, vestments, liturgies. In a more abstract sense, however, the
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church was united, despite the superficial differences. Throughout, scholars implicitly assume that the church under discussion was the Church of England (though Richard Prior also considers the Kirk of Scotland), coterminous with the territorial borders of England. Richard Hooker would have agreed, in part, and his sense of the overlap between the national community and the national church became orthodox: “there is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth; nor any man a member of the commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England.”41 And yet, this assumption was not universal in the period, and even Hooker, as we have seen, understood the English church inside a wider, true church encompassing all believers. It is difficult to recover the early modern understanding of the church in part because our interpretation of the theological debate is clouded by post-confessional assumptions; in the period, however, the borders between denominations, like the borders between nations, were blurrier and undeveloped.

To understand how the English related to their coreligionists on the continent, we must recover a more global sense of the church universal, or the body of Christ. Like the nation, the church as a community was in flux. Though religious scholars, unlike historians, have often focused on the distinctive key theological and doctrinal points of the reformation, a few have provocatively suggested that ecclesiology may have been the foremost contested point between the reformers and their Roman Catholic adversaries. “It is defensible,” claims Geddes MacGregor, “that the Reformation was about the nature of the Church more than it was about justification of grace.”42 The central debate of the Reformation, which arose in various forms throughout Europe, was over authority — particularly the authority of the church against the

41 Hooker, Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, 190.

authority of scripture. While much has been written and said about this controversy, its tangential relation to the development of the nation-state deserves further consideration. This crisis of authority fragmented Christendom, which several scholars consider a kind of precursor of the nation. More significantly, the “confessionalization” of the period resulted in a reinterpretation of long-stable medieval ecclesiology, producing a marked change in how the Christian community was imagined. The debate over authority forced Protestant — and to a lesser extent Catholic — thinkers into ever more complex and yet specific definitions of the church. No longer could the church simply align with all unified, professing Christians in the Roman Catholic Church, but Reformers insisted the community, though no less unified, was far more difficult — and probably impossible — to locate, and a serious of questions plagued the Reformers’ understanding of the church. The debates between Thomas More and William Tyndale highlight this particular process as well as any, and offer a convenient origin for English Protestant theological reflection on the church. For, despite disagreeing along almost all of the major fault-lines separating the early Reformers from the Roman Church, their most pointed conflict, and the one to which all others inevitably return, was the authority of the Church; and their dialogue clearly manifests very disparate definitions, not merely of that authority, but of the church itself. This context therefore lucidly reveals the pressures that began shaping contemporary ideas of national and transnational communities.

The debate between Thomas More and William Tyndale offers a useful gateway into the questions facing Protestant theologians as they attempted to formulate their doctrine of the church. As a lay-theologist, too, More’s long-winded polemic highlights the concerns and
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questions of many well-educated early moderns, and — more than anything — the fear of the decomposition of the former bonds uniting Christianity — fears that the Reformers, I would argue, felt with equal trepidation. Since More’s dialog addresses Luther and Tyndale, and regards both the ‘heretics’ in Germany and England, it also initiates the debate in an international mode — an internationalism that, according to More, is threatened by the new Protestant doctrine. And for More, the doctrine of the church serves as the foundation for the entire system — it is “the very brest of all this batayle.”44 When the heretic Blynny is martyred, according to More, he repents most for “the framynge of a secrete vnknowen chyrche that he lerned of Luther and Tyndale / was ye very poynt that broughte hym vnto all hys myschyefe, as the very fundacyon wherupon all other heresyes are byelled.”45 The challenges posed by More resonate across Europe in the early and mid-sixteenth century and were faced again and again by Reformers.

As E. Flessman van Leer claimed long ago, the church plays a central role in the polemic between More and Tynsdale.46 Indeed, Tyndale hoists it center-stage in his translation, and the decision to express “ekklesia” with “congregation” was foremost among More’s critique of the Tyndale Bible. More importantly, Tyndale’s view of the church takes shape under More’s polemic, and his concept the holy community begins shifting during the debate. According to More, the church is the base of theology and dogma; common practice, the “comon knownen church,” defines what Christian faith means.47 The church can change (and has) because God has
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44 Thomas More, *The Confutation of Tyndales Answere* (London: 1532), sig. CC1V.
45 Ibid., sig. CC4V.
stayed with his church, as promised, and revelation continues beyond the scriptures: “What so
ever Tyndale bable to the contrary, god is yet at as mych lybertye to teache hys chyrch forther
what trouth he wyll hereafter.” 48 Innovation by and through the church, far from being an anti-
Christian degradation, reveals the will of God. Traditions, therefore, must please Him: saints,
images, and pilgrimages are “allowed, approbate, and accustomed for good Christian and
meritorious virtue.” 49 The main reason More can place such confidence in this church is that its
borders are clear and visible: again and again he returns to common practice, commonly shared
traditions, and apparent succession leading back into the time of their ancestors. Structure, the
hierarchy, and common practices constitute the church.

For Tyndale, however, as for all Protestants, the boundaries of the true, spiritual church
are never coterminous with the visible congregation on earth. Tyndale agrees, in principle, that
God has promised to abide with his church and that this divine wardship guarantees the church’s
infallibility; however, he claims that the passages refer to the invisible true church of the elect,
not More’s commonly known, visible church. After all, the Roman church has done some very
un-godly things, and claiming that divine omnipotence has sanctioned them all borders on
blasphemy. Because the early Reformers needed to justify the break from Rome and explain how
their faith was not schism, but in fact the true, original faith, they highlighted the tradition of the
invisible church, which, though always present in the ecclesiological discourse, had generally
been muted. Tydale’s idea of the invisible church, however, is somewhat ambiguous; it includes
all right believing Christians, and appeals to the Bible to define right belief. More challenges this
definition, and claims that the recourse to an invisible, scripture-based church merely collapses

48 Ibid., cccxxii.

49 Thomas More, A Dyaloge of Syr Thomas More Knyghte (London: 1529), sig. C1V.
Tyndale’s church to disconnected individualism, each member not only unable to descry other members, but unable even to objectively define the category of right belief. The two churches in this debate, then, stand somewhat differently than they would when John Bale represented them a few decades later: for More, the sacraments, the orders, and the members of the church were visible, and the teachings well defined; for Tyndale, the church was spiritual, based in scripture, with the elect members known only to God and themselves. More exploits a real weakness in Tyndale’s Ecclesiology; Tyndale never fully articulates his vision of the church, but instead aggressively attacks a simple reading of the visible church. He seems to hazily separate from past views, still thinking through the ramifications and implications of his own claims.

The Church, as van Leer noted, is the center of More’s theological thinking, the “point to which he always returns.”\textsuperscript{50} The church according to More both defines and guarantees right belief: More claims that it is best for a layman like him to “Iene & cleve to the comen fayth, and byleve of crystis chyrch… wyth commen report of other honest men from all other placys of crystyndome.”\textsuperscript{51} This universal agreement, transcending both time and place, exhibits Christian unity and stands as firm proof against the new-fangled heresies of Luther and Tyndale. He repeatedly invokes the “y^e fayth of chrystis chyrch by y^e comen consent.”\textsuperscript{52} Like the reformers, More interprets Peter’s faith (rather than Peter himself) as the ‘rock’ on which Christ will build his church. But for More, this further guarantees the infallibility of the church, since Christ’s promises refer to the faith generally:

\begin{quote}
Tell me then I requyre you / whan chryst sayd to saynt Peter / sathanas hath desyred to syfte y^ as men syfte corne / but I haue prayd for y^ thy faith shall not fayle / sayde he thys to h as a promyse of y^ fayth to be by goddes helpe perpetually kepte & preseruyd in
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{50} Van Leer, “The Controversy about Ecclesiology,” 65.

\textsuperscript{51} More, \textit{A Dyaloge}, sig B2V.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., sig. C1V.
saynte peter only / or elles in yᵉ hole churche / that ys to wete yᵉ hole congregacyon of chrysten people professyng his name & his fayth & abydyng in yᵉ body of the same / not being precided & cut of / meanyng yᵗ his fayth shuld neuer so vtterly fayle his church / but yᵗ yt shulde hole & entyere abide & remayn therin?53

The challenge for Tyndale, More claims, is to explain what Christ’s promises mean if the church can go astray: if Christ promised the faith of Peter would not fail (and he cannot have simply meant Peter, for Peter’s faith did fail, at least on the eve of the crucifixion), then how can Reformers claim that the faith of the church has failed for 800 years? What does it mean that the faith of the visible, known church has in fact been blasphemous idolatry? And how would Christ, then, not be a liar?

More emphasizes the God-backed assurance of the visible church further with an even more explicit promise of Christ.

and fynally then were these wordys frustrat where he sayd. Lo I am wyth you all yᵉ dayes to yᵉ worldes ende. yf he shude mene yt but wyth them that hard hym speke yt / then shuld yt appere yt he had intendyd a chyrche onely of them and for theyr tyme / And them from theyr dethe hether al were don.54

Christ in nearly his final earthly speech had promised to continue with his church, that his church might endure in truth forever. This promise clinches the matter for More, as well as his imaginary disputant in his dialog. (He can “well agre that all suche thyngys was spoken by christ to make them sure that the faythe should never fayle in his church.”55) Moreover, this promise reinforces the fact that the church refers to a visible and knowable community. It makes no sense, at least to More, to imagine an invisible, hidden church to which this promise applies, and to state that the known, visible church has no claim on Christ’s accompanying presence. The

53 Ibid., sig. E1V.
54 Ibid., sig. E3R
55 Ibid., sig. E3R. Stressing the desired unity of the church, “agree” is one of the most common words in the Dyaloge, appearing 83 times.
abiding presence of the holy spirit ensures that all the decisions and ceremonies of the church, all the accretions over the past thousand years, still please God: God has “by hys owne holy spyrYTE whom he sent to instructe hys chyrche, taught them holy ceremonyes to be vsed about hys blessed sacramentes, to the honour therof and to the encreace of crysten menny deuocyon, as in dede it doth what so euer Tyndale bable.”

Everything that must be known by a Christian can be known through the church, and everything the church teaches edifies Christians. Though More will later deny the implication and claim that all Christendom comprises the church, his discussion of the church’s authority tends to align the church with the clergy. In his polemic, the distinction remains unclear.

For More (and many Catholic polemicists) the church needed to be visible to ensure that people could find the truth. Potential converts — from Islam or Judaism — still need to locate the true church to be brought to Christ. In both the Dialogue and the Confutation, More therefore levels some of his most pointed criticism at Tyndale’s notion of the invisible or hidden church, the “secrete unknowen chyrche”: “Yf he and hys company quod I be the chyrche / he must tell where hys felwes be? Why so q he yf men sholde aske you and me where the chyrche as / we colde tel no one place but many. Let hym quod I in lyke wyse assygne some companyes tht be knowen for congregacyons to gether in dyuers countrees.”

More appeals to community and argues that the true church must recognize ‘fellows’ everywhere. The apparent isolation of the Protestant community disqualifies its claims to be the church. Often, as many scholars have noted, More’s critique of Tyndale’s doctrine degenerates into personal attack and bawdy mocking, and certainly his defense of the church is no different: “the flesshelynes of theyr chyrch
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56 More, Confutation, cxliii.
57 More, A Dyaoge, sig. J2V.
is spyrytuall. For the flesshely wedded harlotes of theyr chyrche be theyr chyef holy spyrytuall fathers, and holy spyrytuall mothers, monkes, freres, and nunes.”

His contemporaries, however, felt the brunt of his critique perhaps more keenly than modern critics, and the marrow came through the mocking: despite the tone, More’s assertion that “theyr holy chyrch is but new bygonne” and that their doctrine implies that for “viii. Hundred yere and more Criste hath had no chyrch in the worlde at all” hit a sore spot for early Reformers. As Luther’s writing testifies, in moments of self-doubt, they did fear the seeming novelty of their position, despite the insistence that their church aligned more truly with the historical (apostolic) church. More’s greatest strength (though perhaps he overused it) was to juxtapose “the comen knowen people of all crysten realmes” against the “secrete congregateyon of unknowen chosen heretikes, scatered abrode in corners, and studyenge to destroye the chyrche” This was the central question Reformers were forced to answer.

More’s attack on the invisible church is relentless, and, as he shows, the invisible church faces obvious problems: if they can never recognize their brethren, how do they choose ministers? How do they properly admonish those who live in sin, as Christ commanded the church? In fact, the notion of the invisible church of elect, according to More, proves more than Tyndale had in fact intended: “his argument proueth y there is in erth no chyrche at all. For what chyrche he fynde or ymagyn in erth that doth not synne / & specyally yf y were true y him selfe sayth amonge his other heresyes / where he holdeth styll y all the good workis of good men be sinnes / & y men sinne in y they do good?” Confusion remains even after Tyndale explains
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58 More, Confutation, lxxxviii.
59 Ibid., lxxxviii.
60 Ibid., cxvli.
61 More, A Dyalogue, sig. K1R.
that members of the church are “sinners and no sinners” (Luther’s *Justus et Peccator*), for More claims that this is manifest nonsense. Maybe most importantly for More, a visible church allows for the kind of international unity of Christendom that More (somewhat idealistically) imagines has always existed; to undermine the visible church undermines all the known bonds of community. One central church allows this, and Paul has admonished us to join together in agreement: “[H]e meruelouse effectually besecheth Chrysten people to agree to gether all in one mynde / and in the fayth to tell one tale / sufferyng no sectis or scismes among theym. whych agrement & consent can neuer be where no man geueth credence to other. But among Christen people yt wll sone be / yf every man geue credence to the chirch.”\(^62\) Disunity arises as an obvious consequence of the reformation, of schism. More recounts the Farmer’s War and the uprisings in Rome in his *Dyalogoe*, events which he had ruefully predicted in his earlier Latin polemic; and he generalizes the lesson in his *Confutation*, claiming that “neuer shall y^\(^ ^\) cuntre long abyde wythout debate and ruffle / where scysmes & factyouse heresyes are suffered a whyle to grow.”\(^63\) The dire admonition localizes the international unrest caused by the Reformation, moving quickly from an international to a national frame, and stresses the need for visible, obvious communion.

A more subtle blow to Christian unity is the temporal confusion occasioned by Tyndale’s doctrine, and More also begins raising questions about the community of the church in time. “Where was your church before Luther?” became a potent weapon in Catholic polemic. Just as the nation, though a relatively recent invention, is assumed by most nationalists to have always existed throughout time, the church, too, needed to exist throughout history, not just before

\(^{62}\) Ibid., sig. H1R.

\(^{63}\) More, *Confutation*, sig. Dd3R.
Luther, but even before Christ. Hence, Protestants (especially Calvin) tended to stress the continuity of Israel and the Christian church. But not only, claims More, does the new heresy cut adherents off from the long history of the Christian church, by taking a Gods-eye view of history it leads to manifest absurdities within the moment. If the “predestynate” comprise the true church, at any moment the true church likely contains many men who actively persecute and resist the church — those who will be converted later. As More points out, this view means that Paul would have been a member of the true church even as he was persecuting Christians:

But yt may be quod I that as men be chaungeable / he that is predestynate may be many tymes in hys lyfe nought. And he that wyll at laste fall to synne and wretchednes and so fynally caste hym selfe away / shall in some tyme of hys lyfe be good / and therfore for the tyme in goddys favrre. For god blameth nor hateth no man for yt he shal wyll / but for that malyuous wyll that he hath or hath had al redy. And thus shal therby thys reason be good men oute of Crystys chyrche and nowghty men therin / faythful men out of yt and heretyques in yt / and both yd tone and yd tother wythout reason or good cawse why.

This argument, to More, is clearly ridiculous; failing to recognize that “men be chaungeable” and treating the church instead only as an eschatological reality offers no guarantee of unity, but instead only a motley variety of the good and bad at any present moment. And this is all further complicated by Tyndale’s notion that the church cannot sin, which tries unsuccessfully to relocate the church inside history: “For yf he shold be in yt alway whan he is out of synne / & out of yt whan he is in synne / than shold a man peraduenture be in yt in yd morninge & out of yt at none / & in agayn at nyght.”

Protestants, then, were forced to answer questions about their apparently novel religious community: how was it not schism? Where did it originate? How could it be located? How were the various Protestant congregations connected, both to each other, to Rome, and to Christians
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through history? To fully answer these required significant, complex revision of ecclesiology, and left the Reformers with a very different conception of the religious community than Catholics had held before them. According to More, Tyndale’s theory failed to explain how all Christians could be united. Perhaps the most famous part of More and Tyndale’s debate arises in More’s attack on Tyndale’s New Testament, and the polemic again focuses on different understandings of the church. More’s first complaint is that Tyndale “falsely translated ecclesia in to ye vnknownen name of congregacyon, in such places as he shold haue translated yt in to ye holy knownen name of chyrch.”

He critiques Tyndale’s discussion of the uses of the term ‘church’ in scripture, and claims that he misses the single definition of “greteste wayght”: “that sygnificacyon, by whych the chyrch sygnyfyeth not as Tyndale taketh yt in his thyrde sygnyfycacyon, for all a multitude gathered to gether in one, of all kyndes, condycyons, and degrees of people / but of such onely people as be crysten people, and them not in one cytye onely, but that hole nomber of euery cytye, towne, and village thorow out all the hole world: this sygnificacyon Tyndale leueth out clene, bycause yt toucheth moste the mater.” This sense of the international Christian body represents for More the greatest and most common usage of the term, “the catholyque chyrch and unyversall.” In his opinion, at least, Tyndale’s newly-minted ‘congregation’ is unable to carry this true, international signification. More probably harbors unjust suspicions about the reformers doctrine of the church. In the end, he claims, their obscure theories on the church were developed only to enable their heretical notions: “he [Luther] wolde brynge the very chyrch of Cryst out of knowlege / and wold put yt in dowt whyther ye saintis that

66 More, Confutation, cxxvi.
67 Ibid., xcvi.
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the chyrch honoureth / were good men or not.” Tyndale’s translation of *ecclesia* as congregation epitomizes this obfuscation. ‘Church,’ More claims, was well enough known and always used in English; but Tyndale reworked the known word with the unfamiliar word — which could just as easily apply to an assembly of non-Christians — because he wanted to insidiously reinforce his heresy: he was plotting with Luther and “was wylyynge to helpe hys maters forwarde here.”  

More’s conclusion, reached many times throughout his polemic, is that the church really is the unified and known institution that has endured since Christ. This binds nations together, and ensures unity in the faith: “‘[Is it] not this company and congregacyon / of all these nacyons / that wythout faccions taken & precysyon from the remenaunt / profese yᵉ name & fayth of Cryst? By thys chyrch know we the scrypture / & thys is the very chyrch.’” Tyndale responds much more briefly — though still in a volume of 80,000 words; certainly no simple pamphlet — to More’s attack in his *Answer to More*. While he defends his entire spectrum of belief, Tyndale tacitly agrees with More about the importance of the doctrine of the church and opens his *Answer*, after a short introductory epistle, with his ecclesiology. Admittedly, this responds to More’s critique of the translation of *ecclesia* as congregation, but it also foregrounds the importance of the doctrine. He offers first the various “significations” of the word church. First, it can refer simply to the building, a “place or house” where Christians gather to hear the pure word preached; also, however, it has begun to denote priests, those “multitude of shaven, shorn and oyled whych we now calle the spirytualtye and clergye” (and this is “mystaken”); finally, a “little knowne” signification: “it signifieth a congregatcion/ a multitude or a company gathered to

---


70 Ibid., sig. O4V.

71 Ibid., sig. K2R.
gether in one/ of all degrees of people. As a man wold saye/ the church of London."72 This last meaning is most important from Tyndale, and he stresses the inclusion of all believing people, not merely the clergy, in the Church of Christ.

Tyndale focuses on developing this last and most important signification. He notes that the church of Christ can be further subdivided and carries a “double signification”: it is “some times taken generally for all that embrace the name of Chryste though their faythes be nought or though they have no fayth at all. And some times it is taken specially for the electe only in whose hertes God hath written his lawe with his holy spirite and geven them a felinge faith of the mercy that is in christe Jesu oure lorde.”73 Though Tyndale does not employ the terms ‘visible’ and ‘invisible,’ the seed of this later concept already exists, burgeoning from Tyndale’s desire to explain how true Christians could remain hidden for so long within the church of Rome, and to explain why the church of Christ seems to contain so many wicked men and women. Calvin would later exploit the division most fully, under the same pressure from Catholic polemic. Tyndale finds the distinction, however, in Scripture itself: “This ys therfore a Sure conclusyon/ as paul sayth Ro. ix. that not all they that are of Israel are Israelites/” “this word church hath a double interpretacyon.”74 Instead, the nation (signifying the church) was divided exactly as in the present: “There is a carnall Israel and a spirituall.”75 Notably, Tyndale turns to biblical metaphor (the church as Israel) to explain his relatively new sense of the Christian community.

Through this metaphor – or perhaps more accurately, type -- of Israel, Tyndale also asserts the union and continuity of God’s people throughout time. According to Tyndale, the
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church often shrinks to only a few people of God, but it has never disappeared from the earth. Under the patriarchs the church was “greate in faith and small in numbre/ And as it encreased in numbre/ so it decreased in faith.”\textsuperscript{76} The size of the Roman church itself almost precludes it from truth. Instead, the people of God have always been a small, select band, and Tyndale stresses that they have also, since the beginning, been persecuted by secular forces: “as we doo in oure tyme and as the electe ever dyd and shall doo tyll the worldes ende.”\textsuperscript{77} Just as Christ promised, those true to his faith would always face adversity, and the wealth of Rome clearly proves how little adversity the false church of Antichrist has faced. Persecution almost manifests the true, invisible church. For English Reformers during the reign of Mary, persecution became important enough to be a mark of the true church, even the principle distinction: the persecuting church of Rome against the persecuted church of Christ.

Because of their desire to manifest the true church and answer charges from their Roman Catholic opponents, Tyndale and other Reformers either implicitly or explicitly developed lists of signs. Persecution seems one for Tyndale, but the importance of the word, central to all reformers, constitutes the most important sign. The disagreement over the church reduces to a disagreement over authority, and for Tyndale the Scripture is obviously above the church: “for ye hole Scripture and all belevinge herites testifye that we are begotten thorow the worde;” “And therfore in as moch as the worde is before the faith/ and faith maketh the congregacion/ therfore is the word or gospell before the congregacion.”\textsuperscript{78} In the Bible, Tyndale claims, one can find clearly indicated the scope of the true church: the Scripture “truely understood aftir the playne places and generall articles of the faith which thou findest in the Scripture/ and the ensamples
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that are gonne before/ wyll allwaye testifie who is the right church."\textsuperscript{79} The authority of Scripture over the church is “a playne and an evident conclusion as bright as the sonne shyninge;”\textsuperscript{80} truth is not taught by the church, but rather written inwardly by God through the word on the believer’s heart.

Tyndale’s doctrine of the church remains less developed, less systematic than later Protestant thinkers would make it, but it begins taking form under the polemical attack of More, and the debate itself explains in many ways its final shape; it highlights the questions and insecurities of the Reformers as they began reimagining the wide, transnational community.

**Metaphors of the church**

As evident in Tyndale’s response, the pressure exerted by Roman Catholics on Reformed ecclesiology led to a renewed emphasis on biblical metaphors of the church. In a communion that incorporated (to use their metaphor) disparate structures, adiaphora, and even, to some extent, variant belief, defining the church in a concrete (visible) way became increasingly difficult. Addressing these questions became an international task, as Protestant writers located throughout Europe collaborated in the polemic against Catholic writers. A snapshot of the works translated into English and printed in England, including the Reformers and later, French, German, and Dutch theologians, reveals the transnational, collaborative and yet popular interest in ecclesiology. Reformers did attempt a concrete definition, of course, and volumes have been written on the *notae ecclesiarum* that constituted a minimum sufficiency. (For Luther, for example, it was some combination of the following: always the word preached and the sacraments properly administered; occasionally, the use of keys, calling and consecration of
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ministers, prayer, the bearing of the cross.\textsuperscript{81} Calvin similarly defined a true church’s marks as “Wherever we see the word of God sincerely preached and heard, wherever we see the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ,” with his followers sometimes adding the third mark of discipline.\textsuperscript{82}) Common and widely used distinctions emerged: the church was, for example, both visible and invisible; the visible church was mixed with hypocrites, those professing Christians who were not true believers. It existed on earth (the church militant) and in heaven (the church triumphant). And yet simultaneously, the bible and Christian tradition offered rich material for a less systematic, though perhaps more holistic, way of conceptualizing the church. These metaphors were more common in non-theological religious discourse, but they also shaped the thought of the most detailed Reformed thinkers. As recent scholars have remarked, the manner in which each generation appropriates and privileges these metaphors can offer insights into the historical context. I will therefore focus primarily on the most popular metaphors among Reformed writers during the first century after Luther.

A focus on metaphor presents certain challenges, however. At a most simplistic level, many of the metaphors are now dead – the church as a body, for example. When we talk about ‘members’ of the community it no longer carries any explicit metaphoric resonance. Likely, however, this remained alive and true for early moderns, and still accompanied visions of the holy community as a body. More importantly, the metaphors resist simple explication, and were in fact used heuristically themselves: they explained doctrines of the church, and required – or perhaps made possible – no further explanation. Any attempt to explicate the metaphor, or discuss its significance, inevitably flattens, as much scholarship on the metaphor avers. The
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importance of these metaphors in the early modern self-understanding corroborates Ricoeur’s insistence, now widely confirmed, on the cognitive significance of metaphors: far more than ornamental, these actually shaped how social reality could be conceived, and reshaped experience of the community as inflections changed in the period. As Ricoeur expresses it, “a metaphor may be seen as a model for changing our way of looking at things, of perceiving the world.”

Recent scholarship has insisted on these cognitive, social, and emotional dimensions of metaphor. Although none of these metaphors were new, the changing conception of language and figurative language, as well as the new contexts in which theologians stressed or appropriated the metaphors, could re-script how contemporaries thought of the religious community. And yet, counter Ricoeur, literary critics of the early modern period have argued that metaphor, too, is a concept that must be historicized rather than an innate anthropological reality. Part of Ricoeur’s metaphor theory relies on the tension between being and not being, on the recognition that the subject compared both is and is not. Literary critics, especially those focused on the body, have suggested rather that the early moderns may have been given to more literalist conceptions of many of their metaphors. In their writing on the church, theologians tend to grant a special kind of truth to theological metaphor: the church as a body, as we shall see, is in some ways more truly a body than the ‘national’ body.

Typology, also, plays a significant role in the church’s self-definition and is never entirely continuous with the other metaphoric relationship. Typology provided a connection with the past, especially in the metaphor of the church as Israel, which allowed for almost endless reflections of the church in the Old Testament and extended comparisons that illuminated the
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current community. Luther, for example, saw a pattern of the persecuted true church and the persecuting false church reverberating back all the way to Cain and Able. Typology is again figurative and analogous, but it provides a way not only of organizing the community, but of organizing the community inside history. As Auerbach notes,

In the modern view, the provisional event is treated as a step in an unbroken horizontal process; in the figural system the interpretation is always sought from above; events are considered not in their unbroken relation to one another, but torn apart, individually, each in relation to something other that is promised and not yet present [...] Whereas in the modern view the event is always self-sufficient and secure, while the interpretation is fundamentally incomplete, in the figural interpretation the fact is subordinated to an interpretation which is fully secured to begin with: the event is enacted according to an ideal model which is a prototype situated in the future and thus far only promised.85

In this case, the church maps itself onto the church, for writers understood Israel and the true church as coterminous. The past, however, could be repeated, categorized, anatomized. The continuity between Israel and the church guaranteed that minute characteristics and events took on figurative significance as interpreted by reformed thinkers. With all of the figurative language employed in the attempt to characterize the church, then, new ways of understanding social reality were opened, but never a single, correct way. Rather, a plurality of choices exist.

An important constellation of metaphors compares the church to a woman: virgin, bride, mother. These found expression in both Christ’s parables and apocalyptic literature, and they became especially popular during the early modern period. In Luther’s Lectures on Galatians, these metaphors overlap not only with each other, but with the city/nation metaphor that we will see shortly: “Therefore Sarah, or Jerusalem, our free mother, is the church, the bride of Christ who gives birth to all. She goes on giving birth to children without interruption until the end of

the world.” According to Paul Minear, “It is typical of both testaments that this image of bride could coalesce so readily with such disparate pictures as those of nation, city, temple, and body.” As Luther’s passage makes clear, the mother metaphor could not only serve to suggest the church’s fecundity, but it insinuated a biological connection between Christians: children of the same parents. Calvin similarly describes the church as mother even in his heading on his section in the *Institutes* on the church, relying on Cyprian’s ecclesiological writing: “The Holy Catholic Church, our Mother.” For Calvin, “mother” becomes a privileged metaphor which denotes the continued progress of the church on earth, and the helplessness of humanity without God’s grace. Only inside the church can a Christian make progress toward his or her final goal; “we revere her as our mother, so we desire to stay in her bosom” … “away from her bosom one cannot hope for any forgiveness of sins or any salvation.” The metaphor invoked soteriology as a process, and, perhaps more importantly, it stressed the importance of the church as a kind of mediating agent between Christians and Christ.

Like many of these metaphors, bride/mother implied its inverse. The clearest expressions of the church as the bride of Christ derive from apocalyptic writing (Rev. 21:2,2-10), and early modern writers, within often violent religious contest and perhaps as a result particularly given to binary thought, fully applied this division to history. Opposed to the bride/mother stood the whore. According to the French Huguenot Phillip de Mornay, writing near the end of the
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sixteenth century, the Roman church “is an heretical Church worse then al the Churches that euer haue bene, a wife which prouoketh God to a diuorce, a mother which nourisheth vp her children to the diuell.”

Bale had similarly used the metaphor in his *Image of Both Churches*:

> Herein is the true Christian church which is the meek spouse of the lamb without spot in her right-fashioned colours described. So is the proud church of hypocrites, the rose coloured whore, the paramour of Antichrist and the sinful synagogue of Satan in her just proportion depainted.

This binary closely linked the mother/bride to New Jerusalem and the whore to Babylon, entangling the metaphor with civic significance. Those tracing the iconography of Elizabeth have demonstrated how central this binary was to her presentation, and several critics early in the 2000s carefully examined the idea of the nation as a gendered body, which itself played a role in consolidating nationalism. Though the binary-thinking often militated against a simple nationalism, dividing the world into the Church of God and the Church of Satan (everyone else), it could occasionally overlap with nationalistic imagery to reinforce English chauvinism, but only within the context of a wider, transnational church.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, not only theologians but poets appropriated this representation of the church, suggesting its wider resonance in early modern culture. Both John Donne and George Herbert famously invoke the Mother/bride set of metaphors in their religious poetry. The two poems, “Holy Sonnet 18” and “The British Church,” demonstrate how the universal ideal of the reformers became entangled with national churches, for in both the representation of the church as mother, which had always referred to the entire church, comes at least partially to stand in for a particular or national version of the church. Herbert’s, obviously, implies this national focus even in his title — though it is worth qualifying that the “British”
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church already implies a multinational community (see Chapter Three). Herbert opens his poem addressing the church directly as “mother”: “I Joy, deare Mother, when I view / Thy perfect lineaments, and hue / Both sweet and bright.” The metaphor serves as a foundation for Herbert to discuss religious ceremony, and, on the common spectrum, locate the Church of England as a via media between a meretricious Rome and an excessively-abnegating Geneva. Yet part of the tension in the poem stems from the background metaphor of the true church, the entire church, as mother — which was, again, perhaps Calvin’s favorite ecclesiological metaphor and thus well known among reformed congregations. Nothing particularly “British” appears in Herbert’s poem until the end, when he praises God for “double-moating” the church (“And none but thee”), glancing at Britain as an island. Still, the metaphor, particularly with the forceful final line, begs the question: what is the Church of England’s relationship to the true church? For that matter, how does the Church of England relate to the British Church? (Scotland’s national church might look more like the church that “wholly goes on th’other side, / And nothing wears.”) Surely, the speaker cannot be arguing that only the English church is a true church, and the myopic position on “Britain” and the naive use of the metaphor in some ways undercut the nationalist position the poem expresses. The attachment to his national church almost becomes another false position that the speaker must learn to abandon.

Donne similarly compares the church’s adiaphora to clothing, though he adopts the metaphor of the bride: “Show me, dear Christ, thy spouse.” Donne’s use of the metaphor is
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more ecumenical, and he divides the churches into Protestant and Catholic; England does not have a qualitatively different church, as in Herbert’s poem, but the same community “robbed and tore, / Laments and mourns in Germany and here.”96 Yet uncertainties over the shape of the true church riddle Donne’s poem, the same uncertainties raised in the early Reformation debates: does the church always exist on earth as Christ promised, or had it disappeared under Rome? (“Sleeps she a thousand, then peeps up one year?”) Can the church err, or is the spirit ever-present? (“Is she self-truth, and errs?”) Donne’s turn of the metaphor to close the poem mixes bawdy with spiritual, as he so often does, but it is based in a desire for an open and inclusive church: “Who is most true and pleasing to thee then / When she is embraced and open to most men.”97 While for Herbert the mother metaphor was adopted for celebration of the national church, for Donne the church as mother/bride provided a comforting irenicism that conflicted with some of the more insular metaphors popular among reformers. Both poets therefore play with the metaphor, twisting its connotations to explore what it might say about the holy congregation — whether in terms of ceremony or inclusiveness.

The most prominent biological metaphor for the church — and one that the nation shared (and still shares) — represented the community as a body, specifically the body of Christ. Like the others, this metaphor has scriptural roots. Reformers adopted the metaphor of the church as a body perhaps because it provided another visual and compelling image of unity in the face of increasing schism; against visible disarray and the Roman claims of historical continuity, the metaphor of the body proposed an organic unity: “All they that are knit and incorporated into this Churche in true faith & charitie, are partakers of this inheritance, because they are members of
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the body of Christ.”98 ‘Members,’ of course, derives from this way of conceiving the holy community, and its wide usage in the period perhaps reminded people of the larger metaphor. It conveniently explained hierarchical distinctions in the church, and it also demonstrated how particular churches, which sometimes looked very different, actually constituted the same creature; the same spirit animated them all: “For this knowlege maketh a man of the church. And the church is christes body Collossen. i. and every person of the church is a member of christ. Ephe. 5. Now it is no member of christ that hath not christes spirite in it. Roma. viii. as it is no part of me or member of my body wherin my soule is not present and quikeneth it.”99

When discussing the church as a body, many writers both stress the necessity of unity and explain the force binding the church together. For Heinrich Bullinger, love is a bond which “joyneth together the members of the ecclesiasticall body, mutually amongst themselves,” “a bond most firmely knitting together all the members.”100 Hooker similarly insists on this literalness, “That Church of Christ, which we properly term his body mystical, can be but one… Only our minds by intellectual conceit are able to apprehend, that such a real body there is: a body collective, because it contains an huge multitude; a body mystical, because the mystery of their conjunction is removed altogether from sense.”101 For Hooker, the body metaphor negated national attachment: “be they Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, they are all incorpored into one company, they all make but one body.”102 The Puritan woodcutter Nehemiah Wallington’s use of
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the image during the Thirty Years War suggests how popular the metaphor was, the very literal manifestation of the metaphor in many religious laypersons’ thought, and the ramifications it held for understanding their connection with their coreligionists on the continent. “This discovers Gods Marcys to mee in giving me an heart to Simporthize & morne as though I were in the same body which gives to me some evidence that I am a lively member of Christs body because I am a felling member for where there is sence there is Life.”103 For Wallington, his empathetic connection with Protestants in Germany, the true suffering church, serves as a proof of his own membership in that community. Yet while Wallington’s sympathy had placed him inside the church, his external view as an Englishman had simultaneously removed him from the true community of sufferers. Thus, he notes how useful the news could be, because it offered a chance for reflection: “Wee may examine our selves wither wee have not been wanting to them in their wants and warres. Whether wee have prayed for them in their troubls and sorrow.”104 He was a member of the true persecuted church, as his sympathy proved; he was also an observer, reflecting as part of a national community and drawing national lessons.

The pervasiveness of the church-as-body trope resulted, perhaps, from its place in the Psalter, which often returned to the metaphor when praying for coreligionists abroad. It served as a useful reminder that, though the gospel might be preached in England, Protestants of the same church suffered elsewhere, and English laypersons should feel their suffering: “for Christ thy Son’s sake, be merciful to the commonwealths where thy gospel is truly preached and harbour granted to the afflicted members of Christ’s body.”105 As in this prayer, the community of Christ’s body is both markedly separate from the political community – the commonwealths –
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and yet, almost always evokes it. Often the psalter’s prayers implicitly parallel the church to the political body of England. For example, after mentioning the “whole body of the commonweale” in “A Prayer for the Whole Estate of Christ’s Church,” the author turns to the church with the same language: “And for that we be all members of the mystical body of Jesus Christ, we make our requests unto thee, O heavenly Father, for all such as are afflicted with any kind of cross or tribulation, as war, plague, famine, sickness, poverty, imprisonment, persecution, banishment or any other kind of thy rods.”

In the psalter, perhaps expectedly, the spiritual community takes precedence: “God save the Church universal, our Queen and realm.”

The church and nation, then, were sometimes competing, sometimes overlapping bodies. Theologians recognized the overlap, and many insisted that the metaphor belonged more truly to the church. Other societies are called a body, too, Bucer notes in his Commonplaces; “But since by far the greatest unity and oneness is that existing between the members of Christ, for they are gathered into one by divine action, through the Spirit of God and not by any natural or political affinity, then the company they form is much more appropriately called ‘the body’ in which Christ lives and which itself lives in Christ.”

Unlike the nation, the church had a soul animating the communal body. The church stood more fully united body because its members shared a higher identity, and, as Bucer remarks, “The unity and oneness of the members of this body is quite wonderful.”

As Calvin similarly notes in his commentary on 1 Corinthians:

It is usual, however, for any society of men, or congregation, to be called a body, as one city constitutes a body, and so, in like manner, one senate, and one people… Among
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Christians, however, the case is very different; for they do not constitute a mere political body, but are the spiritual and mystical body of Christ.\footnote{John Calvin, “Commentary on 1 Cor. 12:12,” in \textit{Ioannis Calvini Opera quae Supersunt Omnia}, eds. G. Baum, Edward Cunitz, and Edward Reuss, volume 49 (Brunswick, Germany: Schwetschke & Son, 1892), 201.}

According to Calvin, the metaphor becomes truer for the Christian community because the spirit of God animates the collective body. Unlike the national body, there is an assurance of unity.

The metaphor also proliferated during the reformation period because it offered useful polemic against the papacy. Unlike earthly communities, the church had a spiritual head, not the pope but Christ. Luther insists on this in his definition: “Through one faith we adhere to Him and appear as one body with Him and He with us; He, the Head and we the members.”\footnote{Martin Luther, \textit{Luther’s Works}, volume 43, eds. Helmut Lehmann and Martin Dietrich (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1968), 582.} Calvin, too, invokes the metaphor in part to discuss Christ’s role: “All the elect of God are so joined together in Christ, that as they depend on one head, so they are as it were compacted into one body, being knit together like its different members; made truly one by living together under the same Spirit of God in one faith, hope, and charity, called not only to the same inheritance of eternal life, but to participation in one God and Christ.”\footnote{Calvin, \textit{Institutes}, I.1.2, 1014.} In his commentaries, Calvin makes the anti-papal ramifications of this church egalitarianism more explicit: Christ’s headship means “all others, whether angels or men, must rank as members; so that he who holds the highest place among his fellows is still one of the members of the same body.”\footnote{John Calvin, “Commentary on Eph 1:22,” in \textit{Ioannis Calvini Opera quae Supersunt Omnia}, eds. G. Baum, Edward Cunitz, and Edward Reuss, volume 51 (Brunswick, Germany: Schwetschke & Son, 1892), 159.} If the spiritual head guaranteed a special kind of unity and undermined the pope’s authority, however, it also attenuated the community’s visible borders: an earthly head at least provided shape to the body, whereas the spiritual head again rendered the church invisible. This, paradoxically, meant that the very metaphor used to
stress Christian unity – and the importance of the Christian community – portrayed it as unknowable. In practice, of course, fervent Protestants would assume that the body aligned with other Protestant churches – and sometimes all churches besides Rome; but opponents of intervention could invoke a powerful uncertainty again based on the invisibility of the community.

Admittedly, the application of the body metaphor never aligned perfectly with either the visible or invisible church. For many Reformers, the body of the church contained only those true Christians, the eschatological reality. Luther, however, appropriates the metaphor and employs his characteristic scatological imagination to explain Rome’s status as a church: “A body may possess fine, sound and useful members which man can employ for his various needs; but that same body may also contain perspiration, secretion from the eyes, nasal mucus, scabs, abscesses and other filth… Filth is still part of the body even though it stinks.”

Yosep Kim argues that Calvin uses the body metaphor to discuss the importance of discipline in the church, a very practical application of the mystical theology. The use of the metaphors therefore depended on the problem theologians attempted to answer, and they granted diverse potential.

All of these metaphors interpenetrated: the bride of Christ, the body of Christ, the temple of God. Perhaps because of the political and religious overlap in the use of the body metaphor, theologians also often evoked the metaphor of the church as a body and the church as Israel in the same sentence. This most direct and complex metaphorical overlap between nation and church, however, derives from both the Old and New Testament. Throughout the Church’s history, early moderns knew, the church had been portrayed with national and civil metaphors.
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The Church was Israel, the people of God (Eph 2:12, Heb 8:8-10, Rev 2:14); the church was “a chosen race” and “a holy nation” (1 Pet. 2:9). With the importance of typology in early modern religious thought, any reference to Israel throughout the Old Testament applied almost without thought to the church. Calvin, for example, evokes Israel without explanation to answer a question on the church, simply assuming the equivalence: “God wondrously preserves his Church, while placing it as it were in concealment. Thus it was said to Elijah, ‘Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel,’ (1 Kings 19: 18).”

Other related metaphors persistently reinforce the significance of “Israel” and hint at the interconnectedness of ecclesiological and political thought. Tyndale’s famous dichotomy of the two kingdoms attempts to distinguish the earthly and heavenly, but in some ways only fuses them as related concepts: “Ye must understand that there be two states or degrees in this world: the kingdom of heaven, which is the regiment of the gospel; and the kingdom of this world, which is the temporal regiment.” Any separation was particularly difficult, given how deeply the metaphors and language of the nation and the church interpenetrated. Luther, for example, continually relies on civic language as he attempts to define the church. Scholars have enumerated the various ramifications of Luther’s insistence on relation in the church, his use of communio to mean both “gathering” and “fellowship.” Paul Althaus famously claims that fellowship should be understood as the “sharing of goods among believers.” Bernhard Lohse remarks on the importance of “mutual engagement on behalf of the other in bodily and spiritual

116 Calvin, Institutes, I.1.2, 1014.


Of note here, however, is the language used in an early sermon on the sacrament. The church is the incorporation with Christ and all saints. It is as if a citizen were given a sign, a document, or some other token to assure him that he is a citizen of the city, a member of that particular community… This fellowship consists in this, that all the spiritual possessions of Christ and his saints are shared with and become the common property of him who receives this sacrament. Again all sufferings and sins also become common property; and thus love in engenders love in return and unites.

As much as Luther may stress the differences between worldly and spiritual communities, the metaphor used to understand membership in the church is political — that of citizenship. And the fact that the suffering of the godly becomes common property to all of the church certainly opened questions about violence inflicted on other Protestant communities. Melanchthon, similarly, claims “we are citizens and members of this visible gathering.”

This series of national metaphors was so ubiquitous that the metaphors hardly needed explanation, though writers sometimes bluntly state the shared fact. Bertrand De Loque, for example, notes in his dedicatory letter to the Viscount of Turenne, “There being meant by Syon and Ierusalem the Church of God.” The primary model the Old Testament offered the people of God for how to understand themselves and their relationship was the political and ethnic model of Israel. To be a church was, at least in some sense, metaphorically indistinguishable from a nation. Calvin strove to establish this unity between Old and New Testament communities, and his use of the metaphor became particularly influential. Once again, the Psalter
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largely popularized it, as each Psalm discussing Israel was briefly interpreted in the opening explanation as referring to God’s church. In religious song and verse, Israel appears almost always on a personal level (describing the life of the believer) or a transnational level that encompasses the entire church. The typology is so firmly established that psalms and hymns can invoke Israel without a requisite explanation that it stands in for the church — that English (or Dutch, or German) congregations participate in Israel. George Wither justifies his translation project, *Songs and Hymnes of the Church*, by noting that ancient Israel and their songs apply still to the church today, specifically because they are made first to represent and presage the church: they “farre better expresse the nature of that which they mystically point out, then of what they are litterally applied vnto.” Thus the songs of Israel “are made in the person of all the Faithfull, and do (for the most part) treat of those things which concerne the whole Catholike Church.”\(^\text{123}\) Wither invokes Israel often in his songs, implicitly and sometimes explicitly meaning “the whole Catholike Church.” The first song of Moses, for example, uses Israel in both a historical and a mystical sense: “Historically, in commemoration of that particular Deliuerance, which God had so long agoe, and so wondrously vouchsafed to his persecuted and afflicted Church. Mystically, in acknowledge\|^\text{124}\) In the Sternhold-Hopkins psalter, the same use of Israel is made, and even sometimes explained in detail, as for example in the marriage of Solomon and the Pharaoh’s daughter (considered in Chapter Four).

If for a brief time patriotism encouraged English Protestants to see England as a new Israel, God’s chosen people, they also learned repeatedly that the metaphor referred most truly to


\(^{124}\) Ibid., 2.
the entire estate of the church, never simply aligning with England – or even including all English people. Early critical description of English “elect nationalism” — the idea that England itself became a new Israel, chosen by God — has mislead interpretation of these comparisons and transformed a transnational, unifying metaphor into something insular. As more recent scholarship has demonstrated, true elect nationalism was confined to a very small minority and a very short period. Even if English laypeople might talk of themselves as Israel, moreover, they surely were aware that similar claims were made for the Dutch (who, as we shall see in the first chapter, had perhaps the better claim), German territories, Denmark, Sweden, and others. The image could be both insular and unifying simultaneously, as writers imagined England as Israel while knowing the full context and holding firmly to the belief that Israel also presaged the entire church — the true people of God. Israel’s own status as a “nation,” though certainly understood in a pre-modern sense, further complicated these entangled ideas.

In the period, the type of Israel became complicated by the newly emerging definitions of nation. Often it maintained a biological sense – as expressed in the related metaphor of the church as the “sons of Abraham” – but territorial ideas of the state inevitably influence it, as well. It also remained attached to Christ, as a kingdom was attached to a monarch, though in no less a political expression:

And because our Lord is a king, therefore be must néeds haue a kingdome. As well the realme & dominion subiecte to a kinge is called a kingdome, as principalitie, empire, power, & manner of gouernment it selfe. Therefore the church, the communion or fellowship of saints, béeing obedient & subiect to their king Christe, is called the kingdome of God.125

The national metaphors came concomitant with the problematic associations of the papacy as a spiritual and earthly kingdom. As Denys Hays has shown, a territorial idea of Christendom

125 Bullinger, _Fiftie Godly and Learned Sermons_, 699.
(which could be synonymous with the church) emerged during the middle ages, especially in the ferment of the crusades. This inheritance was vexed, however, by the new sense that the borders of this kingdom could never be described: “The definition of this people by its Lord permanently prevents it from finalizing or absolving its own map of the boundaries that divide it from those who are not his people.”¹²⁶ When the spiritual community became obviously fragmented, Reformers needed to re-imagine the characteristics of a manifestation of a spiritual kingdom in the earthly realm.

Several questions thus emerge from the metaphor linking church and nation, and, as all metaphors, the connection produced a reciprocal effect on both imagined communities. As we will see in the subsequent chapters, these questions were central to the reception of continental heroes in England. The church became a nation, and the members of that nation united, through shared ideology rather than shared territory, custom, or heredity; they were a nation of belief. And yet, if the church was a kind of kingdom, it had to answer all the perplexing questions of political philosophy: did the church, for example, have a foreign policy? Should it interest itself in imperialism and expansion (and could these bring social and cultural prestige to the holy institution)? Did the church need to be defended by secular rulers? Could the church itself legitimate violence? What was the best political organization? Many of the debates in practical ecclesiology stem in a way from this nationalized conception of the church. And, perhaps, it facilitated more militant Protestantisms which believed princes might intervene by force. The Zurich reformers, unlike Luther early and the more cautious Calvin, allowed for militant intervention to protect God’s church on earth. Bullinger only briefly discusses the possibility in his sermon on the church, and conflicting demands sometimes render his exposition somewhat

¹²⁶ Minear, *Images of the Church*, 70.
contradictory. While Bullinger critiques Rome’s power and insists that “by no other instrument, than by the doctrine of truth and sounde & simple godlinessse, is that holy & catholique church of God built up, fenced, & preserved,” he also recognizes, in the very same paragraph, that “the wepons of carnal or corporal warfare have been profitable sometime to apostolicall men, and to the church, & do good even at this day.”

God has expressly forbidden militant intervention: “the Lord himselfe doth remove force & armes from ye building of the church, since he forbids his disciples the use of the sword.” But he has also, it seems, nearly commanded it: “Al men wil confesse, yt a good and godly magistrate oweth a dutie toward ye church of God.”

Bullinger fleshes this tension out more fully in the seventh, eighth, and ninth sermons of his second Decade. He declares explicitly the war might be waged by the Christian magistrate in defense of the church abroad: “They err,” he claims, “that are of opinion that no warres may be made in defence of religion.” In fact, God has explicitly commanded the use of militant force to uphold the church in Deuteronomy 13, in which he demands “that everie citie (within the iurisdiction of everie magistrate) which departeth from God and the worshippe of God, should be set on with warriours, and utterlie raced, if it revolted not from idolatrie betimes.”

The scriptures are filled with “innumerable sorte of examples” of kings who have defended the church, and post-scriptural history also offers many exemplars. As a commandment, the importance of militant intervention in defense of the church seems for Bullinger central to the
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obligations owed to coreligionists. Further, even for common people, fighting for a godly cause is both something owed to prince and neighbor, and also a high kind of virtue, for “the doe with greate glorie die a happie death, that die in so iuste a quarell, as for the defence of religion, of the lawes of God, of his countrie, wife, and children.”\textsuperscript{133} If the church is held together by love and unity, all believers united together in the kingdom of God, then the defense of that church becomes a necessity.

And yet, if during high points of Protestant optimism the church nation could begin to look like an empire, more often the metaphors pessimistically portrayed the church as minute and oppressed. Many of the minor metaphors took on a charged political meaning early in the Reformation and then again at the height of the Catholic Reformation, when the Roman Catholic Church stood as an enormous and powerful enemy. The religious wars later in the century only exacerbated the commitment to a religio-political conception of the church. Calvin’s sense of the church as an oppressed and scattered minority was particularly influential, and relied on biblical metaphors: the elect, the remnant, the flock, the wheat in the chaff. For Tyndale, the terms “remnant” and “little flock” imply that the “majority within the visible Church were not the elect children of God.”\textsuperscript{134} Calvin similarly stresses with these metaphors how few truly belong to the holy church: “But because a small and contemptible number are hidden in a huge multitude and a few grains of wheat are covered by a pile of chaff, we must leave to God alone the knowledge of his church, whose foundation is his secret election.”\textsuperscript{135} The earlier the reformer, in many ways, the more pessimistically this metaphor was applied: for Luther, the Church was “a tiny little

\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., 212.

\textsuperscript{134} Ralph S. Werrell, \textit{The Theology of William Tyndale} (Cambridge: J. Clarke, 2006), 144.
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flock of the most wretched, forlorn and hopeless men in the sight of the world.”

According to Catharine Davies, the metaphor of the flock, when used by Edwardian divines, complicated and often conflicted attempts portray the church as a unified national community, a Christian commonwealth. These series invoked the distinction between the invisible church and the visible church, and reminded laypeople of how few actually belonged to God — though of course, each person was to assume their own election, to “feel persuaded that we are truly ingrafted.”

The flock became a particularly important metaphor for poets discussing the religious community, perhaps once again because it also carried political overtones through the pastoral. Clergymen continually lambaste those wolves attacking their flock in their polemical sermons. Milton memorably critiques the state of the church in “Lycidas” through this metaphor:

The hungry sheep look up, and are not fed,
But, swoll’n with wind and the rank mist they draw,
Rot inwardly, and foul contagion spread;
Besides what the grim wolf with privy paw
Daily devours apace, and nothing said.

As in Herbert’s use of the Mother metaphor, this sheep-pen takes on specifically national connotations; yet it equally divides the nation, for the English are both the sheep and the wolves.

Metaphors of the remnant often complemented and overlapped with the larger ones we have already seen. Bullinger’s Second Helvetic Confession, for example, lists them as part of a rapid series: “And as there is but one God, one Mediator between God and man, Jesus the
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Messiah, one pastor of the whole flock, one head of this body, one Spirit, one salvation, one faith, one testament or covenant, there must needs be but one Church, which we call catholic, that is, universal, spread throughout all parts of the world and all ages.”¹³⁹ When connected to the kingdom and given political signification, however, this reformed tendency to imagine the church as a persecuted minority in some ways challenged the political conception of the church, since its members were in their very nature scattered and unknowable; this was a nation that could never be mapped until the apocalypse. And yet, this sense of a small, elite community also meant that religious identity, for a devout Protestant, especially, almost always superseded national identity. They viewed themselves as exiles on earth, citizens rather of a heavenly kingdom. The religious bonds could therefore easily become much stronger than any national union.

Finally, another central metaphor, found throughout the New Testament, portrayed the church as a temple. In its Pauline expression, it combines once again with ideas of citizenship.

Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; In whom all the building fitly framed together growth unto an holy temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."¹⁴⁰

The idea of the cornerstone appears again in 1 Peter 2:4, where members of the church are called “living stones” (KJV). Like the body metaphor, the metaphor implied a collaborative society founded by God, filled by God, and for God’s use. Similarly, it demanded a perfect kind of unity, even effacing more distinction than the metaphor of the body. It represented the church as a dynamic, living community, continually changing and expanding, yet also solid and permanent.


¹⁴⁰ Eph 2:19-22 (KJV).
While Reformers employed this metaphor less often, it came to hold particular significance for the godly community in England, and indeed the centrality of “edification” stems from these scriptural passages. According to Peter Lake, “[t]he whole vision of a community of the godly, a church built only of lively stones, and the consequent obsession with edification, that process of spiritual building, of mutual advice, admonition and, if necessary, rebuke, whereby the spiritual temple of the godly community was constructed and maintained, were of the essence of puritan religion.”\textsuperscript{141} As Lake’s work has shown, the metaphor could once again disconnect the true church from the national church, focused as it was on the community of the godly, and certainly no clear and specific borders were erected by the metaphor. Indeed, Paul also uses the temple of God to refer to individual believers, making the metaphor all the more complex (and perhaps explaining the Reformers’ reticence). Herbert quite obviously employs the metaphor in the title of his collection of poetry, but leaves its significance ambiguous: does it refer to the individual, the church, or both? And if the church, which church?

The point of this section, once again, is not to trace determined, practical meanings. As I have demonstrated with nearly all of the metaphors, they each opened up significant room for disagreement. How the metaphors might be used depended very much on conviction and context. Other scholars have demonstrated the spectrum of belief regarding what the church should be. In providing these scriptural metaphors, however, I hope to shift focus to the neglected aspect of ecclesiology, the abstract, universal sense of the church. When this aligned with pan-Protestantism, as it often did in the minds of contemporaries, these were the metaphors through which contemporaries understood their relationship to fellow Christians on the continent, and this church could become a transnational, identity-defining institution in competition with the

\textsuperscript{141} Lake, \textit{The Boxmaker’s Revenge}, 403.
nation. The church, like the emerging nation, was an imagined community, and this figurative language was the stock through which it was imagined.

**Is God’s Kingdom a Nation?**

The “church” in the early modern period was thus a complex, unstable community described by a rich semantic field. As I repeated often in the previous section, the metaphors to describe the religious community overlap conspicuously with the dominant emerging “imagined community,” the nation. Like literary critics, historians and social scientists have granted religion a determinative role in shaping the nation, though their understanding of the interaction of the concepts sometimes conflicts. Benedict Anderson famously posed that the nation replaced Christendom as the central organizing unit of society in the West.\(^\text{142}\) Other historians, however, have investigated more closely how religion and the later nationalism interacted during modernity. Specific doctrines have been explored, particularly election, with attention given to how they helped establish or bind the national community.\(^\text{143}\) Religious roots have helped explain the duration and intensity of nationalism. Scholars have even considered nationalism as a kind of religion, an approach rooted in Durkheim, linking religious and national practices. Carlton Hayes first made this claim explicit in *Nationalism as a Religion*, and argued that
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nationalism evokes a “deep and compelling emotion” that is “essentially religious.”

Anthony Smith designates nationalism a “new religion of the people,” and finds that nationalism both “parallels and competes with traditional religions.” Social or institutional aspects of the Reformation or early modern religious life have been suggested as forerunners of nationalism – for example, the self-rule in sectarian congregationalism. Finally, scholars have examined the religious rhetoric used in modern nationalist causes. A few scholars have even turned from a general understanding of religion to focus specifically on the church. Kjell Bluckert compares the concepts of church and nation and notes the overlap, the symbiotic relationship between the two. Bluckert, a theologian, starts from the straightforward assertion of the similarity between the two concepts and seeks to explore the ramifications: “Church and nation are both imagined. Each has a discourse. In what way do these linguistic discourses and rule-governed practices overlap?” Even *Church as Nation*, however, though treating the theoretical aspects fully in the first chapters, delves particularly into nationalism and ecclesiology in Sweden. The Church takes on a particular, historical manifestation, a confession, while, as Bluckert himself suggest, the concept of confession had not fully developed in the early modern period.

Neither, however, had the concept of the nation. The overlap and confusion regarding church and nation in the period stems in part from the fact that the concept of each community was very much in flux. For some historians – Liah Greenfeld most notably – England holds a unique place as the first nation, a state that had transformed into a full nation, in the modern
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understanding, by the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{148} This argument has been championed by many literary critics, but most historians have quibbled with her use of the term. Nations are instead viewed as post-Enlightenment creations, which often have no relation to the histories that come before. The debate over antiquity itself offers another fascinating overlap between church and nation. Ernest Gellner’s famous question, “Do nations have navels?”, one of the defining statements of the modernist position, sounds much like the question put to the reformers, “Where was your church before Luther?” More importantly, however, the criticism of Greenfeld’s thesis undermines our conviction that the nation existed in the period and reminds us that early moderns likely comprehended their collective identities very differently. Two primary factors prevent the wide acceptance of early modern English ‘nationhood’: popular diffusion – that is, the absence of evidence that the totality of the people (including the lower classes) esteemed the nation as the highest unit of loyalty; and alternative sources of identity that at times, perhaps, took precedent to the nation.

As Rogers Brubaker has noted, ethnicity and nationalism are understood by social scientists as “ways of identifying oneself and others, of construing sameness and difference, and of situating and placing oneself in relation to others,” and religion can be, too; religion “provides a way of identifying and naming fundamental social groups, a powerful framework for imagining community and a set of schemas, templates and metaphors for making sense of the social world.”\textsuperscript{149} In the early modern period, certainly, the apocalyptic binary between the church of God and the antichristian church structured the world for many zealous Protestants; they understood their places in history through their participation in the church. Yet, as Brubaker

\textsuperscript{148} Greenfeld, \textit{Nationalism}, 27-88.

claims, “religion” itself is too diffuse a concept to be useful; the church, however, was a highly-theorized institution that demanded allegiance and defined the early modern Christian. Though the invisibility of this community of the church in time disqualified it from the kind of allegiance the nation solicited, institutionally and authoritatively it stood on equal footing with the state. In Britain, for example, more soldiers fought and died (the ultimate loyalty demanded of the nation) for the church during the Elizabethan and Early Stuart period than either the crown or the nation (whichever “Britain” might have meant). The concepts intertwined because, as has been argued, the church influenced the nation, but their proximity also guaranteed their possible competition.

The symbolic materials with which the nation and church are created were part of the same cultural stock: common myths, stories, and types. The church’s use of past materials also parallels at least some scholars’ understanding of nation-construction. As already noted, the historicity of the nation remains a debated concept. According to modernists like Ernest Gellner and Anderson, the nation is created out of nothing, and these myths and symbols are randomly selected and applied. Ethno-symboligists such as Anthony Smith and John Armstrong, however, argue that nations are not created out of nothing. Instead, they emerge from long-enduring cultures and were prefigured by ethnic consciousness and varied polities. Smith lists six attributes of these “ethnies” from which the nation emerged: a collective proper name; a myth of common descent; shared historical memories; one or more differentiating elements of common culture; an association with a specific homeland; and a sense of solidarity for significant sectors of the population.150 This biological conception of the pre-nation was occasionally appropriated by nationalists, but it is again equally analogous to the church. One prominent metaphor of the church represents the unity of believers biologically and ethnically: they were all children of

Abraham. The shared biblical materials provided the myth of common descent and shared memory; the intense conflict with non-Christian (and non-Protestant) peoples asserted the differentiating elements of Protestant culture; their homeland was the New Jerusalem (though they lived as exiles on earth), and the sense of solidarity, bound by love, was more perfect than any earthly society (according, at least, to theologians). If, as it has been remarked, the nation emerged as a special kind of ethnie, the church also fits the profile perfectly. As theorized, the community had a remarkable degree of cohesiveness, despite its very diffuse borders. And yet also, the available figurative language allowed the church to both fit and defy the categorization: it did have a territory, the New Jerusalem, but the simultaneous focus on the exile of the church disconnected members from the land, and, as many theologians pointed out, the true church had been dispersed throughout the earth. It could become, in a sense, a nation without borders.

In fact, the proximity of the church and nation perhaps explains why scholars have so carefully tracked connections between Reformed Protestantism and nationalism; this scholarly tradition simply looks at similar phenomenon from a different perspective. For example, the nation is “conceived as deep, horizontal comradeship.”\textsuperscript{151} The Reformers insisted on the equality of all members of the church, the priesthood of all believers. The latter concept perhaps resulted in the former, but it also aligned the two communities and imbued the church with characteristics of the modern nation. Regardless of whether this is viewed from a modernist perspective (explained by influence) or a historical perspective, attempting to understand how the church functioned as a means of social organization in the early modern period, the overlap draws the two kinds of community together. Similarly, Anderson has noted the philosophical incoherence of the doctrine of nationalism and contrasted it against its political power. Though nations

\textsuperscript{151} Anderson, \textit{Imagined Communities}, 16.
actually exist nowhere, they are able to solicit loyalty from nationalists, even the sacrifice of their own lives for the national good. No one could locate the church in the early modern period: it remained invisible, inaccessible, and incoherent. Yet soldiers fought and died for it, academics ruined their careers attempting to shape it, and thousands of believers left their homes and nations to more fully participate in it.

Because of the abstraction of religion, Brubaker recommends focusing on the intersection between religion and nationalism in three ways: as a mode of identification, a mode of social organization, and a way of framing political claims. For Brubaker, we might think of religion as “a way of framing, channeling and organizing social relations” – though he admits this unavoidably flattens religion. In the early modern period, considering the “church” as defined by theologians – both an abstraction and an institution – might help us interrogate the connections between religion and nationalism more efficiently, while addressing all of Brubaker’s recommendations. Though the concept was confused, and therefore vague, I have attempted to show that Reformers were very interested in the holy community, and particularly devoted to defining it. This community provided the imaginary materials for framing and organizing Christians, and it also explained how suffering men and women on the continent could deserve English and Scottish military intervention. If the early modern period precedes the era in which most historians locate nationalism, we might see in the interaction between the church and the pre-nation the seeds of later national characteristics.

Both the nation and the church serve as the base for collective identities, competing and sometimes overlapping in the early modern period. As we have seen in the metaphors of the church, the conceptions of the political community often overlapped with the religious

community; the church was, after all, a “kingdom of God.” In the early modern period, as confessions were still being created and codified, laypeople were less likely to think of their church in national or confessional terms. The church, in the writings of the reformers, in the sermons of pastors, and in the hymns and songs of laymen, was almost always an international institution; if anything else, it was on the parish level. The lines between these representations of the church, like the borders between political and ethnic units, remained blurry. Anthony Smith provides a simple and useful definition of the nation that might illuminate the previous discussion: “A nation can… be defined as a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members.”153 From what we have seen, almost all of these belong equally to the church. The most debatable element would likely be the “mass, public culture,” for the most influential models of the public sphere (Habermas) or literary field (Bourdieu) tend to imagine them as national spaces. Part of my argument throughout this dissertation is that the pan-Protestant church also had its own mass, public culture and its own literary culture. The church and nation remained confused, intertwined concepts; yet as Brubaker notes, however “intertwining is not identity… religious movements that pursue a comprehensive transformation of public life do not become nationalist simply by working through the nation-state.”154 The transnational religious society could exist independently.

**John Foxe’s Prayer for ‘the Church and all the states thereof’**

Considering the debates and overlap surveyed in this chapter, it might be concluded that most early moderns likely had no clear and concrete conception of the religious community they


referred to as the church, but instead shifted between complex mixture of significations. The
church in the period had multiple levels of meaning. Even in the prayers of reformers, the
transnational mingled with the national and local communities. In the Sternhold-Hopkins Psalter,
three prayers for the church drive in its universal significance, while also demonstrating how
closely tied the religious and national communities remained. The longest of the prayers was
written by John Foxe, and as in his other work, he situates English Protestants within a
transnational frame. Though Foxe was long considered a proponent of a narrow ‘elect
nationalism,’ critics have long since demonstrated his commitment to the wider Protestant cause.
His apocalypticism influenced generations of English Protestants after him, and set the course for
thinking about what the English owe their coreligionists. At the very least, they owe them prayer,
and for Foxe the time was especially dire. Though the church had been widespread and healthy
in the past, it had suffered drastic reductions and now stood a church threatened both from
without and within. He therefore prays God “to be good to thy poor Church militant here in this
wretched earth; sometimes a rich Church, a large Church, an universal Church, spread far and
wide through the whole compass of the earth, now driven into a narrow corner of the world, and
hath much need of thy gracious help.”  

In his discussion of the Church’s losses, Foxe implicitly evokes a political and territorial
idea of Christendom, which, as Denys Hay has shown, developed in the Middle Ages. The
church is tied to particular lands, and within those lands belief is relatively uniform. Thus, he can
lament the spread of Islam by noting “in all Asia and Africa, thy Church hath not one foot of free

155 John Foxe, “A Prayer Made for the Church, and All the States Thereof,” in The Whole Boke of Psalms (London: John Daye, 1577), sig. NN4V-NN5R.

land, but all is turned there to infidelity or to captivity, whatsoever pertaineth to thee.”\textsuperscript{157} The Church constitutes a certain amount of definable land, with geographic borders, and all the Christians within these lands are part of the church and owe other Christians certain obligations. In the face of threats from outside, the Christian lands should be unified, and the current conflict within the church sets them at risk: “Such dissention and hostility Satan hath set amongst us, that Turks be not more enemies to Christians than Christians to Christians, papists to Protestants; yea, Protestants with Protestants do not agree, but fall out for trifles.”\textsuperscript{158} Even an English radical like John Foxe includes Roman Catholics within the church, at least in this prayer (at other times, he was less ecumenical), and far from a nationalist vision, his Church clearly constitutes a political community encompassing most of Europe.

As the dissension implies, however, the Reformation has begun to undermine any supposed territorial unity. In England, the fervent conflict between Catholic and Protestant has instilled the binary divide so common to apocalyptic thought, and at times the prayer excludes English Catholics from both the national and religious community. Foxe notes a particularly blessed space in England, following the contest, but one that remains troubled:

\begin{quote}
Amongst us Englishmen here in England, after so great storms of persecution and cruel murder of so many martyrs, it hath pleased thy grace to give us these halcyon days, which yet we enjoy and beseech thy merciful goodness that they may continue. But here also, alack, what should we say? So many enemies we have that envy us this rest and tranquility and do that they can to disturb it. They which be friends and lovers of the Bishop of Rome, although they eat the fat of the land, and have the best preferments and offices, and live most at ease, and all nothing, yet are they not therewith content.\textsuperscript{159}
\end{quote}

The enemies apparently reside outside of the community, not part of the ‘us,’ though their economic and political benefits clearly imply that they, too, are English. Indeed, Foxe clarifies,
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they repine and rebel and needs would have, with the frogs of Aesop, a ciconia, an Italian stranger, the Bishop of Rome, to play rex over them, and care not if all the world were set on fire so they with their Italian lord might reign alone. So fond are we Englishmen of strange and foreign things; so unnatural to ourselves; so greedy of newfangle novelties, never contented with any state long to continue, be it never so good.\textsuperscript{160}

Their specific wickedness stems from their love of “strange and foreign things,” making them “unnatural” to themselves as Englishmen. As scholars of early modern Englishness have noted, the anxiety of aping – the thought that it might be particularly English to be particularly malleable – was common in discussions of ethnicity and nationality in the period\textsuperscript{161}; and it is certainly present in Foxe. But here, at the same time, the very English who desire the “newfangle novelties” are those circumscribed outside of the community, the persecutors of us. For a prayer that had thus begun irenically covering all of Europe, by the end it includes not even all of England. In the close, Foxe returns to the sense of a church under siege, but now he disconnects it from the land: “And forasmuch as thy poor little flock can scarce have any place or rest in this world, come, Lord, we beseech thee, with thy factum est and make an end, that this world may have no more time nor place here, and that thy Church may have rest for ever.”\textsuperscript{162} It is exile that defines the church, a view dating back at least to Saint Augustine, forever dispossessed of an earthly home. If then, Foxe’s prayer “for the Church” can never quite decide who it is praying for, it both demonstrates the continued longing for a clear, territorial church and raises the issue of the practical divisions. For Foxe himself, Rome would sometimes be outside of the church, and the true church would remain invisible and inaccessible.
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Conclusion and a Note on the Methodology

Finally, the organization of my dissertation is somewhat unorthodox and thus, perhaps, deserves an explanation. My chapters are not centered on texts, authors, or even issues, but each is instead devoted to a single pan-Protestant hero. I do provide more focused engagement with individual authors in each chapter: Edmund Spenser in the second; Ben Jonson, William Drummond, and George Chapman in the third; in the fourth, John Donne and George Wither; and finally, Thomas Carew and Ralph Knevet. These works, however, are contextualized within a vast response to each hero, and they are read primarily as either an illumination of or a reaction against that tradition. And, as will be evident, each of the heroes lends himself to a different transnational focus; for example, the writing on Prince Henry, I argue, makes an intervention in debates about the British Union, and the “lost Renaissance” mourned in the princes death was more British than English. Thus, my third chapter engages with “New British History” or “The British Problem” and details Henry’s under-explored role in the unification of the “Atlantic Archipelago.” The following chapter on Frederick V, on the other hand, explores the very real historical possibility of an Anglo-German “British” empire.

Another advantage of this organization, my focus on heroes has highlighted how all of these figures were part of the same transnational tradition. Traditions have featured prominently in transnational criticism, largely because they are easy to trace across borders. Both William of Orange and Gustavus Adolphus (the first and last heroes studied) were styled Hercules; both were another Alexander; both were Moses and Josiah, liberators of the oppressed church and Protestant emperors. I have therefore attempted to trace pan-Protestant heroism, a vibrant tradition in the period shared throughout the Protestant lands of Northern Europe. In the tropes used to lionize each hero and the expectations that fell upon them, a very clear, transnational
relationship emerges, as the torch is passed over generations to the next young and promising Protestant leader. A full account of this tradition helps re-contextualize, for example, Elizabethan Chivalry and the Elizabethan heroes like Sir Philip Sidney and the Earl of Leicester. At the same time, following the development of pan-Protestant heroism for almost a century – from the early victories of the Dutch Republic through the death of Gustavus Adolphus – illuminates the changing understanding of the Protestant community, as apocalyptic hopes, imperial confidence, and worldly ambition wax and wane. This methodology, in short, offers a window into a transnational, long-enduring tradition, even into the shape of the shared literary and cultural imagination of Protestant Europe. The response to military leaders, I propose, demonstrates a popular, transnational, and multilingual “contact zone.” Occasionally Dutch, English, German, and French poets composed together; more often, the tropes, figures, and typology celebrating these heroes fluidly crossed national and linguistic lines. From my perspective in this dissertation, it is important to recognize that the English writers themselves participating in this celebration apparently did not view the borders of the literary sphere in national terms; they understood their poetic production as part of a larger, shared project.

I would like to suggest that tracing the reception of these heroes can reveal an important part the cultural imaginary, the formation and shape of the various myths and symbols from which nationalism emerged. This methodology therefore suggested itself because religious and political figures have always played an important role in the development of identity – even more so in the early modern period when, as Martin Blain has suggested, national identity remained personalistic, conceptualized through kings and heroes.\(^{163}\) This is equally true of the religious figure, and one need only glance at the names of the various denominations that arose
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in the period (Lutheran, Calvinist, Mennonite) to note how important charismatic leaders were in an age of increasing epistemological uncertainty. Indeed, these religious heroes became, I want to argue, “figures” in the abstract sense, material through which contemporary thinkers represented their understanding of history and the community. Henry, Maurice, Gustavus and Frederick were all read through the apocalypse; but, for many writers, the apocalypse was also read through these men – or the traditions associated with them – as they concretized one of the patterns of divine history. Fredric Jameson has suggested that religious figures in this sense always “become the symbolic space in which the collectivity thinks itself and celebrates its own unity.”

It was through these heroes that poets often conceptualized both their nation and their church.

In our discussion of early modern community, then, we must realize that we are employing two nodal concepts – church and nation – which were radically in flux, mutually penetrating, and highly contested. Properly historicizing these concepts might reveal meanings very different from our own. This has, of course, long been recognized – indeed, assumed – in the scholarship on the construction of the nation and “Englishness,” but less often regarding the church, particularly in these studies of the emerging nation. Protestantism plays a key role in most of the literature that attempts to read a “nation” and emerging “nationalism” in early modern England. Certainly, Protestantism at times offered a shared communal identity; but studies of the English nation often oversell the centripetal aspects of English Protestantism. A great diversity of belief remained in the church throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. More significantly, even under the “Calvinist Consensus” of the Elizabethan period, when devoted Protestants imagined the church, they were reminded time and again that they

belonged to the same community as their suffering coreligionists abroad. Protestantism united the English with the continent as much as it divided, and in a time before solidified confessional boundaries, English laypeople were encouraged to think of their religion on either a local or supranational level. Any theory of an early-emerging English nationalism tied to the Church of England needs at least reckon with the complexity of that church and its lingering ties to continental “Christendom.”

A complex matrix of figurative language was available for early moderns as they conceptualized this connection. As this study begins to survey the literature associated with the pan-Protestant heroes of the early modern period, the metaphors of the church become particularly prominent. The iconography of the temple, the flock, the body, and Israel repeatedly inform English writers’ understanding of how they relate to heroic foreign generals, and how the struggles of Dutch or German Protestants might be their own. In practice, admittedly, the church never fully overlapped with confession, and Rome could be included within the church even by the first reformers. But in times of increased polemical and military conflict, the oppressed band of true Christians seemed to align with the Protestant churches. As evidenced by the vast debate and divergent use of the figurative language, no early modern could be expected to have a clear and concrete understanding of the church, but must have felt vaguely that it included other Protestants. The borders were incredibly blurry. Indeed, even theologians focused on ecclesiology insisted that the true church remained invisible, inaccessible, and the ecclesiology of the period often became highly confusing. Calvin’s book on ecclesiology, the fourth book of the Institutes, is riddled with so many partially-defined distinctions that religious scholars have called it “organized chaos.”165

In the metaphors organizing this chaos, the religious community expands far beyond the nation, but it also works symbiotic with the nation, mutually shaping the development of the two identity-defining institutions. There exist, of course, obvious differences between the kind of community imagined in early modern description of the church and modern and early modern concepts of the nation, despite the significant overlap. Indeed, the change occasioned in the period radically altered how contemporaries thought of community and political power generally. The church was multilingual, multiethnic, supra-national, drawn together by a shared ideology, elected by God and obedient to a set of universally shared principles. Unlike the emerging nation, the church was never land bound, but only realized eschatologically. Despite the fact that both communities were imagined and comprised of members who would never interact, the church explicitly theorized its invisibility, while the nation denied its own. As much because of similarity as difference, however, the transnational religious community continued as a vibrant alternate source of identity, as well as a base for culture and literature, and shaped the lives of early moderns in ways powerfully foreign to modern nationalism.
1. Dutchness and the English Nation

Introduction

In 1578, an English veteran of the Dutch Wars surveyed the victory over the Spanish at the battle of Rijmenant and wrote: “The year of his redeemed is come: neither will he give over the field any more till he hath utterly destroyed his enemies… and given perpetual rest to Israel, according as it is writen.”¹ It seemed, perhaps, a turning point in the fairly disastrous war which would not fully turn until the ascendancy of Maurits of Orange in the 1590s. Though it predated official English involvement, many English soldiers, like the author of the pamphlet, Geffrey Gates, had already served with the Dutch forces in the fight for freedom and religion — at least, in their eyes — against Catholic and Spanish tyranny. For Gates, the glory of a soldier (his work’s central thesis) is intimately tied to the defence of God’s true church, and therefore his examples of soldierly virtue turn again and again to the continent. While some in England may doubt the military, Gates notes, “[y]et hath the Lord planted, mainteined, and restored, his trueth and religion, by the meanes and assitance of warlike force and policie.”² The Dutch revolt is a culmination of a series of battles, led by a series of heroes, by which the gospel has gained prominence, heralding the proximity of the apocalypse. As he recounts victories in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, he summarizes the church’s progress: “This being the most glorious effects of Militarie industrie in these saide countreis, to the enlarging of Christes

¹ Geffrey Gates, The defence of militarie profession: Wherein is Eloquently Shewe the Due Commendation of Martiiall Prowesse, and Plainly Prooved how Necessary the Exercise of Armes is for this our Age (London, 1579), 16-17.

² Ibid., 12.
kingdome for the salvation of many, and comfort of the whole world.”\(^3\) All these countries are tied, and all wars make up part of a larger transnational conflict, for together the lands constitute Christ’s kingdom.

Though Gates celebrates all common soldiers, his account of the wars and of the church’s glory inevitably celebrates their heroic leaders. Indeed, his view of the church’s militant history, originating in Israel and linked typologically to the contemporary religious strife, necessitates a hero-centric view of ecclesiastical history. From the beginning of the Reformation, the forces of God needed a general, and they found one first in a German duke: “the last restitution of his Gospel… which began in Germanie with peace, but was forced to holde on the way, by the ayde of warlike prowesse and fidelitie: which was valiantly attempted, and prosperously atchieved by the famous Souldier of God, Maurits Duke of Saxoni, the first vanguisher of the Armed enemies of the Gospell in the latter restution.”\(^4\) Other heroes emerged, as well, and appropriated a pattern first set by the heroic and militant princes in the Old Testament: David, Gideon, Joshua, and Josiah.

In the wars Gates surveys, and the war in which he participates, we might see the emergence of a pan-Protestant heroic tradition. This tradition not only produced some of the paragons of English chivalry – Leicester, Sidney, de Vere – it challenges the Anglo-centric focus in scholarship on nation-writing in the period, clearly demonstrating how intertwined national and transnational religious leaders, literature, and communities remained. As this chapter will demonstrate, collective identity in the Renaissance was complex and variable, and shaped by a range of factors. Christopher Lewis has argued that early modern identity might best be

\(^3\) Ibid., 22.

\(^4\) Ibid., 16
conceived as consisting of concentric circles: local, regional, national, and so on.5 No identity remained dominant, but early modern men and women could shift between identities as they negotiated their context. At work in this discussion of foreign wars and foreign leaders were all levels of identification: local, national, and transnational. The links and interaction between these were, however, more complex than scholars often recognize. For example, the English and Scottish (who would incompletely and haphazardly merge as the “British” during the Jacobean period) soldiers serving in the Dutch wars were volunteers; since England had no national army, these volunteers often identified on a very local level, while they fought for the transnational cause of Protestant religion. Debates and disagreements inevitably arose over how to organize society – how to prioritize these various collective identities – especially as writers watched their coreligionists suffer in wars on the continent.

The transnational, which remains my primary interest throughout this dissertation, could combine with local and national identities in various ways. Almost always, English sources demonstrate a commitment to the pan-Protestant church. Sometimes this religious identity completely supersedes national identity. The writers surveyed in this chapter remained attached to a particularly militant, anti-Roman conception of the Protestant church, but this was only one of many possible forms of imagined religious community. The period was filled with schemes for unification, both religious and political, and the borders of relation remained constantly in flux. It seems an irony of history, in fact, that just as English Puritans were de-centering the nation from relational identity — giving the international Protestant (Calvinist) church precedence — religious schemes by the foreign intellectuals Hugo Grotius, Isaac Casaubon, and M. De Dominis imagined a religious association — in some ways also transcending national identities — centered on the Church of England, uniting English Protestants, whom Grotius saw

as moderate and irenic, with Arminians in the Low Countries and the moderate Greek Churches. A scholar’s remark on that union, however, might be extended to all the various religious unification projects of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: “it was not at all clear that the kind of union imagined by all these men was the same.”6 At other times, though, these transnational identifications prompt questions on a national level. English writers particularly struggle with the transnational community formed in the face of Catholic and Spanish aggression: would the resistance be a federation of equals, the English, Scottish, Dutch, German and French all equally committed to the cause? Or would a leading nation emerge? Would they all merge as part of the same holy people, or would one ethnic group be specially chosen? For the English, as they viewed the miraculous Dutch victories against Spain from afar, it sometimes seemed that God had granted them only a secondary role, that the Dutch had more right to claim a privileged elect nationalism.

From within this complex negotiation of identity, certain themes emerge, directing how English men and women could understand both themselves and their communities throughout the religious warfare of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Gates’s short and enthusiastic account of the defence of the gospel offers several patterns which will be prominent throughout this study of the English response to (mostly) non-English Protestant heroes – the way English writers attempted to inscribe themselves as part of the transnational Protestant community. First, the apocalyptic setting serves as an exegetical framework for religious war; the year of God’s church has arrived, followed soon by the 1000 years of peace. Revelation becomes a living prophecy as the action of the battlefield replays the scriptural allegories. Embedded in this context, the soldier – Gates – both adopts the prophetic mode (“as it is written”) and divides the
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world into two parties, the ‘redeemed’ of God and the ‘enemies’ of God. War tends to efface difference within the ranks – and indeed Protestantism already promulgated this irreducible binary: the elect and the reprobate. Religious war, for Gates, had at last made the church visible in history. Stemming from this division, Gates draws on Old Testament typology to define the community of the redeemed: this is the victory of Israel. Given the centrality of the type – the chosen nation – in discussions of emergent English nationalism, it may be somewhat surprising to see it applied here not to England, and almost certainly to no political community whatsoever, but instead to the transnational Protestant church. Thus, finally, Gates’s pamphlet demonstrates the complex mingling of local, national, and transnational identities. In the end however, it is the religious community that draws his primary allegiance. My study takes place inside an English department, and therefore assumes certain borders, which remained contested and only took on their modern significance two centuries after the early modern period. My interest, therefore, lies particularly with the English writers participating inside this transnational culture. When later writers looked back on the heroism Gates celebrates, they saw Elizabethan chivalry and the roots of an enduring and seemingly eternal Englishness. And yet, I hope to recover the importance of this transnationalism was even in English identity and to show that even their English nationalism cannot be understood in a national vacuum, but needs these continental sources.

In 1578, describing Protestant victories in the Dutch Revolt as the victories of Israel was a complex claim, and it raises several difficult questions: why do the Dutch and their revolt against Spain figure so prominently in the emergence of English nationalism? How might the Dutch and their wars play a constitutive role in English identity? Considering both Gates’ and the Old Testament’s focus on heroic leaders, how might we understand the role both English and Dutch leaders played in cementing the national community? When seventeenth-century
Englishmen looked back to the glory of the Elizabethan years, English militancy was defined primarily by intervention in the Low Countries, the great religious war of the generation. I am interested in this chapter in exploring the ways in which the English nation was written in a transnational context. Of course, since at least the work of Richard Helgerson, scholarship has accepted that English literature played a seminal role in the construction of English nationality and the English nation. More recent work, especially in the field of post-colonial studies, has demonstrated that Englishness was not only constructed, but referential, developed through processes of ‘othering’ and imitation. Even though the focus on both mimesis and alterity has been productive, however, it has perhaps hidden some of the ways that early moderns understood their relationship with subjects on the Continent, and obscured or ignored complex discussions of communion and belonging. Moreover, the Anglo-centric focus of this work, a product of later nationalism, has caused most work on nation-writing to neglect certain facets of early modern English identity, and the insistence that England existed already as a ‘nation’ in the early modern period has circumscribed all those men and women in England who continued to self-identify with other communities outside of the critical discussion. Historians have, on the other hand, begun calling ever more vociferously for a transnational context when studying early modern England; Jonathan Scott, for example, argues that past historians have been “imprisoned by the
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anachronistic parameters of national historiography.”9 Similarly, as Englishness developed, that phenomenon much traced in literary criticism, it incorporated continental elements and cannot be understood in isolation. A perceived union with the Dutch through the transnational church both allowed and complicated the development of English national sentiment.

The Dutch Wars were, after all, for the English primarily a contest for the survival of the transnational church. However popular Protestant heroism became, and however much it influenced English national identity, the Netherlands served as the cradle of Protestant chivalry. The defining battles of English Protestantism were fought on the seas and on the Continent rather than within the “Atlantic Archipelago,” and often led by Dutch and French commanders. This multinational cooperation was made possible by the continued reference to the higher community that encompassed all parties: the holy church. Even nationalist pamphlets — from both the English and Dutch side — tend to move from the national to the transnational in their final prayers. An account of Maurits’s siege of Bercke, for example, ends with the common move: “God be praised for this great victory, & prosper the proceedings of his Excellencie for his glories sake, and for the profit of his church. Amen.”¹⁰ In the 392 page Triumphs of Nassau, which will be considered in detail later in this chapter, nearly every battle ends with a reference to the church. No writer denies the national stakes of these battles; but finally, as the writers move toward a God’s eye view of history, all Protestant peoples are assumed into the same community. Gates, who opened this introduction with his optimistic prophecy, exhorts his fellow Englishmen to maintain a pan-European perspective: “Looke wisely to your selves, and as ye love the advancement of Gods kingdome in England, so will you pray and labour for the


¹⁰ A True Report of all the proceedings of Grave Mauris before the Towne of Bercke... Translated out of the Dutch copy printed at Amsterdam (London, 1601), sig. C2R.
preferment of the same amongst the French and Dutch.”

The complex mix of nationality and pan-Protestant loyalty found in the sentence appears in almost all of the early modern publications on the Dutch Wars — in which such diverse forces participated that at least one critic has suggested it might be called a World War.

The literary response to this war and its leaders was equally transnational, with tentacles extending into all the Protestant territories of Europe. The English writers not only collaborated with foreign Protestant writers, but recognized their literary production inside these transnational traditions and communities. A persistent, though often submerged, line of criticism has linked poetics and literary development in England and the Netherlands in the late sixteenth century. The vanguard of this work has been led by the accomplished Dutch historian, J. A. Van Dorsten, supported by the Thomas Browne Institute at Leiden. Van Dorsten’s work was, in fact, among the seminal publications of that academic press, first demonstrating that there was indeed significant Anglo-Dutch literary exchange in the sixteenth century. In Poets, Patrons, and Professors: Sir Philip Sidney, Daniel Rogers, and the Leiden Humanists (1964), Van Dorsten tracks the collaboration, overlap, and exchange of the Sidney circle with a Dutch poetic circle at the University of Leiden. His work informs this current study because much of the literary output produced by this circle discussed the Dutch Wars and the English heroes who came to assist their coreligionists. Sidney has remained central in more recent discussions of transnational identities; as scholars of “cosmopolitanism” have proven, the literary communities and international audiences were especially important in the self-definition of many English writers, like Sidney.
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11 Gates, The defence of militarie profession, 63.

who participated in a more global humanistic literary sphere.\textsuperscript{13}

Part of this chapter — and the dissertation as a whole — reasserts the fact that there was a pan-Protestant literary sphere, and further develops the shape of these collaborative projects. More importantly, however, the criticism on Anglo-Dutch literary exchange during the Dutch Revolt has not yet considered the national implications of these projects. Van Dorsten and others have focused on the literary elite; and while these writers certainly deserve attention and represent fascinating kinds of transnationalism, the focus of this chapter — the English and Dutch heroes of the religious wars — enjoyed far wider popularity, a subject of interest that crossed the borders of nationality and class. Indeed, the heroes of this revolt — Sidney, Essex, William and Maurits of Orange — all became crucial symbols for the emerging national sentiment. As Martin Blain has suggested, nationalism in the period remained much more personalistic, attached to important figures, and heroes played a formative role in individual identity.\textsuperscript{14} In Jacobean England, writers gazed back on the Elizabethan heroes in their attempts to understand “Englishness”; and the Dutch, even today, hail Willem as “vader des vaderlands.” These preeminent national heroes, then, forged their identities in a transnational context, creating a complex mix of meaning. A historian surveying the burgeoning interest in transnational literature recently remarked that “[t]he challenge before historians interested in transnational phenomena […] is whether, and how, to engage with the nation-state.”\textsuperscript{15} The literature on these heroes suggests that no easy distinction between nationalism and transnationalism can be made during the early modern period – that from its inception nationalism navigated complex

\textsuperscript{13} Robert Stillman, \textit{Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism} (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008).


This chapter will attempt to show that, from the beginning, English nationalism and Protestant heroism were forged in a transnational mode. By surveying the English reception of the heroes of the Dutch Revolt, particularly as found in Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene* and the massive prose work by Jan Janszoon Orlers, *The Triumphs of Nassau*, I will argue that the Dutch national hero William of Orange sets the pattern for later English heroes, influencing not only how we understand Elizabethan heroism, but even more how we understand late sixteenth-century nation writing. The English connection to the pan-Protestant church, as well as English participation in the Eighty Years War, allows English writers to at times fully embrace the Dutch and their war as a founding narrative of English nationalism; the church and the nation, in other words, set up a “sliding scale” by which contemporaries understood their leaders and their identities. Tracking the reception of Maurits, however, we can also see the tension exerted on this sliding scale as continental heroes began to outshine English heroes into the early years of the seventeenth century, fracturing pan-Protestant and English rhetoric of heroism.

**Pamphlets of the Dutch Revolt: “The whole Christian Commonwealth” Besieged**

The Protestant habit of propagandizing foreign wars, which resulted in some of the most dangerous criticism of the Caroline court during the Thirty Years War, was minted during the Dutch Revolt in the 1570s. Before English involvement in the war, many zealous Protestants published pamphlets of news on the suffering of their coreligionists in the Low Countries. The pamphlets urge involvement, like later iterations in the seventeenth century, offering reasons to support the Dutch and thereby implicitly criticizing the Protestant princes, like Elizabeth, who remained uncommitted. These early modern pamphlets have garnered increasing attention in this century, as the scope of literary criticism has widened to include traditionally neglected genres;
indeed, their stark political character has ensured that pamphlets are now, if anything, overrepresented in this scholarship. The pamphlets published on continental warfare have drawn interest also as works that were among the forefathers of the modern newspaper; not until the Thirty Years War would printers begin numbering their news publications in England, but news of the Dutch Wars clearly set a pattern for what came later in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{16} The pamphlets have also featured prominently in Hugh Dunthorne’s account of what the typical English reader would have known and thought of the United Provinces and have been employed in the work of other historians of Anglo-Dutch relations.\textsuperscript{17} Dunthorne’s detailed scholarship certainly illuminates the context of many of these pamphlets, though he tends to assert national categories with more solidity than they enjoyed in the period.

Despite occasional squabbles and moments of national pride, the pamphlets generally focus on similarity – on the shared history and involvement of the English and the Dutch – and therefore undermine the firmly nationalist modern historical lens. The multinational involvement in the Dutch Wars offered frequent opportunities for incorporation and assimilation, and the wider and popular view of the conflict as a religious war offered the possibility of identifying with coreligionists. Because of this, the audience of these English pamphlets – both who they were and how they thought – opens up a complex set of questions about identification. The language of translation tends to be open and inclusive, directly translating any address to the Dutch audience as a parallel address to the English. The kind of binary logic that gathers people into a communal body fills the pamphlets, as the English readership shares in “our battles” and “our victories,” often against the “common enemy.” Even as late as a pamphlet describing Prince


Maurits’s death, the translator does nothing to re-contextualize the calls for national repentance or the direct addresses to the Dutch national community. There’s an odd bifurcation, in which the nationalist moments both offer the English a chance to witness Dutch national unity and also seem equally applicable to the audience in England, assuming a cultural reciprocity. The loss of another prince of Orange, for example, somehow includes the English readership: “The Lord hath within these few yeares taken from us that faithfull Prince Count William Lodowick of Nassau, &c. And hath sithence visited this Land with heavy plagues, famine, high-waters, strong-warres… when all the world would iudge we stood in most neede of this great Prince.”

The translation seems to make the English participants in loss, suffering, and need — part of the ‘we’ and ‘us.’ Indeed, the calls to repentance were sometimes indistinguishable from those coming from pulpits, printshops and playhouses in London. The same pamphlet uses the typical castigation of sins and prayers for Gods mercy in its address to the United Provinces, which in translation apparently applies equally to its English readership – without any need to recontextualize:

And this is that which wee must doe, if wee will make a good use of Gods iudgements, that he may turne them from us, and if wee desire to have the Lord to blesse this Countrey and State; otherwise wee all see, if wee are not blinde in heart, how the LORD doth threaten us, and which certainely once will come upon us, if wee remaine snorting in our carnall security.

Dunthorne notes the persistent strategy, especially early in the Dutch Revolt, of translating political documents into English and printing them without any explanatory frame. He questions the wisdom of this method — especially with more arcane political documents dating from

---


19 Ibid., sig. D2V.
before the war — and explains that the practice was steeped in the Dutch convention of printing any petition presented to their ruler in order to make it available to the wider public. A mix of assumptions seems to lie behind this unproductive practice, however, and the failure is somewhat surprising considering the usual skill of Dutch propagandists.²⁰ The failing – the lack of context – might perhaps be attributable to the fact that English, Dutch, and French pamphleteers continually assume similarity and kinship.

The news pamphlets also imply that their reader wields an extraordinary depth of knowledge. One of the most remarkable characteristics of the pamphlets of news from France and the Low Countries is the detailed geographical knowledge they presume. A single five-page pamphlet, for example, runs through an impressive list of small towns and cities: Cressy, Bergen, Beaumont sur Dyse, Renes, Furnholt, Brussels, Pontoise, S. Denis, Paris, Rouen, Peronne, Gisors, Ponterson, Dinau (in Brittany), river of Biloin Biskay, Farole – many of which are difficult to place because of the common names.²¹ (Is Bergen, for example, Bergen-am-zee or the site of the famous siege in the 1620s, Bergen-op-zoom?) The towns, battle sites, and soldiers’ movements are tracked with such minute particularity that it is tempting to assume these pamphlets were read alongside a map, perhaps by veterans familiar with the landscape. Even with a map, the specificity is not always easy to follow. In Advertisements from Britany, And from the Low Countries (1591), a soldier traces in his letter the movement of both the combined French and English Protestant forces and the hostile forces of the Catholic league, led by Philippe Emmanuel, Duke of Mercoeur. The English march uneventfully from Saint Brieux to Kersoe, then to Plemy, Collinie, and Medrimack, heading eventually for Saint Meyn.

²⁰ As Dunthorne notes, “the Dutch Revolt was the first revolutionary movement to make full use of the printing press as a means of propaganda.” Dunthorne, Britain and the Dutch Revolt, 8.

²¹ Credible reportes from France and Flanders In the Moneth of May. 1590. (London, 1590).
Meanwhile, however, they track by letters and captive soldiers the movements of the Duke de Mercoeur. After being dislodged from Dinant, his army is reported to head toward Brun, but then actually heads through Plenaden to Kendevos on the way toward a planned battle at Saint Meyn. The English and French forces are unprepared for battle, but Mercoeur’s army fortunately retreats through Luedilliack and Logas to encamp at Saint John, which “put a reasonable good river betweene him and us.”

The English forces hope help will come from Reines and Vittrie nearby, and head from Sain Meyn toward Hendet, then through Breall to unite with other English forces at St. Aubin de Comer. Finally, the English lay a short and successful siege on nearby Chattiollion, taking it and terrifying the inhabitants of neighboring Fougiers. The entire course of these two intertwined journeys is reported quickly, without context, in only a few more pages than it took here. Place names are key, and the uneventful journey requires a map to make any sense at all of the action of the English army.

Similarly, writers assume an engaged audience that knows the key players on both sides of the battle. Little contextual information situates the reader; he or she is expected to know, for example, if the fact that “The Lord Vigues had besieged Ponterson, and had already made two breaches” is good or bad for Protestant forces. French, Spanish, English, and Dutch captains are jumbled – sometimes inscrutably. Even the mutinying Spanish, for example, have in some ways begun to benefit the Protestant cause, and so the reader must discern which Spanish names to support. The publication success of these news pamphlets, however, suggests that readers did actively engage with the content; indeed, the pamphlets grew in popularity into the seventeenth century. Accounts of the war rarely contained exciting narrative descriptions of the war; often, as
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22 *Advertisements from Britany, and from the Low Countries. In September and October* (London, 1591), 5.

23 *Credible Reports*, 5.
in the example above, they were filled primarily with discussions of strategy and wandering. Despite the dearth of action and the complex associational network, however, the news found a wide readership.

The pamphlets therefore imply that they write for an audience that knows both the wars and the land, and more importantly, they tend to include their readers as part of the struggle – part of the community threatened by Spanish and Catholic tyranny. If they did require a map, it is tempting to wonder how the mapspace was conceived as the readers traced these battles from city to city, across national borders. Scholarship around the turn of the twenty-first century turned to cartography and the politics of space, and many monographs profitably explored the changing ideas of mapscape — the move from space conceived as containing local character, imbued with sociocultural significance, to space conceived mathematically, effacing difference and subjecting foreign lands to imperialist expansion. The regional specificity of the pamphlets implies that this transition is well underway, as few aspects of local character remain; however, the political implications of a national space – discussed, for example, by Helgerson – seem absent from the accounts. Battles fought in France, the Northern Provinces, and the Spanish Low Countries – at times part of different wars – are included together in short pamphlets; each site represents a myriad of different political positions, housing both allies and enemies. Instead, the mapscape offers the surface upon which a great, transnational battle between the Protestants and Catholics might be fought.

For the space of these pamphlets is, above all, a transnational space. Most of the

pamphlets broadcast their international character even in their history of composition and publication. They usually – especially early -- were composed in Dutch or German and translated into English, often through an intermediary language like French. *Certayne Newes of the whole discription, ayde, and helpe of the Christian Princes and Nobles* (1574), an early pamphlet, was written in “Dutch” to German Protestant princes, but apparently a printer at Dordrecht thought it would interest an English audience. The pamphlet opens with the parable of advice given by a king of Egypt to his sons: sticks in a bundle cannot easily be broken (a moral which appears often in these writings). The author urges German princes to aid “the poor Christians in the Low Countries” – to bring justice to their oppressed coreligionists. Perhaps more directly persuasive, the author claims that if the princes do not assist “their fellow members of the faithe, in their time of need,” after the Low Countries fall, so will the Empire.\(^\text{25}\) Though the translator never names England explicitly, the threat hangs, clearly present. Indeed, as the pamphlet closes, the threat is universalized: the pope wants to oppress “all other Godly Christians, in what land or dominion soever they were.”\(^\text{26}\) Protestantism is under siege, the news suggests, and the only hope for survival comes from bundling together like sticks rather than hiding and assuming their own safety within their regional borders.

More importantly, the pamphlets tend to invoke the larger frame that divides the world into the apocalyptic binary – largely to evince the importance of a multinational coalition. *A Brief and True Rehersall* (1573), for example, printed by Henry Middleton, narrates the conflict as a battle between “Protestants” and “Papists”; despite the complex and messy conditions on the ground, which resisted a purely religious interpretation of the events, the author simplifies and

\(^{25}\) *Certayne News of the Whole Discription, Ayde, and Helpe of the Christian Princes and Nobles the Which for the Comfort and Deliverance of the Poore Christians in the Low Countries, are Gaterhed Together, and Are Nowe with their Armies in the Field* (Dordrecht, 1574), 3.

\(^{26}\) Ibid., 7.
reinterprets the conflict through biblical prophecy. God “giveth victorye to his poore afflicted Church, against the furious rages of those proud Philistins, who now in our dayes seeke the utter ruine & subversion of the gospel of our only Savoiur & redeemer Jesus Christ, and his poore afflicted congregation: as by the practices of the Pope that wicked Antichrist, and his proud champiounthe Duke of Alva.”

Characteristically, the pamphlet warns that the Spanish, filled with “Egiptish and Popish blindness and cruelty,” seek “to destroy not onely Countreys, kingdoms, and Empires, but also the whole world.” The wide scope undercuts national identity even in these wars for Dutch independence.

Pamphlet writers in England, certainly, often apparently saw the conflict in these transnational terms, part of a larger struggle encompassing religious war across the continent. Thomas Churchyard, in his A Lamentable and Pitifull description of the wofull warres in Flaunders (1578), promises supplementary volumes “called, the calamitie of Fraunce, the blloudy broyles of Germany, the persecution of Spayne, the misfortune of Portingall, the troubles of Scotlande, the miserie of Ireland, and the blessed state of England.”

For most writers, the minatory spector of imperial Spain made the conflict transnational. A similar pamphlet, A pithie, and most earnest exhortation, concerning the estate of Christiandome (1584), by Philips van Marnix, a Dutch writer and Reformed polemicist, calls

---

27 A Brief and True Rehersall of the Noble Victory and Overthrow, which (by the Grace of God) the Protestantes of the North Parties of Holland had against the Duke of Alba his ships of Amsterdam (1573), sig. A2V–sig. A3R.

28 Ibid., sig. A3V.

29 Thomas Churchyard, A lamentable, and pitifull description, of the wofull warres in Flaunders, since the foure last yeares of the Emperor Charles the fifth his raigne With a briefe rehearsall of many things done since that season, vntill this present yeare, and death of Don Iohn (London, 1578), 4.
more directly for a multinational coalition: once again directly translated from a work originally aimed at the empire, it calls for the German princes to not “stand as idle onlookers upon the subjection of your neighbors.”

Spain’s empire is building, and historical example proves that once empire gains momentum, it is difficult to stop. When the Low Countries fall, the Spanish tyranny “may at all times at their pleasure and ease pass their armies into England, France, or Germany.”

Again, the threat of Catholicism spreading over Europe necessitates unity: it is “the King’s (Philip’s) constant and perpetual desire, care, and zeal, earnestly and strictly to establish the Roman religion.” Marnix, however, goes even further in imagining pan-Protestant unity breaking down national boundaries; under threat is not just England or the German principalities, but (repeatedly) “the whole Christian commonwealth.”

Frequently in the pamphlets, writers blur political and geographical borders by employing political language to discuss the church, invoking the long established metaphor of the “kingdom of God.” The switch here to “commonwealth,” however, subtly implies the obligations owed by all members of their church to ensure the safety and prosperity of their coreligionists.

The pamphlets relied on both biblical and classical metaphors for understanding this commonwealth, for imaging the relationship between the English readers and other Protestants abroad. It is useful to remember that the concepts of both “empire” and “union” remained as ambiguous and undetermined in the period as the concept of “nation,” each open to a wider array of meaning than they presently hold. Many of these writers continued to rely on heroic figures to

30 Philips van Marnix, *A pithie, and most earnest exhortation, concerning the estate of Christiandome together with the meanes to preserue and defend the same; dedicated to al christian kings princes and potentates, with all other the estates of Christiandome: by a Germaine gentleman, a louer of his country* (Antwerpe [London], 1584), 10.

31 Ibid., 18.

32 Ibid., 30.

33 Ibid., 19.
bind the community together: *A Brief and True Rehersall*, for example, opens with a discussion of Homer on war, and then the scriptural account of David’s military successes. Both, implicitly, are models for interpreting action in the Netherlands, and both were common frames for understanding the continental events, as we will see below. Occasionally, the states merit praise by comparison to the Romans, as when their ships overcame unfavourable odds to defeat a Spanish fleet: “but the honour and praise of this Roman deed is greater, in that 8. Holland ships, have overcome 17. Well manned Gallions of the mightie King of Spaine, that did so little esteeme and regard the Holland ships and men.”34 The Roman model of expansion and incorporation stands as an implicit background, contrasting the subjugation and tyranny of Spanish imperial expansion, and offering a republican model for the United Provinces.

Moreover, what makes the space of the Netherlands so interesting in the late sixteenth century is precisely its lack of national borders. Any discussion of competing religious and national identity in the Northern Low Countries, especially, is misleading, for the borders had not yet been set; religion, local tradition, and impromptu invention allowed the United Provinces to eventually achieve some unity, but in the sixteenth century the amorphous character of the people allowed them fluidly to associate and even merge with neighbours in their supplications for military assistance. Regional identities remained strong, but as the Northern Provinces pleadingly offered the crown of their newly minted territory to a line of foreign monarchs, the shape and borders of the new country remained open. As much as England could claim kinship through proximity and religion, the Spanish Provinces to the South could also claim shared identity through history: “Thou art our flesh, our blood, (in times passed in a good mind) but

---

34 *A Brief and True Rehersall*, 8.
now cruelly bent against us.”

A battle for interpretation – over the identity, connections, and obligations of the people of the Low Countries – was waged largely within the pamphlet writing during the war. While England remained more centralized, with more thickly defined borders, the recent loss of a foothold on the continent – a blow to traditional English identity -- encouraged many in England to consider the possibility of assuming the Netherlands. Without an established center and historical borders, the United Provinces relied perhaps even more heavily on the heroic house of Orange to offer a rallying point, a base for national unity, especially after Maurits began triumphing against Spain. But, in an attempt to draw foreign support and define themselves, the celebration of Maurits – especially in England and foreign Protestant countries – depicted him increasingly as a savior of God’s church, a religious hero before a national hero.

Indeed, the ambiguous and transnational way of discussing the conflict is not limited to a few militant pamphlets, but may originate in the William of Orange’s original declaration of war, translated into most of the languages of Europe. Early in the official pronouncement, William offers the primary agenda of the revolt:

This our just & reasonable defence, (which with Gods furtherance we hope to goe thorow with) tendeth to none other end, but first and chiefly to the advancing of the honor of God and his word, to the profit of his Majesty, countrey, and subjects, and likewise of the Emperial Majesty our soveraigne Lord and his welbeloved sonne: which in time to come (as true successors of the said countrey) pretend right thereto.

There is some ambiguity in the Prince’s phrasing, but given its placement after “the honor of

---

35 A true copy of the admonitions sent by the subdued prouinces to the states of Holland and the Hollanders answere to the same. Together with the articles of peace concluded betweene the high and mightie princes, Phillip by the grace of God King of Spaine, &c. and Henry the fourth by the same grace, the most Christian King of Fraunce, in the yeare 1598. First translated out of French into Dutch, and now into English by H.W. (London, 1598), 3.

36 William of Orange, The apologie or defence of the most noble Prince William, by the grace of God, Prince of Orange ... against the proclamation and edict, published by the King of Spaine, by which he proscribeth the saide lorde prince, whereby shall appeare the slaunders and false accusations conteined in the said proscription, which is annexed to the end of this apologie / presented to my lords the Estates Generall of the Lowe Countrie, together with the said proclamation or prescription : printed in French and in all other languages (Delft, 1581), sig. A3R.
God and his word,” in “his Majesty, country, and subjects,” ‘his’ seems to denote God. What exactly God’s ‘country’ would be is somewhat ambiguous, but it seems to include all the “poore innocents and faithful people, as desire to live according to the pure gospel.”37 Whether or not Orange is actually referring to Phillip, he intimates that the war involves a larger ‘country’ of Protestantism, a nation of the people, like Israel, transcending regional borders. Of course, imagining wider federations was central to William’s success in the revolt, for the territories of the Low Countries rarely if ever thought of themselves as a cohesive union. Before national borders had been drawn, the fluid shift between local and transnational communities reflected the situation on the ground, a negotiation inherent in carving out the national space of the Dutch Republic. Certainly, the church – even invisible – would prove a more powerful bind than the yet imaginary federation of the northern provinces.

In setting up this country of the godly, Orange establishes himself as a leader or hero of pan-Protestantism; he takes a place on the front lines of the apocalyptic struggle between good and evil. More patriotic Englishmen seem to have had an ambivalent relationship with the Dutch and French leaders of the war – they were attracted to and repelled by the temptation to rally behind a foreign general – and Orange merely asserting a heroic position was sometimes used by English writers to shame the English into matching his heroism. In The Overthrow of the most part of the Prince of Parma his forces (1591), for example, the author compares Orange to probably the most famous of the godly Old Testament militant leaders: “the lord of hosts hath assisted him, yea hath preserved him, as the apple of his eie, even as he did defend David from the mighty Captaine of the Philistines.”38 Orange is like David, representing God’s people in

37 Ibid., A4R.

38 The ouerthrow of the most part of the Prince of Parma his forces, both horse and foote Performed on the twelfth and fifteenth of Iuly last, by the Graue Maurice his excellencie, generall of the armies in the lovve countries. With
battle against their seemingly insuperable enemy. And once again, this heroism takes place in the context of not a nation, but all Protestantism. In the end, the author praises Orange and asks for God’s blessing: “whom I beseech God to prosper with all his Army and to graunt him victory, that he may overthrow the enemies of God’s truth, and build up the decaied Temple in the land of Israel.”

The apocalyptic context, discussed by many critics, militates against nationalism – ‘the land of Israel,’ here, is not simply the Low Countries, but all Protestants spread through various lands. In framing the transnational political context as a final struggle between good and evil, national difference has been effaced.

Certainly, this pan-Protestant status never negates the national role played by the “vader des vaderlands,” but it does suggest that Dutch heroes of the revolt held a dual role. And the fact that William of Orange was, in fact, German, further eroded any stable and firm nationalist base (and led to the rather odd opening lines of the Dutch national anthem: “Wilhelmus van Nassouwe / Ben ik van Duitsen bloed” – I am William of Nassau, of German blood). Later heroes retained this dual heroic role – a prince of both the church and the land – even foreign heroes that brought succour to the besieged people. In fact, in the 1590s, with the rise of Maurits of Nassau, the hero became even more central as a focal point for pamphlets and group identity and a representative for both religious and national communities. Maurits’s ascendancy is marked; the turn is evidenced even by the titles of pamphlets: general and descriptive titles which reference large groups (“A true rehersall of the honourable & triumphant victory: which the defenders of the trueth have had” (1573); “A brief and true rehersall of the noble victory and overthrow which… the Protestants… of Holland had against the duke of Alba” (1573); “The

---

*the breaking of the huge bridge leading to the Valew, neere Arnham. Seene and allowed* ([London], 1591), sig. A3R-sig. A3V.

39 Ibid., sig. B3R.
spoyle of Antwerpe” (1576)), by the 1590s, increasingly reference Maurits (“The honourable victorie obtained by Grave Maurice against the ctitie of Rhyne-berg” (1597); “A true discourse of the overthrowe given to the common enemy at Turnhaut… by Count Moris of Nassaw” (1597); “A proclamation… touching the victorie atcheived by the prince Maurits before Emmericke” (1599); “A true relation of the… victorie latelie atchieved by Counte Maurice” (1600).) If he is a centripetal force for Dutch nationalism, these pamphlets demonstrate that he is equally a focal point for foreign, pan-Protestant interest in the war.

The pamphlets create and sanction this dual role. Even English pamphlets – especially those translated directly from the Dutch (an increasing number by the beginning of the seventeenth century) – affirm Maurits’s nationalist status in the United Provinces. Pamphlets end praying that God might “vouchsafe to blesse and keepe his Excellencie, and to further all his godly proceedings: and graunt happie & prosperous effect to his attempts, for the general peace and quietnes of all the Lowe Countries.” Maurits’s victories defend his home country, ensuring their safety and prosperity; yet the very same pamphlet shifts to a wider lens, reminding once more through inclusive language that they share “common enemies.” Maurits strives to “free the Netherlandish Provinces from the bloudie yoke of the Tyrrannical Spaniards and hipocricall murtherous lesuites, which daily practise to trouble, not only the welfare of the Netherlandish Provinces, generally, (but also to suppresse and murther all good, godly, blessed, and peaceable Kings, Princes, and Potentates).” The pamphlets celebrating Maurits continue to invoke a

---

40 A short report of the honourable iourney into Brabant by his excellencie Graue Mauris, gouernour and Lord Generall of the united Netherlandish Provinces: from the 26. day of Iune, to the 19. day of Iuly, 1602. Together with the taking of Helmont, and of his marching to the strong towne of Graue. Translated out of the Dutch copie printed at Vtricht (London, 1602).

41 Ibid., 3.

42 Ibid., 1-2.
providential narrative, and Maurits becomes a tool of God within this unfolding history. Again and again, the miraculousness of the Dutch victory over the great Spanish empire is referenced as proof of God’s sanction, and Maurits parallels the Old Testament heroes who had also led godly forces against insuperable odds: “For which noble Vitorie, the eternall God is to be praised and thanked. And God grant that his Excellencie may always be blessed, and have most prosperous succes in all his exployts and proceedings, that by his circumspectness and foresight the Enemie may be quailed more and more, and that all such as sigh under Spanish tyrannie, may be delivered out of bondage.” The common trope of bondage – whether Egyptian, Babylonian, or Spanish – marks the Dutch struggle as another iteration of the providential narrative.

At the same time, the success of Maurits also provoked some anxiety about the status of England in the church. For those Protestants who hoped that their nation might lead the Protestant forces against Rome, or even that the church might be a federation of equals, the Dutch story must have made Englishmen apprehensive that the Dutch might, in fact, have more right to claim elect nationhood. While those expressing English chauvinism were a relatively small minority – and, as Richard Bauckham has shown, only after the Armada did the English begin viewing their nation as a divinely elected leader of the Protestant church – the growing sentiment of English exceptionalism began influencing the reception of the war exactly as Maurits began his victorious campaign. Reactions to the Dutch-Spanish war indeed become more Anglo-centric in the 1590s, as Dunthorne has rightly noted. Many English writers insist on the role of their countrymen in the struggle for the Netherlands. The patriotism was so

Albert Hendricks, The honorable victorie obtained by graue Maurice his Excellencie, against the citie of Rhyne-berg, the 20. of August. 1597 Translated out of the Dutch coppie, printed in S. Grauenhaghe, by Alber Hendrickson (London, 1597), sig. A4R.

pronounced, in fact, that John Chamberlain wryly observed that it seemed “as if no man had struck stroke but the English, and among the English no man almost but Sir Francis Vere.”45 Dunthorne remarks that, while many of the pamphlets were supportive of the Dutch, even more “were more crudely chauvinist, never hiding the fact that their main purpose in writing was to glorify the part played in the Netherlands conflict by ‘our English nation.’”46 Still, for writers who saw the struggle in apocalyptic terms — in the binary between the true and false churches — the distinction between the heroic English and their Dutch coreligionists was often blurred.

Even this increasing Anglo-centrism in reports of the Dutch war with Spain, corresponding to the patriotic sentiment unleashed by the victory over the Armada, is complicated and qualified by the continual shifts to a pan-Protestant lens, the uncertain borders of the nation, and the possible place within the nation for the Dutch. Stephen Gosson’s 1598 sermon, The Trumpet of Warre, demonstrates how even the most vociferously nationalist popular writing could still employ a sliding scale that incorporated the Dutch within English nationalism. Gosson never hedges on England’s preeminent position, still riding the post-Armada high a decade after the event. The Church of England, Gosson boasts, is “by Gods great blessing at this day (euen in her ruines) the most famous church in Europe.”47 His nationalism, however, takes shape within the wider context of the Dutch Revolt, and like so many contemporaries he transfers between a local and an international church without clearly marking the shift. Though Gosson never mentions the Dutch, his anti-Spanish bias and his title — a call for war — allows Dunthorne to incorporate the work into his discussion of English reaction to the Dutch revolt.


46 Dunthorne, Britain and the Dutch Revolt, 11.

And while Gosson laments the many injuries done to England and Queen Elizabeth by Spain, most of those affronts — with the obvious exception of the Armada — seem to have taken place in the Netherlands. The ongoing war, by the erasure of the Dutch, is almost reframed as an Anglo-Spanish conflict. This is patriotic, undoubtedly, but it also seems to include Dutch — and the French and German Protestants — within English patriotism. The centrality of the Protestant church in Gosson’s patriotism, that is, establishes an inclusive Englishness often willing to overlook national difference. This becomes most apparent in his turn to the church:

By these practises both you my Lords, and you good people may easily discerne, that this world is a very sea of trobles, wherǐn there be two ships vnder saile, both men of warre. The one is the church, where Christ is the maister, his crosse the maste, his sanctimony the sailes, the tackle is his patience and perseuerance, the caste peeces are the Prophets, Apostles, and preachers whose sound hath been hard ouer all the world, the mariners be the Angels singing their Celeumata glo|rie be to God on high, the fraught is the soules of iust men, woemen, and children. And the rich gifts and deuotions bestow+ed vpon churches and colledges bound vp in baggs that shall neuer perish. …There is another ship at sea which hath this ship in rhace, that is the Pyracy of hel, a hot ship and full of wild-fire, where the Diuell is maister.⁴⁸

Once again Gosson employs the metaphor of a ship — also popular in political discourse — to discuss the church, and the binary between the ship of Christ and the ship of Satan apparently includes all people “over all the world.”⁴⁹ Even in a patriotic sermon, Gosson fluidly shifts his scale and interprets conflict through the more familiar and more global lens of the church.

Similarly, I.B., the author of a verse celebration of Lord Willoughbie’s triumphs in the Netherlands, written in somewhat stilted alexandrines, produced one of the surviving patriotic ballads on the war which exemplifies the complexity. In A Mirrour to all that love the warres (1589), I.B. shows little interest in the pan-Protestant cause. He admittedly returns occasionally

---

⁴⁸ Ibid., 57.
⁴⁹ Ibid., 56.
to ask God’s blessing on England and the Queen, but he never invokes an apocalyptic context nor treats Spain primarily as Catholics. Willoughbie’s heroism in the Dutch republic is celebrated at the end of each six-line stanza as somehow bolstering the “Countries cause.” The repetition drives this in incessantly: “So iust was Countries cause, that no man could him stay”; “Yet zeale for Countries cause, them bloudie left on ground”; “Our countries cause is iust, by prooфе our foes may see.”50 This begs the question: how is the Dutch revolt for “Countries cause,” and who is that country? Staging the war in the Netherlands to avoid a Spanish invasion of England may have been a practical strategy, but it hardly warrants Dutch victories described as English national victories. Where are the borders of country for I.B, and how, one wonders, does the Netherlands relate to England? What makes the victories national: that Englishmen accomplished them? That they bolstered England’s international position?

If I.B. is a nationalist balladeer, then, his nationalism is shaped by England’s role in transnational conflict. As we will see also in Spenser’s Faerie Queene, nationalism continually takes shape in a transnational arena. Another ballad, this anonymous, printed in 1600, like later pamphlets, moves to center the conflict and interest in the Netherlands onto Maurits, a hero representative of both his nation and his church. His hortatory speech in the ballad betrays the same multipurpose, transnational role that the pamphlets insinuate:

For Flandres, and for England,  
Brave gallants must we fight:  
In his defence and quarrel,  
That is the God of might.  
To armes I say then gallant lads,  
Let nothing us dismay:  
Against professed foes we fight,

---

50 I.B., A mirrour to all that loue to follow the warres go trudge my little booke, possesse ech willing hand, and giue all leaue to looke, that seekes to vnderstand, the travels of thy knight, plead hard to hold his right, who finds thee may be bould, his actions to vnfould (1589), 1. 54, 114, 168.
And hope to win the day.  

Troops are fighting for country – both their own and their allies; yet these nationalist ramifications are subordinate, and national struggles are assumed into the larger, divine cause.

**Emblems of Unity**

The images accompanying the ballads reinforce the pan-Protestant unity of the lyrics, though sometimes with rather confusing implications. In *Newes from Flaunders*, for example, which details in song a victory of Maurits over the Spanish army, a small woodcut displays an Angel with the sword of the gospel (marked “IHS”) floating to meet an army of Turkish soldiers, their shields inscribed with the star and crescent. The image, perhaps recycled, links the Spanish Catholic forces to the Muslim forces of the Ottoman Empire, a common association, especially for Protestants who viewed the world through the apocalyptic binary. The image sanctions Maurits as divinely appointed, a servant of God confidently combatting seemingly insurmountable odds, assured of victory; it reinterprets the complex, multinational battle, representing it as a simple struggle between the forces of God and his enemies. Perhaps even more provocatively, I.B. affixes to his ballad the image of Saint George. The song recounts the valorous actions in the Low Countries of both Lord Willoughbie and Grave Maurits and describes a religious struggle for the survival of the United Provinces; the front image, however, interprets the material for the reader through English national iconography.

These complex attempts to both imply and solidify Anglo-Dutch unity, often condensed in a heroic figure, are common throughout the visual arts, especially in the genres that so easily crossed national borders: portraiture, woodcuts, and especially emblems. As Hugh Dunthorne
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51 *Newes from Flaunders* A new ballad of the great ouerthrow that the valliant Captaine Graue Maurice, Sir Frances Veere, and other of the Queene of Englands friends: gaue to the Archduke, and his army of Spaniards, vpon Sunday being the 22 of Iune last past, 1600. To the tune of lusty gallant (London, 1600), l. 89-96.
has noted, patriotic portraits of William of Orange were available from a shop in Pope’s Head Alley by the 1570s; in some representations, he mounted a horse and appropriated the form of Saint George. Many Englishmen similarly took mini-pilgrimages to Delft to see the monuments of William and, later, Admiral Tromp. More generally, there was, according to Dunthorne, an enormous presence of Dutch graphic art in early modern Britain. 52 Emblems circled freely throughout Europe – even across religious divides – and certainly were appropriated in service to the Dutch Wars. Indeed, one of the earliest English emblemists, Geoffrey Whitney, printed a work dedicated to Leicester during his Governor-Generalship and replete with Anglo-Dutch significance. Whitney studied at the young University of Leiden and collaborated with a circle of Dutch poets including Janus Dousa, the principal author of the collection, Odarum Britannicarum Liber. His emblem book, A Choice of Emblems, was a product of this interaction.  

Whitney’s work — which was, until fairly recently, read as propaganda for the Dutch cause 53 — scatters dedications to important English and Dutch leaders and intellectuals – including both Sidney and Leicester. Whitney occasionally addresses the situation in the Low Countries, but usually obliquely, and the ambiguity intrinsic to the emblem genre resists a simple and straightforward propaganda. I therefore agree with Kenneth Borris and Morgan Holmes’s more recent assessment, which sees the work as somewhat doubtful of Leicester’s campaign and instead more interested in Anglo-Dutch literary exchange. 54 In support of this thesis, the work offers an interesting rewriting of perhaps the most famous image of Anglo-Dutch unity, which had recently been minted by the Dutch. A popular coin celebrated the close relationship of the

52 Dunthorne, Britain and the Dutch Revolt, 54-5.


two peoples: a pair of yoked oxen stood on one side, one marked with the Dutch Lion, the other the English Rose; on the back, two pitchers floated beside one another, with an inscription beneath: “Frangimur si collidimur” [We are broken if knocked together]. The image stresses both the unity and distinction: two separate countries, but linked together in their work.

In an emblem dedicated to his Father, Whitney rehashes the image:

Two pottes, within a runnings streame weare toste,  
The one of yearth, the other, was of brasse:  
The brasen potte, who wish’d the other loste,  
Did bid it staie, and neare her side to passe.  
Whereby they might, togeather ioyned sure:  
Without all doubt, the force of flood indure.

The earthen potte, then thus did answere make,  
This neighborhood doth put me much in feare?  
I rather choose, my chaunce farre of to take,  
Then to thy side, for to be ioyned neare,  
For if wee hitte, my parte shalbe the wurste,  
And thou shalt scape, when I am all to burste.56

Whitney over-explains the image in the final stanza: the pots are the rich and the poor floating through life. Given the context, however — according to Manning, the whole work is “a public apology for a national [military] campaign” that forwards “an expansionist, imperialistic foreign policy,” and, even if perhaps that oversells its propagandistic function, it was at least dedicated to Leicester and produced in a literary circle at Leiden — the emblem almost certainly recalls the Anglo-Dutch relationship. Whitney’s emblem shifts the meaning, however, so that a kind of union now implies a great danger, at least for the earthen pot. To come fully together risks the destruction of the weaker vessel, and union involves contention. The re-scripting of this image

55 See Dunthorne, Britain and the Dutch Revolt, 55.

56 George Whitney, A choice of emblemes, and other deuises, for the moste parte gathered out of sundrie writers, Englished and moralized (Leyden, 1586), 164.

apparently fits better with Borris and Holmes’s reading, which discovers in Whitney’s emblems “doubts about Leicester’s command, continental military interventions, and militant apocalyptic Protestantism.”58 Perhaps Whitney, like the Queen, had doubts about the wisdom of accepting the United Provinces as part of the English crown.

Several other emblems of unity inform the Anglo-Dutch relationship, especially when one considers the freedom with which the emblems circulated among English and Dutch literary circles. These both visually and lyrically gave shape to the ways English and Dutch readers imagined their relationship, as well as opening a rich Anglo-Dutch literary conversation as multilingual emblems fluidly crossed borders. Claude Paradin’s massively influential Devises heroiques (from which Whitney borrowed extensively), translated into Dutch (Antwerp, 1563) and English (London, 1591), contains many of the images of unity that fill the pamphlets, including the renowned Roman fasces band, referenced as the “bundle of sticks” in the pamphlets. Of course, the image has a rich afterlife, but for the early moderns it was perhaps most closely associated with Roman magisterial power.

The English translator explains the “bundles of yong and tender rods” as “signifying ... the triumphes of that most noble region of Italie, and the whole government of the world, and also that the Romaines by their great wisdome, peace, and affection to the common weale, purchased to themselves no little praise and dignitie.”

The image, drawn from political discourse, is applied to the religious community in the pamphlets, encouraging unity among Protestant nations through a political – arguably even imperial -- conception of themselves and the church. In Paradin’s emblem, the insistence on unity becomes almost superfluous, surfeiting the image and becoming contradictory as it is read through time. “The iron wreathes, & chaines,” the work notes, “doe signifie the bondage and captivity wherewith from that time to this day, Italy is

59 Claude Paradin, The heroicall devises of M. Claudius Paradin Canon of Beauieu. Whereunto are added the Lord Gabriel Syeons and others. Translated out of Latin into English by P.S. (London, 1591), 73.
brought to ruine by the wickednes of sedition and civill dissention."\(^{60}\) The image contains both the virtues of unity and the threat of discord, and though the chains are left unmentioned in the pamphlets, the transnational popularity of these emblems meant, perhaps, that they lingered as an implicit subtext, a recognizable threat to English Protestants.

**English Heroes of the Dutch Revolt**

When England did begin its official involvement with the Netherlands, English heroes entered a space already fully carved out by the Dutch nobility, especially William of Orange. In fact, the assassination of William (July 10, 1584), only a year before Leicester’s campaign as Governor-General of the United Provinces began, made comparisons almost inevitable. In a letter to Francis Walsingham, Leicester’s co-campaigner for a militant and Protestant policy in England, Emmery de Lyre notes the succession: “I doubt not but that God will bless all [the Queen’s] heroic enterprises, since she in a way brings back to life the late Prince of Orange in the person of the Earl of Leicester.”\(^{61}\) Heroism and “heroic enterprises,” especially in the Dutch wars, inevitably remind of the pattern set by the Prince of Orange. In fact, as Strong and Van Dorsten note, the role Leicester assumed had already taken a multinational stamp: “Memories of William the Silent, of Anjou and of the Archduke Matthias constantly appear in contemporary descriptions and letters treating the reception of my Lord Leicester.”\(^{62}\) Leicester and Sidney, in their campaigns in the Netherlands, inherit a multinational tradition.

England, it should be noted, stood excluded from much of the heroism of the sixteenth-century religious wars, especially before the Armada. The dearth of religious war inside England

\(^{60}\) Ibid., 73.


\(^{62}\) Ibid., 34.
– besides a few notable exceptions – left the country without a recent, post-Reformation heroic tradition. Elizabethan heroism was largely a construction based on texts, like Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*, that misrepresented English involvement in the Dutch Wars. Complaints of English pacification and effeminacy became endemic in the Stuart period, as writers looked back anxiously on their Elizabethans forebears, and as we shall see, this anxiety played an important role in shaping English reaction to foreign heroes.\(^63\) From the other side of the millennium, however, the complaints and anxiety over the effects of peace equally informed English reaction to the Dutch Revolt, as writers located the purported natural militancy of the English even further back in history. Barnabe Rich, who had served in the Dutch wars, argued in his *A Martial Conference Pleasantly Discoursed Betweene Two Souldiers* (1598) that this concern was tied to religion:

> It is yet within the compasse of our owne memories, and hundreds of thousands are now liuing that do well enough remember the very maidenhead of these wars, when they were first vndertaken, both in France and Flaunders, yea and in Scotland too, about matters of religion: howe long they were in armes and in ciuil broiles among themselues, whilst we liued here in *England*, by a most gratious go|uernemen|t in the calme of quiet peace: we heard of warres round about vs, but with vs we had none but at Westminster hall. Yet alarmses were sometimes hote amongst louers, when their Ladies were disposed alittle to be froward, our warlike instruments were laide aside, and almost out of vse, our shril trumpets for the field, were turned to stil musicke for the chamber, our drummes to tabrets, our martial exercises to maie games: this swéet and quiet peace brought with it a carelesse securitie, our gallant youths forgat to bestride the stirring stéedes, and walked vp and downe with feathered fannes in their hands, masks to couer their faces, and tawdry laces about their neckes, they became effeminate in al their demeanours, disguising themselues like demi-harlots. Our happines was enuied by our neighbors that did inuirone vs, but what could they doe to disturb our quietnes.\(^64\)

---


The common marks of the Stuart critique are already in place: the drums and trumpet have been exchanged for dancing music; too much time is spent at court on courting; the “carelesse securitie” makes men become “effeminate in all their demeanours,” focused too much on their dress. The religious wars – all connected in Rich’s account – have provided other nations an opportunity to both express and forge their valor, while England’s somewhat aberrant position of having converted to Protestantism without a war potentially compromises English glory. For Rich, with morality and religion tied so closely to war, England needed the foreign battlefield for its own moral reformation; the proper soldier is the proper Reformed Christian:

There is nothing therefore more inciting to true Christian valiance, then when a man shall remember he goeth to fight in a iust and honest cause: for when I know I shall aduenture my life in the maintenaunce of Gods true religion, in the seruice of my Prince, or defence of my country, whether I liue or die, in this case I may liue or die in the seruice and feare of God.65

The argument links heraldic, national, and religious motivations for war – in service of King, country, or Church – but subsumes them all into religious obligation. War provides an opportunity to demonstrate one’s justice – a foundational term for all of the writing on these continental wars (including, of course, the fifth book of the Faery Queen) which, for Protestant writers, implies both moral uprightness and alignment with God’s providential history. Nor is Rich alone in anticipating later nostalgia.

Even in 1579, Geffrey Gates felt that an English national bias against the military – along with meagre participation in the great religious wars – merited a defence of the soldier:

what meaneth the vulgare multitude of the English Nation, so maliciously to contemne soldiership, and so brauely to despise the profession of Armes, as a vile, and damnable occupation? Surely, bicause they are of seruile and vnnoble heartes: foolish in discretion, idle bellies, carelesse of the common welth of their countrie, litle friendly to mankinde in generall, and lesse zealous toward the glory and preseruation of their Soueraigne Prince and gouernement.66

65 Ibid., sig. D1R.

If Gates detects “unnoble hearts” in the English, this perhaps stems from a conspicuous absence of heroic English leaders. For Gates, heroic figures take central importance in the church, just as they had in Israel when God had used David and other heroes to ensure the safety of his people.

A whole list of heroes – all continental -- now continue the tradition:

As were Fredericke, Iohn, and Maurice, the renowned Princes in honour, chialrie, and vertues, Dukes of Saxoni: Philippe Lantgrawe of Hesse; Albert Marques of Brandenbourgh, Christopher Duke of Wyrtembergh, the warlike and faythfull states of Germany and Zurik. The Nobility of France, and aboue them al, William, Earle of Nassau, the vertuous, good, and happie Prince of Orange. By vertue of the fayth, indu|stry, and prowesse, of these sacred martialists, is the gos|pell, and kingdome of Christ Jesus, brought againe to their passage, &freely preached to the world, an inspeakable comfort & riches to al mankinde, and that specially to the elect children of God, to whom be prayse, Amen.67

While no English leader makes the list, Gates can claim the heroism of the German, Dutch, and French, since they provided succor to the entire church. His religious lens allows him to identify with the Protestant community abroad, a wider view of history in which some more nobly inclined Englishmen may participate. God has sustained the tradition of the godly heroes of the church in the Low Countries, transforming the inept locals into a powerful military force, rendering the Dutch-Spanish wars primarily a revelation of the truth of Protestantism. Gates frequently adopts a prophetic mode – ends his pamphlet, for example, by predicting increasing trouble as the end times draw close – and calls therefore on Englishmen to serve more zealously in religious warfare abroad, wars that are both foreign and also, in the apocalyptic context, their own: “be wise therefore, and acquinte your selues with armes, both corporal and spiritual, that you may at al times and in all causes be compleat Israelites ready for the fielde.”68 “Israelites” here, almost a decade before the great triumph over the Spanish Armada, clearly refers to all true

67 Ibid., 42.

68 Ibid., 63.
Christians; the adjective prefixed to the Israelites – “compleat” – perhaps even insinuates that the English are currently found wanting in their participation in the church. But for those thousands of Englishmen who had or would soon respond – including the Earl of Leicester – Gates’s pamphlet places them inside a long tradition of Christian heroism, inaugurated in Israel but reinvigorated by continental Reformed Princes.

Whether Orange, who stood for freedom of conscience and was accused of a politically expedient use of faith, would have associated himself with the same tradition is doubtful. The inclusion of Anjou and Matthais in Dutch letters suggests, too, that they at least drew less firm distinctions between Catholics and Protestants. And yet, for Leicester and the many fervid Protestants following his progress in England, the Prince’s religious conviction was as important as his political role, and Anjou and Matthais rarely surface in comparison within England. It was perhaps the Leicester circle and English response which transformed the heroism inhabited once by Orange from a civil to a religious heroism. Retrospectively, even Willem himself was represented as an anti-papal crusader. Strong and Van Dorsten note in the ceremonies celebrating Leicester a “general change in emphasis to a triumph of the Reformed Faith under the auspices of Elizabeth and Leicester.”69 While religion had certainly played a key role in the propaganda of Orange’s circle — especially the freedom of religion — the Reformed religion became central in Leicester’s view of himself, and the view of the Eighty Years War from England.

Sidney had earlier noted that Orange’s patriotic activity stemmed from his commitment to the Protestant cause. According to Greville’s encomium, Sidney “made the Religion he professed, the firm Basis of his life; concluding that the wisest, and best way, was that of the famous William Prince of Orange, who never divided the consideration of Estate from the cause

69 Strong and Van Dorsten, *Leicester’s Triumph*, 67.
of Religion.” Church and nation are tied, and Sidney – perhaps even more consciously than Leicester – patterned himself after the Prince, making Orange a hero of both. The English heroes cultivated the connection to past heroism, asserting a wider religious frame that allowed their participation. Certainly, the progresses and pageants through the United Provinces insisted that Leicester filled a space once held by William of Orange. In blunt symbolism, Leicester lived at Haarlem, Amsterdam, Utrecht — each stop on the tour — in the same residence that had formerly housed the Prince of Orange. At Leicester’s first arrival in the Low Countries, he was hailed as “pere de la patrie,” a clear reference to Orange as vader des vaterlands, a more lasting appellation enduring still today. Writers appropriated and reused the same iconography associated with William — and indeed with heroism generally throughout Europe: Leicester was Hercules, resisting tyrants and establishing justice; he was also Arthur. As in the fifth book of Spenser’s epic, these historical exemplars are tied both to the contemporary injustice of the Spanish against the Dutch, and also to the true and eternal forms of justice, existing outside of history. Even the British historical models, however, had first been used by Orange and his propagandists: William, too, had been another Saint George slaying the dragon. But during Leicester’s Governor-Generalship, British historical myths were refashioned with Reformed meanings. According to an oration delivered at Flushing, Arthur had been the “protector of the orthodoxy of his time.” The Garter likewise featured prominently in the processions, taking on
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the role it would hold henceforth in Protestant heroism.

Biblical connections, which had certainly appeared in the encomia for Orange, became if anything more frequent with the refashioning of heroism under the English heroes. In the triumphs, allusions to King David were popular; at Leiden, the university town with a close connection to English Protestantism and poetry, they interpreted Leicester’s arrival as another prince sent to succour God’s people against the idol worshippers of Babylon. In the anti-papal atmosphere, Leicester was also Moses, naturally, leading Israel to freedom from Egyptian slavery. Finally, he was Josiah, or Joshua. The Old Testament provided a rich set of types, heroic princes who had served God’s church, and writers used them to interpret contemporary history, establishing another set of symbols — which we shall see throughout the celebration of these transnational heroes — to effect the transfer of power and allegiance from Orange to Leicester. Perhaps in part to secure his power, Leicester insisted on the connections between the two peoples, especially their shared religion. Although his time as a leader of the United Provinces was short and filled with problems, this insistence on a transnational frame held direct ramifications for how the English interpreted his vastly more successful successor: Maurits of Orange, Prince of Nassau.

**The House of Orange**

When Maurits died in 1625, a pamphlet written by Johann Bogerman, the clergyman who ministered to him in his sickness, was quickly translated into English. Though it came out three decades after the height of the prince’s successes during the Dutch revolt, the pamphlet neatly illustrates the dual role held by pan-Protestant heroes and their relationship to subjects throughout the church. Maurits, according to Bogerman, had been “a patterne of all heroicke and
Militarie actions, and Politicke wisedome.” ⁷⁴ England apparently agreed, as there was a market for an account of his Christian death. In England, of course, 1625 marked the year of Charles’s disastrous entry into the continental wars, and the quick and embarrassing English failure only exacerbated fears that England could no longer be considered at the vanguard of Protestant chivalry. Bogerman scatters reminders of the many great victories throughout the godly death-bed scene, accounts of Maurits’s heroic resistance against Spain, perhaps a shameful comparison when juxtaposed with Charles’s contemporary endeavours.

And yet, the English interest seems not to have been entirely comparative. The pamphlet was translated because Maurits’s victories were also theirs. In part, English soldiers’ role in the 1590s explained their attachment to their former general; but even for those who had not served, Maurits’s role as hero of both the Netherlands and the church allowed an identification with the David-like prince who had culled the great Spanish empire. For Bogerman, as undoubtedly for many of the English, Maurits “was held of all true-hearted Patriots, a precious and chosen Instrument of Gods glory, specially for Gods Church, and these Countries.” ⁷⁵ The sentence uses Dutch nationalism — ‘Patriots’ and ‘these Countries’ — to bookend perhaps his most important heroic role: ‘specially for Gods Church.’ If Maurits was truly a Dutch national hero, his nation’s cause could be understood only as part of a wider, transnational struggle: the true church against the forces of Babylon.

One of the prince’s final utterances expresses this duality. As Bogerman explains it, contextualizing it within the Thirty Years War:

This may comfort all good Christians in their affliction, who at this present live in griefe and persecution, that this famous Prince did beare such affection unto them, saying, when


⁷⁵ Ibid., sig. D2V.
he heard any good newes from abroad:
That will be good for gods children.
Which his Excell: declared likewise to beare unto the church of God, and to the
preservation of the true religion, (which he hath sufficiently shewn unto the whole world
by many actions) …
These be two great Maximies, the preservation of the reformed Religion, and the warres
against Spaine.
Upon which two heads his Excell: did mean that the welfare of the countries depended.76

Maurits — like so many Englishmen — followed foreign events closely because he identified
with suffering Protestants, soldiers who were part of the same holy community resisting the same
tyannical forces. ‘The countries’ in the brief explanation of Mauritz’s policy almost certainly
refers to the states of the Dutch Republic, but the sliding scale between a national and global
conflict easily allows readers to interpret it as indicating the welfare of all Protestant countries.

The Prince’s death, however, is a somber and naturally religious occasion. More
remarkably, he was presented as simultaneously a hero of the United Provinces and a hero of
Protestantism during his enormously successful and sustained career. Indeed, while Maurits may
never have enjoyed the zenith of Protestant enthusiasm lavished on Gustavus Adolphus, or even
the far less competent Frederick V, his long and victorious military career won him the
admiration and laud of generations of Protestants. Several books were printed advertising
Maurits’s military strategies; other leaders came to study under Maurits during his campaigns;
various sieges became a “school of war.” Maurits’s success, after inheriting the mantle of
Protestant heroism from his father and the English commanders, did perhaps more to shape the
character of Protestant heroism – both in Britain and on the continent – than any other leader.
Though many poets had declared their intentions of immortalizing the prince in epic verse, it is
perhaps fitting that the longest work devoted to the Dutch Stadhouder was a compilation of
news pamphlets, anecdotes, and history, perhaps influenced by epic conventions, but written in

76 Ibid., sig. A3R.
Jan Janszoon Orlers’s *The Triumphs of Nassau* serves as a foundational text for the kind of transnational Protestant celebration of heroism that I have suggested, both involving and creating a multinational and multilingual community around the figure of Maurits. The work was a massive (392 pages) celebration of the Dutch leader that combined past news reports to tell the overarching story of the Dutch triumph against Spain. Although apparently telling a national story, Orlers immediately signals his belief in the pan-Protestant stakes by its quick translation into all the languages of Protestantism. Indeed, the work seems imagined as a foundation for a pan-Protestant literary community, catering to readers in multiple vulgar languages. Orlers first published a Dutch edition in Leiden in 1610, titled *Den Nassauschen Laurencrans*. Shortly after, a French edition, *Les Lauriersde Nassau*, was published in 1612, 1615, and 1624, also at Leiden; a German edition followed, *Der Nassawische Looberkrantz oder Triumphwagen* (Leiden and Amsterdam, 1612 and 1618). And an English translation, following the French, appears in 1613 and then again in 1620. (The dates are obviously important, and I will return to them shortly.) While the English was the last of the translations, it was the only edition to be printed outside of the Netherlands, in London, perhaps evidencing the close connection between the presses in London and the United Provinces.

The content and paratext of the celebratory book reinforce the transnational frame insinuated by its translation history. The English *The Triumphs of Nassau* is a work, like many of the pamphlets, that advertises its transnational character even on its title page: it notes that it was “translated out of the French by W. Shute.”

---

77 Jan Janszoon Orlers, *The Triumphs of Nassau: or, A Description and representation of all the victories both by land and sea: granted by God to the noble, high and mightie Lords, the estates general of the united Netherland Provinces. Under the conduct and command of his Excellencie, Prince Maurice of Nassau*, trans. William Shute (London, 1613), sig. A1R.
product – or even a foundation – of Dutch nationalism thus advertises its multilingual network immediately, and implicitly invokes all of pan-Protestantism as a relevant context. The translations frame the wars and victories as the property – or at least the interest – of all Protestants, shared equally by the church. Both the Dutch writer and the English translator, moreover, belong to the larger Protestant community. Orlers was a writer and statesman in the town of the newly minted Dutch university, Leiden, with important political and literary connections. He was the nephew and pupil of Jan van Hout, the most prominent early advocate for Dutch vernacular verse in the sixteenth century and a Dutch counterpart to English writers in the Sidney and Spenser circles. Leiden was, of course, the center of Anglo-Dutch poetic and theological exchange, a town threatened repeatedly by the Spanish but each time successfully liberated by the United Provinces. Orlers eventually rose to become the Burgemeester of Leiden in 1631, and his other long prose work records the history of the city. William Shute, a frequent translator, belonged to a circle of ‘hotter’ Protestants supporting English intervention in the Netherlands during the Elizabethan period. Indeed, Shute was married to the daughter of Sir Thomas Bodley, who had personally served under Leicester; Shute also was an English diplomat in the Netherlands during the 1580s and 90s and was friends with the Sidneys, the Earl of Essex, and Maurits of Nassau.

Viewed purely from an English perspective, The Triumphs appears to offer little outside

---


the interest of specialists: it recounts a series of battles between the Dutch and the Spanish, interspersing exploratory missions of Dutch shipping. Yet this narrow focus is belied by the work’s popularity. The translator apparently believed the work was not simply foreign history, but belonged equally to the English, since it records the contemporary history of the great and inclusive struggle for religion. The audience addressed in the English version, even in the notes to the reader, is often assumed to have a participatory role in the victories of the church. Shute admits, for example, that the translation “tells thee little but what perhaps thou hast alreadie heard from the mouth of the canon, or, if the crampe of feare benumb'd not thy spirits, hadst an hand in.”

While Shute anxiously notes the decay of English virtue, he also proudly advertises the English role in the recorded episodes – noting to his dedicees, William, Earl of Pembroke, and Philip, Earl of Montgomery, that “many of these actions” had been performed by their “noble uncles.” The Englished version offers interested English Protestants a means of participation in the struggle against Catholicism, and, as we shall see, their frequent appearance in the work (as Triumphs often highlights the service of English volunteers) highlights the transnational stakes of the Dutch struggle for independence.

To understand the audience this work engages in England, then, it is important to consider the wider, multinational audience cultivated by other iterations. For the English, as presumably for other non-Dutch Protestants, the heroism of the Oranges provided an important foothold, a way to cement the Protestant community. At the same time, however, the vexed interrelation between the Orange’s national and religious roles, their involvement in a war that was simultaneously creating a nation and, in the eyes of contemporaries, succouring

---
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Protestantism, complicated the presentation of Willem and Maurits. A flux in the relationship between the state and the hero can be traced even in the titles. In the original, the church, the nation, and the Oranges fully overlap:

Den Nassauschen Lauren-crans. Beschrijvinghe ende af-beeldinge van alle de victorien, so te water als te lande, die Godt almachtich de eedele hooch-mogende Heeren Staaten der Vereenichde Neder-landen verleent heeft, deur het wijs ende clouck beleyt des hooch-ghebooren fursts Maurits van Nassau, uyt gegeven.83

Though the work and victories are named after Nassau, the princes are vehicles through which “Godt almachtich” has granted victory to the Estates General of the United Provinces. Maurits, especially, factors prominently in the account, but the title suggest the celebration of a national leadership – “de eedele hooch-mogende Heeren Staaten der Vereenichde Neder-landen” -- as much as a heroic encomium.

The descriptive title is, moreover, an accurate account of the contents. While the header, printed across each page (“The heroicke acts of his Excellencie Prince Maurice of Nassau”), focuses on the prince, Maurits is often muted in the text itself; many accounts make no mention of either Willem or his son, particularly those that celebrate Dutch skill in shipping, and they evidence clear tokens of national pride. Later editions, however, both expand and re-brand themselves to focus more prominently on Maurits. The second French printing (1615) engenders a related work, also printed in multiple languages and attached to versions of The Triumphs: La genealogie des illustres comtes de Nassau (Leiden 1615; Amsterdam 1624); Geslacht-boom der graven van Nassau (Leiden 1616); Genealogia illustissimorum comitum Nassoviae (Leiden 1616). Finally, in 1651, the title foregrounds the Oranges and their divinely ordained role, minimizing the rest of the Dutch nobility:

83 The English title accurately translates the Dutch: The Triumphs of Nassau: or, A Description and representation of all the victories both by land and sea: granted by God to the noble, high and mightie Lords, the estates general of the united Netherland Provinces. Under the conduct and command of his Excellencie, Prince Maurice of Nassau.
This celebration of national and Protestant pride, in other words, becomes increasingly entangled with the character of Maurits.

Maurits’s stunning run of military victories began during the end of Elizabeth’s reign, but much of the celebration of the house of Orange begins to calcify during the Jacobean period. In the disappointing 1590s, after English leadership in the Netherlands had proven disastrously impotent, the success of Maurits drew many fervent Protestants. Paradoxically, as we have seen, the English pamphlets at times became chauvinistic during the 1590s, but this likely stems more from an urgent sense of England’s waning role in the Protestant church than patriotic confidence. By the Jacobean period, English heroism had dried up almost completely; it laid, as the next chapter will show, in potentia in the young Prince Henry. The first printing of the Triumphs of Nassau in 1613 capitalized on the pan-Protestant sentiment unleashed by the marriage of Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart, and initiated Friedrich into the pan-Protestant tradition. Maurits himself had led Protestants and provided the model, as the long recounting of his victories implied, and the work implicitly encouraged the young prince Frederick – who, it was hoped, would assume his mantel – to achieve similar victories. By the reprint in 1620, not only had Frederick accepted the crown of Bohemia, but Maurits himself again had come to transnational prominence at the head of the counter-Remonstrant party at the pan-Protestant Synod of Dort. For a short time, the work could figure multiple temporalities: both optimistically forward, prophesying military success for Protestants in Bohemia, and also backward, reminding pan-Protestantism of Maurits’s importance and garnering support for Counter-Remonstrants as
he faced another challenge, a religious movement considered by most Calvinists to be heretical, a return toward Rome.

With multiple printings in each vernacular language, there seems little question of the transnational popularity of Orler’s work. In England, there was a significant appetite for literature on the continental wars, but it seems worth considering why a long and sometimes tedious work continued to attract readers long after the contents had ceased to be “news.” Why, similarly, did Orlers and his collaborators want or assume a transnational audience for a work celebrating one of their national heroes? Shute capitalizes on the inclusiveness of the Protestant cause in his English version. As in the pamphlets, the full and direct translation sometimes obfuscates the audience, inviting full English participation in the Dutch victories. Orlers includes, for example, a celebration of Dutch shipping among the many military victories, and as throughout, Shute’s translation tends to blur the lines dividing the two peoples. Orlers feels it necessary to justify a non-martial episode, worrying it might “seeme impertinent” to include this among Maurits’s many victories, but he explains that shipping has, in fact, contributed to the country’s glory:

Secondly, I thought good here to insert them, that when the Reader shal look upon the victories which these united provinces have obtained against the king of Spaine, he may here likewise find the valourous actions of our countrimen, and al that they have done and endured abroad in forraine countries many thousand miles from home, to the ruine & diminution of the greatnesse of this Spanish Pharaoh.84

By the author’s inclusiveness (“our countrimen”), the English translation invites its audience to read themselves as part of the Netherlands – or at least to read English heroic action within the history of Netherland’s shipping industry and navy. Indeed, an English reader of the paragraph might well assume that “our countrymen” were fellow English sailors – who had likewise done
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great deeds upon the sea. Typologically, the Protestant nations are implicitly unified as Israel against the (Spanish) Pharaoh. Only toward the end of the author’s apology is it clear that he (Jan Janzoon Orlers) refers to the Dutch:

that the inhabitants of these united Provinces may never forget but alway remember, that the Almighty and onely good God, hath not alone thus blessed, preserved and defended them from the power of the king of Spaine and his bloudie Councell: but likewise how so small a countrie hath been able to make head against the mightiest potentate of Christendome.  

Even the nationalism of the work can thus become open and inclusive in translation. Their shared religion and enemy tend to efface differences, and Shute corroborates the process by leaving national distinction ambiguous.

The religious overtones can not only become inclusive, however; at moments in which a national perspective arises, they can recall the negotiation for position within the Protestant church. Even in the last example, the national turn at the end establishes the United Provinces as the New Israel, a ramification of the link between Egypt and Spain. The passages are in many ways “nationalistic” and could be used to demonstrate an “emergent nationalist sentiment” – for example, the prideful claim that the Dutch were “excelling all nations in the world in navigation and number of ships” (something likely to grate a Jacobean audience).  

Even within this proto-nationalism, however, the Dutch and English, Scottish, and German Protestants tend to merge as a single people in their conquest; just as Dutch victories serve to reinforce English national pride, so the English victories are again incorporated into the celebration of the Dutch navy. One of the prime accounts of the Dutch navy is the conquest of Cales-Males in Andelusia, a joint Anglo-
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Dutch attack led by Thomas Howard and Walter Raleigh.\textsuperscript{87} The military exploits recounted are so tangled that they must be imaginatively reconstructed for any kind of nationalist focus to make sense.

Orlers’s history, in fact, remains open to a multinational readership, operating along a sliding scale between nation and church. Likely, this was intentional, a method for garnering international support gleaned from Willem’s massively successful (and again transnational) propaganda. The English (along with Scottish soldiers, and “Almans”) participate in almost every victory celebrated in the volume. In each case, English and Scottish soldiers are mentioned by name and number during important sieges and battles. During most of Maurits’s ascendancy, Sir Francis Vere led the English troupes, and he receives frequent praise; Orlers describes him, in fact, as “a gentleman of a noble house, a gallant souldier, and more favoured of the Low-countries than all other stangers whatsoever.”\textsuperscript{88} Perhaps glancing at the tension Leicester’s Generalship had eventually provoked, Orlers clams that Vere was wholly embraced by the Dutch – though still recognized as foreign. All English and Scottish soldiers, along with Vere, merged into the Dutch army – under Maurits’s command and in the pay of the States General – while still maintaining their ethnic “nation.” At Deventer, for example, the enemy sent an assault over a bridge, “for which, the English, Scots, and Dutch, were in readinesse, everie Nation under [Maurits’s] command, striving who should match first.”\textsuperscript{89} The army works as a kind of competitive federation, each people striving for the most heroic accomplishments, united under their heroic leader; and yet, ‘nation’ remains here firmly in the classical sense, and local differences do not prevent a wider unity among the army.

\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 185-90.
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Perhaps the most surprising inclusion among the many triumphs of Nassau is the divinely assisted victory over the Spanish Armada, which merits over thirty pages of description. Although Maurits plays no role in the sea battles, the author includes this seminal event for the English nation among his “heroick acts.” English heroism — of the Queen, the High Admiral, and Drake — becomes the focus of the account, but the work also highlights the role the Dutch played in holding back Alva’s forces. The Armada, too, was a war on multiple fronts. The somewhat jarring reinterpretation of the Armada as a transnational battle, inclusively Protestant, stems from the explicitly religious frame of the work. Of course, the English, too, read divine favor into their victory, and saw their Spanish opponents through a religious lens; it was the battle that proved God English. Orlers’s work, however, uses the religious frame to undercut national distinction and stress the unity of Protestant peoples:

In this manner it pleased God not onely to shew vnto England, but likewise to Zeland, their enemies great vessels, to haue them see and confesse how weake they were against so great a power, had not he giuen them discretion and courage, and in sundrie manner fought for them.\(^90\)

The victory had been achieved by prayer as much as naval strength, and there, too, the nations had been joined:

In this regard, the Queene of England and my Lords the States of the vnited Prouinces, did, whilst the fleet houered vpon their coasts appoitnt sundrie dayes of prayer and fa\[s\]ting, beseeching God to turne away so great & imminent danger from them and their countrie, and not to looke vpon their sinnes which had deserued such a punishment, but to aide and assist them for the glorie of his name, and for or Iesus Christs sake, seeing it was his owne cause, which the Pope and King of Spaine sought to exterminat. And because these praiers were made to Gods glorie, and in praise of his inuincible power, he therefore heard them, and graunted their requests.\(^91\)

The account of the Armada in *The Triumphs of Nassau*, while maintaining the traditional

\(^{90}\) Ibid., 76.

\(^{91}\) Ibid., 80.
narrative found in most English accounts – God had protected his elect Protestant nation from the Catholic threat – emphasizes the Protestantism and broadens the meaning to include the United Provinces. It becomes a pan-Protestant victory – applicable, certainly, to both peoples – rather than a confirmation of national status. In fact, the Armada was originally sent to England, Orlers claims, because England lacked the solid Protestant character of the Low Countries:

so as he resolued first to inuade England, which Escouedo Secretarie to D. John of Austria, & some other malitious Spanyards, together with some rebellous Englishmen supposed would be sooner won than Holland & Zeland, maintaining it to be more profitable for the king to inuade England and the Low-countries by sea, than continually to entertain a mightie fleet for defence of the voyages to the East & West Indies against the English and Hollanders.92

Far from the elect country, England harbored some Catholic malcontents who threatened Protestantism, and this gave the pope and his Spanish allies hope. Even after the post-Armada enthusiasm had cooled, few in England would likely have accepted the account which relegated their nation to a secondary role in the heroic struggle; yet the work still found a large enough audience to be reprinted in 1620. Only by a consistently transnational frame does Orlers occlude the challenge his interpretation poses to English superiority. Orlers notes that celebration after the Armada was similarly transnational – paralleling his own work lauding Nassau: Elizabeth receives congratulation from “all Princes, her friends and neighbours,” and is celebrated in what the author estimates to have been “many millions of verses.”93

In his description of the Armada, Orlers notes that the day also prompted remembrance and ceremonies not just in England, but also in the Netherlands; a day for thanksgiving was established also by the States General. This final result of the Armada is perhaps the most interesting, for Orlers unites the people not only in the resistance against Spain, but also in the

92 Ibid., 50.
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repetitive, commemorative practices used to remember the event and foment a unified nationalist sentiment. In churches throughout Britain and the Low Countries, citizens gathered in their churches – ostensibly part of the same larger and invisible community – and gave praise and thanks to God for their joint victory. These moments, though brief and often buried in The Triumphs of Nassau, are crucial during these years of ‘emergent’ or ‘proto’ nationalism, material practices which unite people in both reflection on and creation of their national unity. They appear after almost every victory – state-sponsored, collective and unifying. As in the celebration after the Armada, however, the work hints at the means for establishing a joint, transnational sentiment; the national and the transnational are simultaneous.

A slightly longer example of this conflation can be found after the description of Maurits’s victory at Breda:

For this victorie, all the united provinces and townes, gave publique thankes unto God in their Churches, made bonefires, and in memorie thereof, coyned pieces of gold, silver, and copper, with this superscription on the one side, how that the towne of Breda had beene on the fourth of March 1590 freed from the Spanish bondage by the conduct of Prince Maurice of Nassau.\textsuperscript{94}

Here once again is the same kind of collective, repetitive act that establish a national sentiment, the United Provinces together praising God through the same motions, words, and rituals. While somewhat delayed by the slow pace of news in the early modern period, it is worth noting that many English parishes similarly celebrated the victory. The coining, an act itself weighty with symbolic authority, likewise stamps the Dutch/Protestant victory into metal, creating a shared material memory. And once again Maurits stands as central, the author of the victory as well as another bond uniting the provinces. The message on the coin refers clearly to the him: “Readie to

\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 119.
win, or die, and then, The reward of an invincible courage.”

The implication of Maurits’s role as a religious hero, a repetition of the heroic leaders of the Old Testament, surfaces again in the understated allusion to Moses; just as the Jews had been led from bondage in Egypt, or later captivity in Babylon, so now Maurits frees God’s people from “Spanish bondage.” The pattern had certainly existed far earlier, but Maurits did more than any other prince to restore confidence that God would again succour his people through their military leaders, a unifying confidence that took force contemporaneously with the development of nationalism.

Maurits’s heroic role – and the shifting focus on the Princes of Orange through the work’s print history – derives in part from what a scholar of political theology has recently called “the archaic charisma of the sovereign.” Both nationalism and Maurits’s heroism calcify at the same time precisely because the emergent community still heavily relies on the unifying force of the leader. The story of the Dutch War against Spain thus becomes the triumphs of Nassau. Maurits’s ability to unify diverse groups is apparent throughout, implied in simple rhetorical gestures – the way, for example, Maurits personifies the entire army. Battles in a single pamphlet, condensed to a page or two, fill the nearly 400 page volume. The miraculousness of Maurits’s heroism is further enforced by the small, repeated references to divine aid. When the Spanish fail to destroy a supply ship in Breda, for example, the pamphleteer describes their inaccuracy as “a manifest worke of God.”

God permeates the work, a character of similar importance to the gods that directed battles in the epic tradition; his support of both the United Provinces and his Church through Maurits enables the conquest, which in turn marks them both
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as truly righteous:

 Whilst his Excellencie obtained all these great victories, and that Almightie God, who helpeth the afflicted, assisted these countries and augmented their meanes: as many as knew the king of Spaines strength, did not a little marvaile… But we (as becometh us) doe attribute all this unto God, and say with the kinglie Prophet, Not unto us o Lord, but to thee, belongeth all honour and glorie; for it hath pleased thee, by the weake forces of the Netherlands to abate the pride and arrogancie of the Spaniards.98

Again, Maurits is like David, and the history of the United Provinces allegorically rehearses the suffering and deliverance of God’s people, another fold in history.

As so often in this heroic tradition, the typology establishes the context of God’s providential history and makes sense of Maurits’s actions by reading them through his biblical predecessors. And yet, if this biblical foundation takes precedence, The Triumphs also draws on a diverse array of resources as it places Maurits. The emergent heroism was diverse and layered, embedded in several continental and literary traditions. The Triumphs engages in a complex negotiation of various forms of heroism, reinforcing the tension between national and transnational identification. At one point during a particularly heated battle, for example, one of the generals offers to meet an open challenge from a Catholic opponent:

 There likewise happened a matter worthie of note, ,viz, a single combat betwixt two brave soouldiers […] A Gallant Albanese horseman, […] coming forth of the town, made a brave, and, like Goliah, dared any man to fight, asking if none durst breake a launce with him.99

The encounter itself ends abruptly and with little suspense; the Dutch Lord Ryhoue, after entreating Maurits for permission to humble the German, breaks lances with the knight and then nearly cuts off his pistol-wielding hand with a sword. The entire battle fills only a brief paragraph. Yet, it roots the battle in both classical and biblical traditions, simultaneously
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elevating the Dutch actions and establishing them as a chosen people. The Lord of Ryhoue is both Achilles and David – and David, named in the account as the obvious model, takes precedence. Still, like an epic, the massive work focuses on war, and even a nation-founding war. Willem van Oranje takes on his stock epithet, William the Silent, just like many of his Greek and Roman predecessors, and the story records the Oranges’ almost superhuman acts.

It is also worth noting, however, that the work is in prose, like the Old Testament histories that supplied the most frequent comparisons. This is a heroism that fights for God’s church, and that repeats in each generation until the end of the world. It is, unlike in the classical tradition, always reducible to God’s will: “But it is God that encourageth his servants to attempt great matters, bravely to execute them, and to come off with honor. To him be glory for ever.”\textsuperscript{100}

The typology establishes a kind of “heroic elect,” and the work can even promote a kind of “elect nationalism,” since the single combat was undertaken for both Israel’s protection and glory; but the context almost always renders the national meaning transnational, since Germans fought on both sides and, at least in the eyes of contemporaries, religion defined the ranks. As we will see more fully in later chapters, the various meanings attached to these traditions allowed for significant debate over the meaning of these heroes. Caesar, for example, could inspire English Protestants to imagine the final victory over Rome led by a Protestant empire, while others longed for the settled political borders and purported peace of Augustus’s reign.

The work, then, posits Maurits as the epitome of a heroism that blends biblical and classical traditions, that succours both church and nation and simultaneous binds national and transnational communities; it also describes the genealogy of this heroism early in the volume. In the 1620 edition, shortly after the pages adumbrating the genealogy of William of Orange, Orlers

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 304.
hints at a more varied and multinational genealogy for the heroism that Maurits assumes. The work briefly remembers the leadership provided by William, by Anjou, and then Leicester. When Leicester left, however, the States General assigned his role to Maurits, now laden with both the political and religious baggage from Leicester’s brief and unsuccessful term; he became “Gouernour generall in the sayd Earle of Leycesters absence, with charge and instruction of the preheminences, rights, and pri|uiledges, for the profit and conseruation of the countries townes, and inhabitants, to maintaine and defend the exercise of the refor|med Religion.” Just as Leicester had embraced a heroism passed down to him by William of Orange, the Prince of Orange assumes the baggage of Protestant heroism left by the Elizabethans. Most importantly, however, Maurits assumes the role vacated by his heroic father, as Maurits is raised by God to avenge his death and succour God’s people:

a Prince whom God ha-h made an instrument to reuenge his fathers cruell death vpon the bloudie Spaniards and their adherents, and to let the world see, that it is he alone, who with the father lie eye of mercie beholding these wretched and oppressed Provinces, hath freed and set them at libertie

Religious heroism in the age was founded, or at least most fully developed, in the Netherlands, in the house of Orange. The work itself serves as another remembrance, like the coins and preserved ephemera of battle so often mentioned, drawing together the transnational community of the pan-Protestant church. And in this transnational context, with all the ramifications of Anglo-Dutch negotiation inside the Pan-Protestant Church, Spenser sets the Fifth Book of his Faerie Queene.

Transnationalism in the *Faerie Queene*

The most complex literary engagement with the Dutch Revolt appears in a work

---
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considered the prime example of an English nationalist epic: Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*. Spenser has traditionally been viewed, first and foremost, as a national poet, England’s Virgil, and, more specifically, a poet of “an expansionistic and ultimately imperial English identity.” Since Helgerson’s *Forms of Nationhood*, Spenser’s work has remained a constant in the vast array of criticism that studies the Elizabethan project of “writing the nation.” More recently, when critics have considered Spenser in international contexts, his work has generally been examined through the lens of “New British History,” or the “British Problem,” with a focus on Anglo-Irish politics. He has also, of course, long been understood as a “Protestant poet,” but the additional adjective (‘English’) is almost always prefixed to Protestantism. While I have no intent to contest Spenser’s place in the history of English nationalism, I’d like to challenge the assumption that the church allegorically represented in the *Faerie Queene* can be


simply and always circumscribed by the borders of England. Instead, I suggest in this section that Spenser’s allegory of English Protestant intervention on the Continent, especially in the Netherlands, collapses the distinction between English Protestantism and Protestantism, and moreover draws extensively on the propaganda of the Oranges in its creation of fairy heroes. As we have seen in pamphlets, plays, and the visual arts, readers often appropriated the Dutch Revolt as a pan-Protestant struggle and, at least potentially, identified with coreligionists on the continent as fully as they did with others within their own country. In the apocalyptically charged environment during the Dutch revolt, Spenser’s allegory proves self-consciously unable, or perhaps unwilling, to fully fuse national and religious identity, and thus recapitulates the dual role held by pan-Protestant heroes.

Critics, understandably, have viewed Spenser’s poetry, in Book V as elsewhere, primarily through the lens of English politics. Even those critics who profitably examine the religious contexts of The Faerie Queene do so generally from the vantage of the English court – for example, the Leicester circle’s aggressive international Protestant agenda. Of course, politics and religion – as Leicester himself proves – remain intractably entangled in the period; but much of the material printed or written outside of the court suggests a less nationalistic focus. The materials used to promote the Dutch Revolt often forwarded a claim of not just an international Protestantism that could bind various countries together, but a pan-Protestantism that could itself be described in terms of state. For many of the propagandists, and for William of Orange, the people of God were a country, as in the Old Testament, and the powerful were bound by God to protect the oppressed. Provocatively, there are signs that we should also recognize Spenser’s fairy as at times a religious identity, and one that does not fuse as easily with Englishness as we often assume. Just as transnational historians have begun to argue against “tak[ing] national
boundaries as fixed, implicitly timeless, or even always meaningful,” we should perhaps be cautious about assuming permanent English meaning. Scholars focused on early modernity have suggested that, in these periods before the full emergence of the modern nation, individuals shifted more fluidly between local, national, and transnational identities. To accommodate this variation, historians have proposed a “shifting scale,” the ability to assume different frames while interpreting a text. What is remarkable, however, is how well this shifting scale is accommodated by Spenser’s allegory, which similarly contains multiple levels, draws on multiple sources, and supports reading from these various perspectives. Like early modern identity generally, that is, Spenser’s fairy identity never calcifies around a single source.

The transnational outlook seems most appropriate in Book V, Spenser’s most transnational Book. The inclusion of events and conflicts from across Europe implicitly represents them as part of the same struggle, though critics have generally focused on English intervention as the linking element. Of course, England’s role seems misrepresented – or at least, overenthusiastically retold. The remarkable successes of Arthur and Artegaal saving Belge and Irene, respectively, belie the disastrous failure of Leicester and Grey in historical fact. Yet the Arthur incident does capture the wonder of the Dutch victory over the mighty Spanish empire; it simply misrepresents English involvement – unless, as paradoxical as it sounds, Arthur does not necessarily denote English involvement specifically. The fact that the Armada plays a relatively minor role, relegated to the eighth canto and easily won, suggests that England might actually reside on the periphery. Adopting a more transnational perspective, wide enough to encompass the global struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism, might thus significantly change how


we interpret the events. Arthur’s succour of Belge becomes less fantastic if considered from a pan-Protestant perspective, but the episode raises a novel set of questions. What are the stakes of the battles waged in book V, and are all three fields (the Low Countries, France, and Ireland) equally important? Is the pan-Protestant collaboration a union of equals, or must one nation be truly exceptional? And if the church should be led by an exceptional nation, how might England claim this over their vastly more successful and active coreligionists in the Netherlands? Spenser’s use of Dutch history thus becomes a subtle appropriation and negotiation of England’s character, not as a nation, as so much past criticism has claimed, but as part of the church.

From within this transnational perspective of the Belge episode, then, we might become more attentive to both veiled Anglo-Dutch competition and also the ways in which English nationalism takes on Dutch characteristics. Indeed, reading fairy as a religious identity – especially within the turmoil of what most contemporaries saw as a religious war – might help us understand even the national stakes of the allegory differently, the way Spenser negotiates characteristics of the constituent nations. We can see, that is, how religious identity combines and alters various local and national traditions. In The Faerie Queene, the Dutch cannot be understood simply through their alterity, but need also to be placed within the context of the Protestant church; depending on perspective, they are both different and the same. As Kenneth Borris has noted, in their attempt to woo English involvement in their war against Spain, the Dutch capitalized on this fluidity and utilized traditional English iconography.109 Willem van Oranje could become half-English by assuming the garb of St. George. Thus, if Spenser’s re-use of this iconography in his allegory again asserts English centrality in the war against Catholicism, it also recalls that the heroic tradition taken on by the Earl of Leicester had been

greatly influenced by the Dutch (or actually, German) leader. Almost a century ago, Ivan L. Schulze noted Spenser’s use of the ceremonies celebrating Leicester’s arrival in and tour through the United Provinces, but we might add that, as we have seen, they celebrated him within an already-established continental heroic tradition.\footnote{Ivan L. Schulze, “Spenser’s Belge Episode and the Pageants for Leicester in the Low Countries, 1585-86,” 
Studies in Philology 28 (1931): 235-40.} Leicester was seen as the heir of the recently-assassinated Willem, building on his past successes.

This transnational inheritance works itself out in Spenser’s allegory, as small details blur the line between English and Dutch heroes. In his victories, Arthur actually aligns better historically with the House of Orange than with Leicester. By the publication of Book V, Maurits’s string of victories, fully expelling Spain from the Northern Provinces, appeared in laudatory English print and seemed far more Arthurian than anything Leicester had accomplished. Earlier, Willem’s refusal of sovereignty, even if mostly propaganda, set a pattern for Arthur’s. William notes frequently in his self-defence that he was chosen as governor “not once, but sundrie times… and they them selves, have oftentimes sued for it, both to me and to you, and yet to this present I have not minded to accept it.”\footnote{William I, Prince of Orange, The Apologie or Defecte of the Most Noble Prince William (Delft: 1581), M1R.} He declined, he insisted, because he had rebelled not for personal ambition, but to secure the religious freedom of his countrymen. Arthur, similarly, insists that he lent aid to Belge not because he desired his own glory, but because of “trueth” and the “causes right” (V.xi.17.5). Indeed, the central features of a Protestant heroic tradition – comparison to Hercules, biblical heroes, a godly stance against tyranny, antipapalism – mark both Orange’s propaganda and Spenser’s Book V. My argument is not that Arthur actually represents Willem or Maurits, but that Spenser drew on the well-publicized and skillful propaganda of the Oranges in developing his hero, and that by framing the most
important battles as battles against Catholicism, Spenser inevitably incorporated a transnational perspective, at least alongside any English chauvinism. A celebration of Leicester could never be purely English nationalism. Because the pan-Protestant tradition of heroism was eminently transnational, and forged on non-English soil, Spenser’s allegory of English involvement always contains remnants and memories of the Dutch leaders. Thus the idealized episode could represent a critique of Leicester, as some have suggested, but not without the anxious contemporary recognition that Willem, and now Maurits, more closely approached the Protestant heroic ideal.

Is Spenser’s allegorical representation of the Dutch war against Spain, then, an English appropriation of Dutch heroism and an assertion of England’s leading role in the church? Is it Spenser’s recognition of the importance of Dutch heroism for Protestantism? Or might it be a moment in which political borders melt away in recognition of a higher, shared cause? I would argue that Spenser’s allegory provides room for all three interpretations. Throughout Book V, the line between the English national church and the Dutch church, or Protestantism generally, is attenuated. As many critics have pointed out, Belge is clearly marked as the Low Countries: she has “seventeen goodly sons,” the seventeen provinces; her former seat of rule is clearly Antwerp; and the menacing Catholic threat has overcome all but five of the sons, just as Spain had quashed rebellion in all but the northern provinces. Even if allegory always entails distance from the historical event, in this book, Spenser’s conceits grow least dark. Many generations of critics have filled in the historical allegory: the death of William of Orange (V.x.11); Geryoneo as King Philip II; the Seneschal as, perhaps, the Duke of Alva. Even these historical interpretations, it should be noted, stress the openness of national and ethnic identities in the

period: there exist seventeen sons, since the northern seven had not yet constructed their own independent identity.

On a higher interpretive level, the allegory, as Borris has shown, relied heavily on Revelation, and in this drew the historical episode into universal prophecy. Borris has cogently demonstrated how closely Spenser modelled Belge on the widow in Revelation, the church in the wilderness during the time of apocalypse. The plot closely parallels the apocalyptic narrative, with Arthur assuming the Messianic role and conquering the beast. In fact, for Borris, “the story relates as much or more to apocalyptic prophecy as to current events in the Low Countries.”

This distinction would likely be nonsensical to Spenser and other Reformed Protestants: the events themselves were an iteration of apocalyptic prophecy, another repetition of a pattern inhering in God’s providential history. Spenser’s poem is connected to both, since they were the same event, only at different representational levels – the abstract in prophecy, the particular on the ground in the Low Countries. The influence of Revelation, however, insures that the salvation of the Dutch looks remarkably like the redemption of the English church in Book One, and this, reading backwards, questions how exclusively English even the first book of Saint George could be. Borris’s reading is therefore convincing, but it misses the transnational stakes: this marked resonance can imply both that the Dutch church more perfectly fits the providential pattern, and also that the English and Dutch church are the same.

And yet, this pan-Protestant reading draws out some of the contradictions in the unstable English identity, and church and nation never seamlessly align in Spenser’s poem. Protestant heroism in England threatened to potentially split allegiances within the country, since Protestant heroes do not necessarily serve the state. In fact, in *The Faerie Queene*, as in history, they

---

potentially clash with their political superiors. Though Arthur initially “humbly” entreated “that mighty Queen... / To graunt him that adventure for his former feat” (V.x.15), in the field he takes precedence over Mercilla. Belge praises his “so great travaell,” rather than the queen’s bounty (X.v.21); and after the victory over Geryoneo, Belge offers him sovereignty: “What guerdon can I give thee for thy paine, / But even that which thou savedst, thine still to remaine?” (V.xi.16). Critics have generally felt that Arthur’s unqualified success must reflect somehow on the more convoluted results of Artegall’s quests. Mallette believes that, in the polemicized 1580s and 1590s, Spenser sides with the apocalyptic proponents of military confrontation against the Antichrist rather than preaching, the early sixteenth century’s preferred weapon; Spenser, like his contemporaries, “relishes the violence deemed necessary to defend religion and punish the sacrilegious.”

Paola Baseotto, though she detects almost an Erasmian reluctance toward the use of violence, agrees that Spenser differentiates Arthur’s violence: he “is the instrument of divine justice, the unattainable pattern that Spenser’s work represents as ideal.” In either case, Elizabeth can at best be a kind of secondary hope of Protestantism, not central to the apocalyptic story but watching closely from her court in London. The Belge episode dramatizes the lure and danger presented by the pan-Protestant hero: the general in the field often proved a more attractive rallying figure than the idle crown in London. And, it sets a precedent for the response to (often foreign) pan-Protestant heroes into the seventeenth century.

In Book V, then, depending on our frame, both national and Protestant identities exist, but they are competing, just as “The noble Briton Prince,” can be seen as serving both the nation and a larger, pan-Protestant struggle, at least potentially circumnavigating, perhaps even


usurping, the authority of the crown. Though the “Springals” that come to Mercilla’s court are marked as having travelled a distance, “from forrein land,” they are not explicitly referred to as themselves “forrein” (V.x.6). At least in part, this seems to be because the ways of defining others are shifting, and the signs of foreignness can differ based on who is reading.

Throughout Book V, the national and the religious refuse to fluidly merge, creating at least some of the tension long recognized in what, for a long time, was Spenser’s least popular book (though this has long changed). At least some of the discomfort generated stems from the desire – in readers and critics – to collapse national and religious identity – to make English and Protestant synonymous. Yet Spenser’s work seems intent, at least at times, on pulling them apart. An example of this comes in the very first canto. Spenser introduces Artegall and locates him firmly within a classical/legal context of justice. He is trained by Astrae “to weigh both right and wrong / in equal balance” – the potent judicial symbol of the scales – and to measure equity (V.i.7). Hercules and Bacchus precede him as models, those who established and spread justice. Though Jane Aptekar has shown the ambivalence surrounding the stories of Hercules (the images, like the allegories, have multiple and often ambiguous meanings), at his best he represents the “archetypal obtainer and maintainer of justice.”

We might also add that Artegall’s relation to Hercules places him in the same tradition once inhabited by Willem van Oranje. Artegall mirrors Hercules in his action throughout Book V, particularly in his combat with tyrants.

Artegall’s first act of judging, however, replicates not a classical, but a biblical exemplar: when deciding whether a lady belongs to the Squire or Sanglier, Artegall appropriates Solomon’s


first judgment and decides to cut the lady in half. Though some critics have praised the ruling – or at least suggested that Spenser used it to establish Artegałl’s wisdom – the trial fits uneasily with the kind of justice praised earlier in the canto. Even if it is a moment of inspired wisdom, like Solomon’s, it still is an absolutely singular and unrepeatable act; once it works the first time, it can no longer be part of Artegałl’s repertoire, for defendants could easily feign concern. It problematically relies on ‘guile’ (unless Artegałl had originally intended actually and simply to cut the woman in half – he was, after all, “Salvagess sans finesse”), and in that it establishes a pattern for much of his future judicial work. Still, I can’t help but think we are intended to notice the fairly obvious differences between Solomon’s ruling and Artegałl’s. Both approach a case as if there is no manifest evidence, and the truth must be ferreted out by cunning. Both demonstrate the kind of biblical “justice for the oppressed” – the assumption that the weak and poor are probably in the right. Solomon relies on motherly love; Artegałl relies on the bonds of courtly love. The objects debated, however, are most emphatically different. While in Solomon’s case the baby could not speak and so offered little useful evidence, Artegałl could presumably have simply asked the lady to whom she was betrothed. Indeed, if she was a ‘Lady,’ her decision on which courtly lover to follow should be all that matters. But Artegałl overlooks the obvious source of evidence for an impractical and potentially disastrous scheme. Perhaps Artegałl’s misuse of Solomon’s maneuver proves exactly the problem with the event: the biblical singularity offers a moment of genius that simply cannot be replicated without divine intervention. Other iterations inevitably fail.

The court of Mercilla, one of the most frequently discussed episodes in all of the Faerie Queene, is, I would argue, another place where the religious expectations of the scene do not line up with the justice of state. As always in Spenser, the allegorical representations of Mercilla’s
court are multi-dimensional. So, critics have shown both how the setting for the trial resembles Elizabeth’s court, and also, especially in the charged apocalyptic readings, how it recalls the divine throne. At the entrance, for example, there sits “one of mickle might... with giant-like resemblance” (V.ix22). Elizabeth’s Porter seems to fit the description, but in the guard’s role eliminating deviousness, he seems to also suggest the guile-blocking gates of the New Jerusalem. Mercilla’s throne itself, when she’s “in royall state,” seems rather divine: she’s covered with a cloth “like a cloud,” through which “sunny beams” and “silver streames” shoot forth, all imagery which, as A. C. Hamilton notes, is scriptural. She is surrounded by a choir of angels, and, as in Revelation 4:10, “kings and kesars at her feet did them prostrate” (V.ix.29). Mercilla’s throne, that is, seems surrounded by imagery connecting it to the divine throne. Not that this is unexpected; the imagery marks divine endorsement of Mercilla’s government. Since Elizabeth represents God on Earth, it only makes sense that she would ‘seem’ like him in appearance. But so much emphasis is put on the relation, it seems hard to overlook the divinity.

The allegory wants readers to feel some discomfort about the trial. Arthur himself “was sore empassionate, / And woxe inclined much unto her [Duessa’s] part” (V.ix.46.-4). Critics have noted details like the “uneasy parallel between Dussa’s royal array and Mercilla’s rich array” and the concealment of the execution between to stanzas, Spenser’s “refusal to show how to arrive at a just decision.”118 The resultant discomfort has led some scholars to break the work itself into a binary of unattainable divine justice and compromised human justice. The court scene, I think, does posit a divide, but it also serves to undercut this idealism about divine justice. It is worth remembering throughout this book of justice that for Luther and the early Protestants generally, God’s justice was a terrifying prospect. A Christian must simply hope for mercy, not

118 John D. Staines, The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots, 1560-1690: Rhetoric, Passions, and Political Literature (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), 135,141.
justice, before the divine throne. Here, however, Duessa is condemned, and Spenser reinforces the eternal consequences at one level of the allegory in the condemnation: she is “damned by them all” (V.x.4). On a political level, it’s expected and necessary, an example of not caving in to ‘vain pity’; but divine mercy, according to Protestants, does not work on the logic of state – or any logic – and withholding it results in eternal condemnation – results, that is, in God’s terrible justice, the fate of those not elected to his mercy. Perhaps this discomfort suggests that Spenser was aware of – and even exploring – the difficulties that arise by exalting an earthly leader into a heavenly role – of setting up Leicester or Orange as heroes of the church.

In these and other moments in Book V, Spenser seems to have had some difficulty in synthesizing the Christian and classical roots of justice. Perhaps it simply meant two vastly different things: in one, the most important and godly; in the other, the most fearful. Yet this synthesis was demanded of the early modern pan-Protestant hero, simultaneously the head of national and religious communities. Throughout these events and the Belge episode, Spenser seems to recognize the complexities and tensions produced by the unity. They remain – as in the allegory – both together and distinct, with obligations and priorities not often resolved.

A Larum for London: Anglo-Dutch Unity on the English Stage

Even the English national epic, then, bore the mark of Dutch heroism and registered some tension between national and religious identity. While the Dutch war against Spain appeared in popular pamphlets and influenced even Spenser, the impact arguably spread most widely through depictions of the Dutch on the English stage. Because of the strong interest in alterity during the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, critics have frequently devoted attention to staged Dutch characters, and they have detected far more scepticism about the Dutch cause and even xenophobia than we have seen in the pamphlet literature. The theatre not only
provided a more diverse and larger audience, it was a space with a different ideological charge. Unlike the pamphlets and even Spenser’s work, which appealed to more fervent, internationalist Protestants, the theatre had an increasingly secular audience. The stage had been used, of course, for Reforming purposes – both Bale and Foxe wrote plays – but by the early Stuart period Protestants of the “hotter sort” had largely shunned the medium. Occasionally a popular Protestantism would re-emerge – famously, for example, in Middleton’s *Game of Chess* – but on the whole the stage was not congenial to the kind of pan-Protestant sentiment that favoured Anglo-Dutch unity. Ben Jonson’s frequent satire of English Puritans as themselves Dutch (“the holy brothers of Amsterdam”) represents the most obvious of this anti-Dutch bias. At times, the stage provided a space in which these relationships could be debated, and there were certainly opinions counter to Jonson. Thomas Dekker, himself of Dutch descent, incorporated the Dutch into the “fairy” community in his *The Whore of Babylon*, a play that borrowed heavily from Spenser’s iconography. But overall, certainly, no ideological commitment comparable to the pamphlets motivated most English playwrights.

Critics have reproduced this early modern debate with arguments over the extent of xenophobia on the English stage. For a long time, xenophobia and anti-Dutch sentiment were held predominant. The Dutch were generally included in studies of other foreigners, and, according to Yungblut, there existed only two categories of portrayal: “contemptuously comical or darkly threatening and subversive.”119 Only recently has this been challenged, with an increasing recognition of the positive images of Dutchmen on the stage. Christian Billing has criticized other scholars for “regarding the Dutch as yet another category of Otherness amid the

---

various sites of antagonism that helped, supposedly, to construct English national identity.”

According to Billing, “plays in which Dutch nationals appear should be read as documents that testify to English and Dutch interdependency – representations of alterity that more often than not shore up supra-national allegiances based upon mutual theological, military and economic benefit.” Difference on the stage – often represented as petty and comic, as in linguistic difference, or gustatory habits -- could often be outweighed by similarities. Indeed, supposed satire often linked the English and Dutch together.

Despite occasional xenophobia, at times the stage could encourage its audience to sympathize with coreligionists abroad as vociferously as the pulpit, especially when portraying the Dutch Revolt. The Dutch war against Spain continued to elicit sympathy from English audiences and appeared occasionally on the London stage as a warning for the English. A Larum for London, staged in the late 1590s and printed in 1602, reanimates the story of the siege of Antwerp, by that point two decades old. A Larum belonged to the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, though no evidence links it to an author. Over the long history of its editing, various authors have been suggested as one of the play’s authorial collaborators, including Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Lodge, John Marston, George Peele, and Barnabe Riche, but these all have been contested and generally debunked. Some scholars have claimed that the play was first performed in 1599, the opening season of the globe, while others have argued that A Larum is

---

121 Ibid., 139.
the same play called *The Sege of London* by Phillip Henslow, which was performed eleven times between 1594 and 1595. The work was based on George Gascoigne’s pamphlet, *The Spoyle of Antwerpe*, perhaps explaining its affinity with pamphlet literature.

As the title implies, the play registers an ambivalent relationship between the Dutch and the English; the Dutch serve as a model, which implies both similarity – the English people are headed in the same direction – and difference. Joseph F. Stephenson argues that “it is very clear that Antwerp is a sort of monitory mirror image of London”; in fact, even the full title of the play – *A Larum for London, or the Siedge of Antewerpe* – insinuates the Anglo-Dutch connection through its grammatical symmetry.124 Throughout the play, characters vent anti-Dutch polemic, though usually only the villainous Spanish characters. The Dutch are “swilling epicures”; “they are remisse and negligent, / Their bodies us’d to soft effeminate silkes.”125 The play has served as a kind of testing ground for arguments about English xenophobia, and has therefore often been treated in studies of “foreigners” on the English stage. Peter Matthew McClusky offers perhaps the most militantly anti-Dutch reading when he suggests that "the play's graphic representation of Flemings being slaughtered reveals a genocidal fantasy shaped largely by animosity toward Flemish immigrants but also informed by the emerging Anglo-Dutch commercial rivalry."126 On the other hand, some scholars have detected traces of sympathy, especially in the overarching unity provided by the shared, demonic enemy: the Spanish. In a way, then, scholarship about this play reproduces in miniature the debate about English representations of the Dutch generally.


The exact relationship between the English and the Dutch remains one of the unanswered questions of the play, made even more complicated by uncertainty over how the audience would have responded. Further distinctions between the Dutch of the northern and southern provinces – a distinction which had solidified by time the play was written – undermine a simple one-to-one connection between the English and “the Dutch,” though they do enable the English audience to identify with fringe Dutch Protestants even more than the effete Antwerpers. Orange’s soldiers offer help – and, the play implies, could have prevented the city’s destruction – but the citizens of Antwerp themselves often seem foolish and greedy. In fact, the play resists the nationalizing assumptions of most criticism by focusing, not on the Dutch and English, but quite explicitly on the two cities of London and Antwerp. The same local push against national readings that we have seen throughout is also active in the play, and considering the United Provinces in the 1590s had not yet settled its borders, and had recently considered the Spanish Low Countries part of the same rebellious block, the national identities were only emerging slowly and haphazardly. The Antwerpers, for example, note that Orange’s men in the Harbour are Zeelanders (237-8). Despite treating them as “our country men,” they also grant a slightly anachronistic coherence to the north by referring to them as the “Co-united states” (318). The Revolt itself was fomenting cultural distinction between the rebellious north and the subjugated south, and the play highlights both this and, indeed, the range of local identities within Dutchness. The slaughtered citizens are more often termed Brabanters or Antwerpers than Dutch. Alva sees them as “Bouzing Belgians” (299). Moreover, Antwerp was an international city, and the play stresses the ethnic diversity present during the violence. Spanish, German, English, and Flemish and Dutch characters all participate with various levels of complicity.

The play therefore raises some interesting questions before we can even begin
interpreting the English construction of Dutchness. In what ways might the cities – Antwerp and London – stand in for the (not yet solidified) national or ethnic identities? Why, if the play was indeed written in the 1590s, does it focus on the Southern Netherlands? Why not portray heroism at the siege of Leiden rather than rehash the violence of the Siege of Antwerp? Once again, assuming the writer cares simply or even primarily about England and Englishness in the face of a threatening foreignness hampers our reading. Two conflicting desires arise in the play, depending on perspective. If Anglo-centric and jingoistic, some of the virulent Dutch satire might be explained by the growing anxiety about Dutch centrality in the pan-Protestant cause. As we have seen, pamphlets in the 1590s became much more Anglo-centric just as Maurits and the United Provinces began their stunning run of success. Dutch wealth, the target of much of the satire, began to be resented by some English merchants. The Dutch reluctance to accept the aid of the prince of Orange because of economic concerns participates in this resentment, and perhaps even metaphorically exculpates English failures in the Dutch wars. Their own greed and miserliness lead to the Antwepers’ fall:

But since we have no neede of such a power,  
Why should we pester Antwerpe with such troupes,  
To spend the victuals of the Cittizens,  
Which we can scarcely compasse now for gilt. (319-22)

The intransigence of the Antwerpers frustrates their allies attempts to save them, and the leaders sent by the Prince of Orange, after several delays, are forced to offer to pay the troops in full themselves. The traitorous Van … pithily sums up the consequences: “Their myserie shall bring their miserie” (372).

The play insists that the stinginess of the Antwerpers results in their downfall and often voices stereotyped and foolish greediness through the Dutch burgers. Some frustration appears to animate this, and perhaps the miserliness becomes a more generalizable excuse for the lack of
successful English involvement. This sentiment, for example, can be read into the heroic Marques d’Hauurye’s annoyance at the wealthy Antwerpers: “[…] surelie Antwerpe is bewitch, / Securitie hath slaine their providence, / And riches makes them retchles of their friends” (373-5). Not only does the citizens’ greed result in the “Publicke destruction of this flower of townes / To the disgrace of all the Netherlands,” but it also undercuts the alliance and makes them treat their allies unfairly. The English, too, could feel the Dutch had become “retchles of their friends” (375). Still, to enforce this Anglo-centric reading, the English must align their sympathy with the Prince of Orange, and once again align the Dutch cause with all of Protestantism.

The play is certainly not chauvinistically English, and a wider, Protestant perspective undercuts much of the ostensible Dutch satire. The English governor, somewhat ignobly, denies any connection between the English and Dutch other than commerce after the Spanish threaten him with torture:

We are not heere great Lord, to ioyne with them
In any bolde confederacie fo warre,
But for the trafficke, which all nations else,
(As well as England) have within this place (858-61).

Often, however, Spanish violence brings the English and Dutch together. An English factor is tortured along with the Dutch, and the English merchants are similarly forced to scavenge for exorbitant ransoms. If some kind of pleasurable catharsis results from the execution and torture of Dutch characters, then apparently a similar pleasure is experienced from the suffering of wealthy Englishmen. In fact, the English scenes often last longer and contain more detail. The violence instead serves to undercut national difference and reinforce the myth of “Spanish rygour,” and the play faults the victims – if at all – only for their shared materialism and military under-preparedness.

More prominently than ethnic divisions, class and profession divide characters in the
play. The wealthy burgers have long neglected poor Antwerpers, especially soldiers, and this more than anything dooms their city. Antwerp should, with its resources both human and economic, have no trouble defending itself:

The Citizens (were they but politick, Carefull and studious to preserve their peace) Might at an houres warning, fill their streetes, With fortie thousand well appointed Soldiers. (41-4)

The play becomes in ways a critique of materialistic urbanity – the “soft effeminate silks,” rather than anti-Dutch satire, applies to citizens of both cities – which links London and Antwerp together, and the qualities do not necessarily define Englishness or Dutchness universally. In fact, the prologue informs us directly that the vices being attacked are not national, but urban: “The punishment of City cruelty” (17). As a mirror for London, the play similarly divides the English along class lines and criticizes those who care more for their own prosperity than the common good and the soldier’s care. As we have seen, the neglect of soldiers and soldiering had already become a concern in the pamphlets by the late Elizabethan period; it would only arise more frequently during James’s reign. The wounded Dutch veteran often voices opinions markedly similar to those broadcast by English veterans in their pamphlets, tying greed to neglect of veterans and war: “These muddie roagues that hoorded up their coyne, / Now have their throats cut for the coyne they have: / They that for two pence would have seeene me starve” (706-8). Like many pamphlets, the play exhorts the English to military preparedness and engagement, inflaming anti-Spanish sentiment and tying England to the Dutch cause. The play therefore cultivates Anglo-Dutch alliance, and, rather than a satire of the Dutch, viciously attacks those English who care more for personal prosperity than international justice.

As in the pamphlets that invite English readers to sympathize and even identify with Willem and Maurits, heroism also draws the English audience into the Dutch cause in A Larum.
Stumpe, a veteran of past wars now without a leg, is clearly a sympathetic and heroic character, preventing rapes and harrying Spanish soldiers. Staging connects him to the English merchant tortured and killed, and throughout the play Stumpe rallies the only resistance to the Spanish violence. As the clear hero of the play, Stumpe proves an English audience remained willing to embrace a Dutch character, provided he demonstrated the proper heroism and fought against the proper enemies. Stumpe also shows that this heroism, connected almost always to militant ideals, attracted followers across national lines: he is called a Brabanter, and the soldiers that rally behind him are marked as “Walloons,” marking a clear distinction from the “Dutch” who blame them (1300). For Stumpe, in a time of war, national epithets are meaningless and exchangeable; anyone can be termed a Walloon, and the Spanish will murder them for it without even the slightest verification. Moreover, a shared ideological country unites the soldiers as they attack the insuperable Spanish enemy and face certain death:

There will no prospect of our Countries fall
Offend our eye-sight; there no treacherie
Of haughty Spaniards treade a bloudy March;
Nor any base objection oft ingrate,
And thankelesse Cittizens sit in our doors. (1477-80)

In Stumpe’s most rhetorically constructed speech, clearly meant to move the audience, the multinational band of soldiers exchanges their earthly country for a heavenly one. Although the play never delves into specifics of religion or employs confessional terms – perhaps because the author hoped to persuade a wide audience of the importance of English militarism – the attachment to justice and chivalric soldiering erases national difference. Stumpe’s speech joins all the resistance together into a single country, clearly invoking the New Jerusalem – a country not accessible to greedy and miserly merchants who shared their city on earth.

Once again, Stumpe’s heroism navigates multiple collective identities. He becomes a
transnational hero capable of evoking English sympathy and attracting a multi-ethnic, multi-national group of followers, but the final lines of the play reify Stumpe as a national hero:

There neuer liued two more Heroick spirits
That for their Country haue deseru’d as much
To be renouned. (168-170).

This, however, is complicated by the fact that the wicked Danillo speaks the lines and encourages Stumpe’s burial (along with another heroic captain) as a servant to country. A certain skepticism is warranted by the fact that the Spanish, clearly, benefit from portraying the conflict in purely national terms. When Stumpe was alive, he proved less sentimental about the country’s cause:

Bindes me my country with no greater bondes,
Than for a groate to fight? Then for a groate
To be infeebled, or to loose a lime?
Poore groates-worth of effection. (591-4)

Later, however, Stumpe’s passionate speeches invigorate Dutch resistance, and his disgust at the poor reward soldiers receive for their service never undermines his confidence in the importance of warfare. Indeed, the “sloath” of the wealthy Antwerpers and their failure to provide for soldiers, in Stumpe’s views, have facilitated a very preventable tragedy: “these villainous Burgers have (by their owne securitie) beene the destruction of the Cittie, a pox on them” (1292).

Similarly, the play foregrounds an anxiety about ethnic mixing and permeable national borders in the constant, frantic metaphors and threats of rape. A Larum compares Antwerp to a woman and the spoil to a rape, a fairly common rhetorical move in discussions of the city’s destruction. Even the Spanish see their conquest through this sexual metaphor: according to Danillo, Antwerp “is amorous as the wanton ayre, / And must be courted” (75-6). But the play also returns continually to threatened or implied rapes as the Spanish ravage the city. As the attack begins, Stumpe warns the Burgers of its consequences: “Your daughters chastity must
quench their lust; / And your deare wives inrich their lawlesse armes” (557-8). Often, the threats are staged and graphic, and prevented only at the last minute. As scholars of nationalism have shown, the female body often came to serve metonymically for the nation, and threats of violence and rape recast fears of invasion. Claire MacEachern has demonstrated how pervasive this metaphor was in England, especially with their virgin queen; and Jonathan Gil Harris has argued that “a recurrent phobia regarding the incursion of contagious foreign bodies led to a heightened attention to the margins, orifices, and gaps of the social organism.”127 And yet, the scenes that could serve this national focus and broadcast xenophobic fears actually serve to motivate England’s participation in a transnational cause. Fear of penetration of the social body, focused on the dastardly Spanish soldiers, evokes both the national and religious body – for the Spanish equally threaten the Dutch and English.

Past critics have generally considered the play to at least verge on propaganda for English military engagement with Spain. It makes a “political statement” according to Stephenson;128 Andrew Gurr claims that it is nothing less than “blatant propaganda” for English intervention in the Dutch War;129 Shapiro, somewhat more sympathetic, tersely notes that “it got its point across.”130 Yet, for a play that has been read as so monolithic in purpose, I would argue that its point is, in fact, never immediately obvious. Certainly, the mirror relationship between London and Antwerp calls for the national repentance demanded so frequently and tiresomely from the pulpits; but the play never makes explicit exactly what this repentance means. It may demand


less attachment to material wealth and a greater focus on the military, but it certainly never
specifies the kind of English engagement with continental religious warfare that it supposedly
promotes. Questions over the ties between the English and Dutch are central to this engagement,
and the readings of the play as vitriolic satire of the Netherlanders would seemingly undercut the
intent of the propaganda: the play could hardly be attacking the very coreligionists for whom it
supposedly advocates intervention. Within the confusing mix of regional and transnational
identities, what obligations are owed to coreligionists?

Although the play generally mutes the confessional aspects of the conflict, *A Larum*
continually places the siege of Antwerp within the context of transnational Catholic assault on
the Protestant church. It establishes this context primarily through clear and frequent references
to Marlowe’s *Massacre at Paris*, which staged that most heinous Catholic perfidy, proof, for
many committed Protestants, of the apocalyptic nature of the war: the Saint Bartholomew’s Day
Massacre. The relationship between the two plays, in fact, has prompted the speculation that
Marlowe wrote parts of *A Larum*. Perhaps the most direct resonance comes when the Spanish
soldiers use the Guise’s cry as they pursue and murder Dutch children: “Tue, tue, tue, tue”
(1124). Though *A Larum* generally avoids specifics on religious belief, the parents’ reaction and
the context suggest that they are part of the Protestant church. Though mournful, they
confidently assert that “Their [the children’s] blessed soules in Abrahams bosom restes” (1125).
The prayer does not prove their confession beyond doubt, of course, but the Old Testament
reference, the strong faith and the assumption that the children would immediately be saved do
reflect Protestant believe. The young boy is also named Martin, a name likely more popular with
Protestants than Catholics in the period. If religion is not an overt focus, then, Catholic violence
against Protestants remains an ever-present subtext, part of what demonizes the Spanish and
unites heroic Dutch characters and their English audience.

Once again, then, English literature places the Dutch War within a complex transnational engagement. The multiple individual and collective identities – local, national, and transnational – compete in readings of the play, and can radically change our interpretation depending on perspective. And heroism, once again, plays an important role in uniting characters across these identity divides. In a later play that deals specifically with a Prince of Orange, John Fletcher and Philip Massinger interrogate the ways in which heroism helped form and shape national and religious communities through the relationship between Maurits and the United Provinces – and, though less directly, the wider Protestant church. By 1617, *Sir John Olden Barnavelt*, a play that, as its critics have noted, is “politically charged and probably politically engaged,” comments directly on the nationalist role Maurits has assumed.131 As the only extant Jacobean play that covers contemporary events, *Sir John Olden Barnavelt* offers a unique opportunity to explore English reaction to the Dutch leaders. The politics of the play have been particularly well explored, largely because the surviving text contained the markings of its censor, Sir George Buc. Though some debate has ensued over the ideological character of these markings, T. H. Howard-Hill has cogently argued that “the character of the censor’s responsibility in *Barnavelt* is best explained by the special nature of James’s interest in the Netherlands” – as well as Buc’s familiarity with the Low Countries and its leadership circles.132 The play itself is equally determined by the close Anglo-Dutch relationship, and it once again evidences the strong English attachment to the Prince of Orange.

In the play, adulation of the prince has driven Barnavelt, the once humble and self-


sacrificing statesman, to his perfidy. In the opening lines, Barnavelt demands: “The Prince of Orange now, all names are Lost els / that hee's alone the Father of his Countrie? / said yo u not soe?” (1.1.1-3). His trusted counselor – the unctuous politician, Leidenberch – in reply confirms Orange’s popular appeal: “I speake the peoples Language” (1.1.4). The masses’ attraction to the heroic Orange has established him as a national pillar – like his father, another vader des vaderlands. Even nearly a decade after the truce, the play interrogates the role of heroic figures in solidifying the nation and creating the national character – all the more interesting in a republic, which, according to anxieties of the period, encouraged contention between great men. Barnavelt summarizes Maurits’s role in his indignant line of questions: “That to his Arme, & Sword, the Provinces owe / their flourishing peace? That hee’s the Armyes soule / by which it moves to victorie? (1.1.5-7). The soul of the army represents particularly well the way Maurits had been constantly portrayed in the pamphlets and poetry, a personification of the entire army, with both the victories and movements ascribed to him. Under questioning by the States General, Barnavelt offers his most acerbic critique of Maurits, describing the people’s loyalty as a kind of idolatry:

what is this man, this Prince , this god ye make now,  
but what o f hands haue molded, wrought to fashion,  
and by o f constant labo r s, given a life to?  
and must we fall before him, now, adore him,  
blow all we can, to fill his sailes w t h greatnes,  
worship the Image we set vp o r selues,  
put fate into his hand, into his will  
o r lives, and fortunes? howle, and cry to o r owne clay  
be mercifull o Prince ? o pittied people,  
base, base, poore patcht vp men: Yo u dare not heare this,  
yo u haue sold yo f eares to slavery: (3.1.154-164)

133 John Fletcher and Philip Massinger, The Tragedy of John Van Olden Barnavelt (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994),
http://literature.proquest.com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/searchFullText.do?id=Z000079631&childSectionId=Z100079632&divLevel=&queryId=2899052539667&area=drama&forward=textsFT&pageSize=&print=No&size=2Kb&queryType=findWork&fromToc=true&warn=Yes. All citations are henceforth in the text.
Barnavelt’s invective offers a lens into the construction of the early modern hero from the perspective of contemporaries. Perhaps its most salient feature is the insistence on the act of creation itself, which repeatedly locates agency in the people. The prince has been made, moulded, wrought to fashion, and given life only by the people – or at least the direct audience, the States General. Barnavelt scornfully attacks the apparent need for a uniting head, which in a republic constitutes a kind of slavery. And yet, though the national context is explicit, his critique inevitably recalls Israel and the golden calf, another tale of self-fashioned idolatry. The religious intonations of the invective make this explicit – they “worship the Image we set up ourselves” – and portrays heroism as a kind of idolatry. This also, however, inflects the national dialogue with a wider, Protestant significance, for part of the tension faced by heroic Protestant leaders was how to affectively unite the people and also avoid becoming simply another pope. Forged in religious warfare and drawing soldiers from across Europe, the Dutch Republic for foreigners and contemporaries always held religious significance – always seemed (or threatened to be) the true manifestation of Israel.

The crux of the battle between Orange and Barnavelt is about who possesses the symbolic authority to imagine the nation. Barnavelt insists repeatedly that he had founded and bound the United Provinces:

```
think through whose care, yo " are a Nation
and haue a name yet left, a fruitfull Nation,
(would I could say as thanckfull,) bethinck ye of theis things
and then turne back, and blush, blush my ruyne. (5.3.131–4)
```

Even in his death, he continues to assert a patriarchal role: instead of repenting, he states, “I dye for saving this Unthanckfull Cuntry” (5.3.172). The struggle for symbolic control over the community is even more important because it remains a young, newly minted nation, and the play – though of course politically cautious – explores the shape and strength of the Dutch
national community. The States General notes that Barnavelt’s sedition threatens their nation more because of its special character:

such mild proceedings in a Goverment
new setled, whose maine strength had it's dependaunce
upon the powre of some perticuler men
might be given way to, but in ours, it Were
vnsafe, and scandalous; then the Prouinces
haue lost their liberties, Iustice hir Sword, (3.2.71-6)

Treason in a republic demands a swift and harsh response, because the government itself remains susceptible to division. Even more, the porous borders during the wars have threatened national integrity, and Barnavelt has brought in any foreign troops through which he might profit:

“England or Fraunce… the Polander, Bohemian, Dane, or Turck” (2.1.84-7).

Barnavelt’s failure is in some ways a failure to properly imagine the Dutch nation because he imagines it as exclusively Dutch and, at least to contemporary Calvinists, undersells the religious character and significance. Despite this Dutch nationalism in the play, the connection between the Orangists and the English mitigates some of the national borders. The English soldiers remain loyal to Maurits and actually turn the war by siding with Orange, and Barnavelt’s associates recognize the English in providential terms as their enemies: “those English are the men borne to undoe us” (2.5.17). John Curran has noted the Calvinism permeating the play, the deterministic framework which interprets the action of each hero. Though the religious controversy is muted in action, the conflict between Arminian and Predestinarian theologies plays out in the contest between Orange and Barnavelt to interpret past and present.\footnote{Curran, “You are Yourself,” 236.} This divides the provinces, but it tends to divide them along religious lines, which actually unites Dutch and English Calvinists. The description of Baranvelt’s plot foregrounds this as it appropriates religious terminology to describe the civil conflict: he was “The roote, and
head of the late Schisme: / to subvert Religion / to deface Iustice, and to break the union / and holly league betweenee the Provinces” (4.5.40-3). The English in the play equally object to Arminianism, which “all true learning much laments, and greives at, / and sincks the soules sweet union, into ruin” (3.1.0-1), and side with the Calvinist prince. It also reflects the ties between the Orange faction and majority English opinion outside of the play, where according to Hill-Howard, most English assumed that “the noble Prince had preserved the infant republic from the machinations of the heretical Machiavel. The Prince of Orange was to be magnified, Oldenbarnevelt vilified, and his death justified by his faults.”

The Arminian controversy in the play therefore reinvigorated the Anglo-Dutch relationship faltering under James I and encouraged Anglo-Dutch unity under Maurits as an exemplar of a Calvinist Prince – a prince with enough transnational clout to head the multinational Synod of Dort. The different readings of history correspond to different readings of the nation, and in Fletcher and Massinger’s play, the transnational view of history derived from Providence wins out. Though many connections encouraged Anglo-Dutch unity, their shared religion shaped the relationship for many English Protestants and encouraged not just alliance, but an erasure of borders, as Calvinists on both sides believed firmly they would soon all share the same heavenly country.

Conclusion

It has been my intent in this chapter to demonstrate the transnational character of Protestant heroism from its inception in England – to show that even the Elizabethan period, a time considered so foundational for the formation of a nationalist sentiment, constructed its ideas of national glory and character in the transnational arena of the Dutch Wars and at least in part

through Dutch heroes. When Sidney and Leicester assumed command in the Netherlands, they inherited a long continental tradition of religious heroism, rendering them simultaneously heroes of the church and the nation. The following chapters will explore the ramifications of this heroism, which constitutes a tradition lasting into the mid seventeenth century, on contemporary conceptions of both the British Empire and English identity. Christopher Lewis has argued that early modern identity might best be conceived as consisting of concentric circles: the local, regional, national, and so on. No identity remained dominant, but early modern men and women could shift between identities as they negotiated their context. In the writing on William and Maurits of Orange and the Dutch Revolt, it becomes clear how blurred and fluid even these concentric circles could become. For national identities could easily shift, sometimes more aligned with local traditions, sometimes invited in the literature of the period to merge with transnational visions of the church. It is at best a speculative, imaginative re-construction of how early moderns imagined their communities, but, however inadequately we might piece together the beliefs of an audience from the skeletons of texts remaining, it seems the Anglo-Dutch relationship could be construed very differently depending on one’s location, history, and religious ideology. The nation’s indeterminate borders remained ideologically open, capable of incorporating foreign Protestants despite a dissimilarity of place, language, even custom. The wider frame of the church, and the sliding scale implied in much of this writing, made possible a myriad of nations.
2. Henry, Prince of Wales, and Israel’s Lost Renaissance

Introduction

In 1612, England lost perhaps its last and greatest chance to produce a transnational Protestant hero. Henry, Prince of Wales, had garnered the attention and support of fervent Protestants in England since the royal family had moved to their southern country in 1603 – and he had inspired the hope of Scottish Protestants from his birth. On the sixth of November, 1612, at the age of eighteen, the prince succumbed to typhoid fever, and his death provoked the most prodigious outpouring of elegies in the period, outstripping even the mourning for Elizabeth. Protestants in England, Scotland, Ireland, as well as in Denmark and German courts, experienced Henry’s death as a communal – and national – loss, something that diminished them as a people and at least temporarily delayed God’s vengeance upon Rome. For, as it was well-known in the period, the prince had planned to lead armies in Germany against the anti-Christian beast; as he and his poets and artists insisted, Henry had been poised to become a Protestant, British emperor.

In the period, however, both Britain and Protestantism were in the process of construction. Cambridge University recently marked the 400th anniversary of the death of Henry, not without some irony (Henry associated himself with Oxford, and the fact that Cambridge had printed the first collection of elegies mourning the prince was felt as an ignoble sting by Oxonians.), and their attempt to revive the prince hints at the this central instability.¹ The task of

the exhibit was to reconstruct Henry’s great lost potential, to recreate some of the fantasies contemporaries had constructed of Henry as king. The number of fantasies, and their records left in print, far outweigh any measurable impact the prince had on European history, but they also suggest how central the prince became to several of the most important discussions of the period: on the British Union, antipapal fears in response to the Counter Reformation, and even the emergence of a global British (or English) empire. Cambridge’s exhibit notes that Henry “had a profound effect on the nation,” and in this agrees with the many scholars who have been drawn to the history of the prince. Yet, as historians and literary critics have suggested now for decades, that nation itself was being written, and the exact nation “suffering” the prince’s loss cannot easily be described without an attempt to reconstruct the historical moment. Henry had played an important role in giving shape to his father’s project of the British Union, and even if the funeral took place in London, the circles of mourning stretch throughout the British Isles and onto the continent.

Despite such massive promise, or perhaps because of it, Henry found himself at the crux of several key religious and political debates of the early seventeenth century, with his image never entirely in his control. Rumors hinted at how fully he disagreed with the morals of his father’s court and the pacifism of that court’s international policies, and Henry emerged in his teen years as an alternate site of royal power – though never in direct conflict with the crown. Even though he recognized, as well as any English prince, the importance of cultivating the arts and constructing his personation, Henry also must have felt the radical instability of his self-fashioning. From his birth, his self-image lay always embedded in a complex matrix of other writers who fashioned him for their own political purposes. Henry was rather prophetic in his
anxiety about historiography; even in his life he apparently felt the ideological pressure exerted on his personation from multiple directions:

And is not this an errour in us, to permit every man to be a writer of Historie? Is it not an errour to be so curious in other matters, and so carelesse in this? We make choise of the most skilfull workemen to draw or carve the portraiture of our faces, and shall every artlesse Pensell delineate the disposition of our minds? Our apparell must be wrought by the best Artificers, and no soile must be suffered to fall upon it: and shall our actions, shall our conditions be described by every bungling hand? Shall every filthie finger defile our reputation? Shall every artlesse Pensell delineate the disposition of our minds? Our apparell must be wrought by the best Artificers, and no soile must be suffered to fall upon it: and shall our actions, shall our conditions be described by every bungling hand? Shall every filthie finger defile our reputation? Shall every artlesse Pensell delineate the disposition of our minds?

Hayward’s account of his discussion with the prince was published in 1613, after the prince had died. The posthumous date made the call for select and ideologically disciplined historians all the more urgent, as almost every poet and preacher assumed the prince as a subject. The process continues even now, of course, as I and other “bungling hands” defile the prince’s reputation, but the competition began during his life; writers attempted to make sense of what the prince meant and to whom he belonged.

Henry’s community becomes increasingly important in the elegiac writing. Like all national heroes, Henry was recognized by poets as a centripetal force holding the national community together, especially at a time when the nation remained fledgling. Despite the enormous literary conversation around Englishness in the period and the assumption among literary critics that England constituted a nation, we have seen that historians are much less likely to ascribe national status to the kingdom. If national sentiment was emerging, it was certainly complicated by other identity-defining connections. Englishness, as we have often been reminded, continued to be written. Though much excellent scholarly attention has been paid to

---

the prince\textsuperscript{3}, scholars have generally neglected to note that the nation was being written in him: that Henry, that is, was recognized as paramount to attempt to define national character. As the widespread mourning suggests, however, Henry’s community never aligns perfectly with the political borders of England. Some writers, as we shall see, place Henry inside a small, closed community of likeminded intellectuals, while others anoint him as the head of the entire pan-Protestant community. But the most popular context for Henry is undoubtedly the (multinational) British Empire. As many historians have insisted, contemporaries had particularly vague ideas of the English national community, concealing a great deal of disagreement; “Britain,” if it was thought of at all, had even less definition. For modern scholars, Britain remains a concept almost unavoidably subject to anachronism, primarily because of the turbid accretions of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century history.\textsuperscript{4} Still, Henry’s contemporaries sensed that he was in some ways implicated with his father’s project of unification, even if the prince offered a radically different Britishness.

Perhaps the most vibrant challenge to the scholarship on English nation-writing has come from the leaders of “New British History,” which, of course, is now far from new and has been established as a significant conversation in itself. Historians and literary critics interested in the “British Question” or, less optimistically, the “British Problem,” have insisted that English state-formation did not take place in a nationalist vacuum; it involved conflict and debate with, and exploitation and erasure of, the Welsh, Scottish, and Irish cohabiters of the Atlantic Archipelago.


\textsuperscript{4} See, for example, the discussion of this problem in Nicholas Canny, “The Origins of Empire: An Introduction,” in \textit{The Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume I} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 1-3.
In a way, this criticism has served as a corrective to the massive interest in Englishness, by demonstrating, as John Pocock, John Kerrigan, David Baker, Willy Maley, David Armitage, and many others have, that Englishness itself was a contested identity, defined against and meshed with its neighbors. This body of criticism offers a particularly useful transnational methodology, and, as we shall see, a fruitful context for exploring Henry. Because of the prince’s early death, his role in Britishness has been largely forgotten; indeed, Henry has become just another of the many figures momentarily appropriated as “British” while writers attempted to formulate the concept. In the moment, however, Henry seemed the most promising version of Britishness – his role as Crown Prince obviously amplifying his importance – and his imagined role in forming the new nation is revealing both for the prince and for the history of Britishness itself. If Henry V, as many scholars have argued, serves as a symbol of Englishness – and a site for the construction of Englishness – then the aborted career of the of the prospective Henry IX served as a similar site for a multinational, colonial, and expansionist Protestant community.

If the British focus has now receded from literary criticism, it has offered important lessons for attempts to think against the national canon. Baker, looking back on the peak of New British History, has recently identified a few salient challenges for all transnational work:

---


6 Tristan Marshall is one exception to this neglect. See Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages Under James VI and I (New York: Manchester University Press, 2000), 87-144.
particularly, there exists institutionally “an enormous resistance to acknowledging (or maybe just
privileging) this sort of hybridity.”\textsuperscript{7} This stems in part from the near impossibility of the various
forms of translation required by transnational work, the impossibility of producing non-Anglo-
centric scholarship from within an English department. Even within ethnic and national identities
– English, Scottish, and Irish – a great deal of disagreement over Britain exists, and attempts to
derline{define a “Scottish” position on the prince, for example, always oversimplify. As another
challenge, like New British History itself\textsuperscript{8}, Henry’s pedigree demands a wider, European context,
and the problems of archipelagic criticism are only multiplied by Henry’s continental
connections. Through his mother, Henry had relatives in Denmark and dukedoms scattered
throughout the Holy Roman Empire; through his father, he had family in France. A full history
of the reception of Henry eventually demands a wider scope. Even Britishness, for Henry,
becomes at times subordinated to Protestant identity, and his intended military expansion came at
the expense of Rome – both on the continent and in the Americas. Henry seems to have agreed
with a recent critic of British History, who claims that “the nature and importance of Anglo-
Scots-Irish interaction is difficult to assess outside the European framework of which it was
part.”\textsuperscript{9} After Henry’s death, as the Protestant cause in Europe suffered, poets and preachers
increasingly read him not as a lost national hero, but instead a lost religious hero – a Josiah who
had died before completing his intended reforms.

\textsuperscript{7} David Baker, “Britain Redux,” \textit{Spenser Studies} 29 (2014): 25. Morrilll describes this problem as the tendency of
transnational history to become “enriched English History.” “Thinking about the New British History,” 25.

\textsuperscript{8} Critique of the insularity of New British History has come even from within New British History. Tim Harris, for
example, notes, “Depending on the questions we ask, sometimes the Three-Kingdoms perspective is going to come
into sharp focus, at other times the national (or local, or continental) will.” “In Search of a British History of
Political Thought,” in \textit{British Political Thought in History, Literature, and Theory, 1500-1800}, edited by David
attack British historians for neglecting the European context.

\textsuperscript{9} Jonathan Scott, \textit{England’s Troubles: Seventeenth Century English Political Instability in European Context}.
This chapter will argue that Henry came to represent a militant, expansionist and pan-Protestant British identity in opposition to the Britain promoted by James. Turning to Greek and Roman models, Henry and his followers pushed the boundaries of Britain onto the continent and across the Atlantic; at the same time, however, the fiery Protestantism of the prince’s court ensured a kind of religious imperialism, in which all subjects of Henry were united in the Church of God. Henry’s image remains a forgotten chapter in British historiography, an example of a kind of Britishness that thrived in the period but, after the prince’s death, was forgotten for over a century. Because of Henry’s massive popularity and early death, however, this chapter also explores the contested nature of the images of early modern religious and national heroes. Each writer attempts to claim the prince for his own ideological purposes. All poets admit that Henry played an instrumental role in cementing the national community, but the borders suggested in the poetry mourning his death vary radically – from local communities of the intellectual elite to the transnational Protestant church. A recent critical stress on the “polyvalency” of political language in the period explains in part how these various ideological perspectives could exist simultaneously.10 In this poetry, these small, local communities often serve as models for the larger pan-Protestant church, as writers try to interpret their belonging through local experience. Like the other heroes, Henry attracted multinational, multilingual communities of poets, challenging once again the national canon; even British literature, it should be remembered, was a multinational project in the early seventeenth century. My claim in its most simple form is that a transnational and Protestant British (cultural and literary) identity proved more compelling to many of Henry’s contemporaries than the emerging Englishness. I will focus on Henry’s foundational role in these imagined communities and argue that many writers in the prince’s

circle rely heavily on metaphors borrowed from ecclesiology in their descriptions of the national community. As national and religious differences were exacerbated after Henry’s death, the prince’s followers contract him more and more as a borderless hero of the Protestant church, belonging equally to all true Protestants and not confined by geography.

**Early Life: the creation of a myth**

To celebrate Henry’s birth in 1593, Andrew Melville, one of Scotland’s leading intellectuals and an internationalist who had studied at both St. Andrew’s and Paris (and whose brother had studied at Wittenberg under Phillip Melanchthon), prophesied in a celebratory poem that the infant would finally unite the kingdoms of Britain and conquer Rome:

Fas iungit & jus Scoto-Britannicum  
Ex iungit & res Scoto Britannica  
Scoto-Britanno Rege princeps  
In poulum vocat unus unum  
Scoto-Britannum.¹²

As Melville’s Protestant exuberance implies, the prince’s mythology preceded his consciousness, and it entailed a complex relationship to the nation from its conception. During the prince’s baptism, Poets and preachers of Scotland echoed Melville’s sentiment and groomed the prince as a pan-Protestant hero, carefully fashioning his appeal to the foreign ambassadors present for the occasion. Protestant nobility from across Northern Europe gathered for Henry’s baptism, stressing both the international network of relatives and allies at Protestant courts and the


¹² Andrew Melville, *Principis Scoti-Britannorum Natalia* (Edinburgh, 1594), l. 29-33. Melville’s use of Latin also raises the linguistic questions provoked by British Historians; as Kerrigan has claimed, Scottish literary pride was still most often expressed in Latin. Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English*, 151.
prince’s own dynastic heredity. James sent invitations to “France, England, Denmarke, the
Lowe-Countries, the Duke of Brunswicke his brother in lawe, and to the Duke of Magdelburgh,
the Queenes Maiesties Grand-father,” and all except France either came in person or sent
ambassadors to witness the Prince’s baptism, rendering it an unmistakably Protestant event.13
William Fowler, who designed the shows and authored the pamphlet detailing them, repeatedly
highlights the nations in attendance: “England, Denmarke, Almaine, Flaunders, and Scotland.”14
The occasion stressed the interdependence of these powers and their close ties to the prince. In
the second sermon during the service, the Bishop of Aberdeen directs attention directly to each
ambassador (“in the Latin”) and flushes out the relationships between Scotland and the other
Protestant nations:

to the Ambassadours, euery one in particular, beginning at the Ambassadour of England,
and so continuing with the rest: Wherein he made mention of the Chronology of eoch of
these Princes: & recited the proximitie, and neernesse of blood that they had with
Scotland.15

In this international gathering, the Prince’s immediate ancestry — half Scottish, half Danish —
was expressed in the main pageantry of the day, a ship painted with various heraldry and
impressa. A prominent motto on the main sail read “En quae divisa beatos efficiunt, collecta
tenes. That is to say, Beholde (O Prince) what doth make these kingdoms seuerally blessed,
ioyntly (O Prince of hope) thou holdes, and hast together.”16 Even in his birth and baptism, a
confirmation of the union between James and Anne of Denmark, the prince already took on that

13 William Fowler, A True Report of the most tryumphant, and Royall accomplishment of the Baptisme of the most
Excellent, right High, and mightie Prince, Henry Fredericke (London, 1603), sig A3r.
14 Ibid., C1r.
15 Fowler, A True Report, sig. C1v.
16 Ibid., sig. D2r.
heroic quality he would hold throughout his life: the ability to unite Protestant peoples. The Scottish publisher who made the events of the day available to a wider population stressed two elements of the Prince’s image that would remain important for Scottish writers: he was, first, a Prince of Scotland, and in him resided the potential of wider Protestant unity.

At the same time, the baptism also stressed the dynastic and militant aspects of Henry’s representation, and James seems to have more freely celebrated his son’s martial qualities as a newborn than he would later in life. The prince lay in a bed “richly decored, and wrought with bordered work, containing the story of Hercules and his trauels.”17 Though Jane Aptekar has shown the ambivalence surrounding the stories of Hercules, at his best he represents the “archetypal obtainer and maintainer of justice.”18 Moreover, Hercules runs throughout the celebration of these Protestant heroes, implying justice and vengeance against Rome, and hinting at Protestant empire, from Spenser and the Dutch Revolt, through Frederick V, the German Hercules, and to Gustavus Adolphus, as we shall see in the subsequent chapters. The painting bordering the prince’s bed establishes him in the line of Protestant heroes and hinted at the future role he might have protecting the Protestant nations. The martial quality of the painting was reinforced by the games celebrating the occasion — “Feeld pastimes, with Martiall and heroicall exploites.”19 Jousting and martial contest seems an odd way to celebrate a baptism, but it invoked courtly chivalric precedent and established the prince’s reputation for militant Protestantism that would continue to ossify over the next two decades. Originally, then, the Scottish poets and preachers who began crafting the prince’s mythology established him as a

17 Ibid., sig. B4r.


19 Fowler, A True Report, sig. B1r.
hero first of international Protestantism, a unifier of various nations standing himself almost above nationality.

Already in 1594, however, the complexity of even Henry’s British inheritance was apparent. With the succession debate still unsettled and James’s desire for a clear proclamation on the English crown growing more insistent, the ceremonies cater often to an English public. The English ambassadors receive positions of the highest honor, and indeed English delay sets back the Scottish ceremonies multiple times. The baptism was printed and distributed, in order to capitalize on the expense of the festivals and spread the prince’s image throughout the reading public, and editions appeared in both London and Edinburgh. As Clare McManus says, “Despite its rushed and improvised air, Fowler’s festival was designed to signal the magnificence of the Scottish court and to advance James VI’s succession to the English throne; significantly, both Scots and anglicised contemporary variants of the text exist.”20 Other than minor spelling changes (“leil” to “loyall”), the Edinburgh and London editions are identical. The printer apparently thought the ceremony, filled with subtle Protestant and internationalist meaning, would fluidly translate into the English context.

Scholars of court ceremony, especially in Scotland, have debated the influences on the baptism, keenly aware of the long tradition of Stuart court ceremony and the “prevalent Anglocentric bias that dates Stuart culture from 1603.”21 While all court ceremony has increasingly been recognized as international – especially with the need to secure dynastic
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marriages and alliances – scholars have disagreed over whether French or English sources enacted a greater influence on the ceremonies for Henry’s baptism. Rick Bowers sees the performances as “a new form of political announcement, a reformed Protestant communiqué that breaks with a Catholic past, balances Scottish nationalism with British union, and asserts the cultural complexities of James’s future power.”

Michael Lynch, in general agreement, believes the English Ascension Day Tilts became the primary influence for the Scottish ceremony – a break from the earlier Valois influence -- and the tilts themselves were a site “where a Protestant ethic was grafted on to a revived tradition of Burgundian chivalry.” Lynch therefore views the baptism as a kind of fulcrum in Stuart court culture, a transition through the prince to a more openly and aggressively Protestant stance. Michael Bath, however, has recently qualified these accounts by demonstrating the impossibility of disentangling the festivals – and especially their emblems and impressa – from French models. If Catholic court tradition continued in these masques, however, the audience gathered to watch the ceremonies, and the reverberations of a heroic tradition that had already become dominantly Protestant, determined how the prince would be interpreted throughout Europe, and more specifically throughout England and Scotland. Even early in his life, the prince accrued the hopes and schemes of more fervent Protestants.

As Williamson notes, “The prince who made the “pepill daft for mirthe” was already a potent symbol […] From his birth Prince Henry was the product of a powerful mythologizing


22 Ibid, 4.


force,” groomed for the eventual destruction of Catholicism.25 In the baptismal sermon, Henry was compared also to a biblical exemplar: Isaac, a type of Christ, and the father of the nations of Israel. There was no necessary division in the comparisons to Hercules and Isaac, as both were often used to celebrate Protestant heroes. Isaac’s image, too, could become militant. Still, a tension exists between Classical and Biblical celebrations of the prince that would be exacerbated, if never acknowledged, as he grew – he was set up both as a conquering hero and a national sacrifice, Hercules and Christ. Williamson’s incisive reading of the prophetic qualities of the baptism is again worth quoting: “always Henry would be associated with heroic deeds and energies fed from the very font of holiness, energies sufficient to conquer monsters, raise up nations, and battle hell itself.”26 What his study misses, however, is the complexity and ambiguity of those nations fate had destined the prince to raise. Both England and the larger Britain were fledgling and mutable, still taking shape in part around the royal family. The religious ties to the continent, too, were present in the circle of Protestant powers who witnessed the child’s baptism and were told during the sermon that he was the cement to bind them as one.

In Scotland, then, both Henry and his image had been born. Scottish poets and writers remained proud of their claim on the prince, and maintained a somewhat possessive view of the royal family. The Scotland-centric focus, however, would begin dissipating after James ascended to the English throne in 1603, and a focus on the larger project of the British Union became more important for many Scottish writers. William Alexander (1577-1640), left behind temporarily by James’s court, seems clearly interested in nationality and the meaning of the unification in his “A Paraenesis to the Prince” of 1604. Alexander, the first Earl of Stirling, was one of the most


26 Ibid., 7.
successful Scottish poets and politicians in the early Stuart period, finding places in James’s and Henry’s courts\textsuperscript{27}, while maintaining friendships with both English and Scottish poets – especially William Drummond and Michael Drayton – and his poem captures some of the ambivalence of the Scottish nobility as the royal family departed for London. He opens “A Parænesis” with a discussion of the general human tendency toward society and amalgamation:

\begin{verbatim}
Then building walles, they barbarous rites disdain’d,
The sweetness of societie to find
And all t’attaine that th’union entertain’d,
As peace, religion, and a vertuous mind:
That so they might have restless humors rain’d,
Their liberties with lawes they straight confin’d:
And of the better sort the best prefer’d
To chastise those, against the lawes that err’d\textsuperscript{28}
\end{verbatim}

Nature develops into the ‘sweetness of society,’ and people naturally gather together. Also necessary in this community building, however, is a strong ruler, the ‘best’ of the people who have accumulated to form the community. So shortly after the union of the crowns, a Scottish poet invoking the benefits of ‘union’ can hardly have gone unnoticed, and Alexander stresses the importance of the prince’s role: dynasties unite nations. At times this growth and unity seem almost natural in Alexander’s poem, and nations grow through merger like rivers, “as when Forth doth from Benlowmond rin, / Shee’s poore of waters, naked of renowne: / But taking Teath, Allon, and Doven in, / Doth grow the greater still.”\textsuperscript{29} Alexander offers a progressivist account of the Anglo-Scottish union (that will be used again, it is worth noting, when the Prince

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{27} Like many in Henry’s court, Alexander remained interested in colonial projects in America – a key facet of the prince’s imperial project, which will be discussed at length later in this chapter.
\textsuperscript{28} William Alexander, \textit{A Parænesis to the Prince} (London, 1604), l.17-24.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., l.35-8.
\end{flushright}
Palatine marries Elizabeth Stuart); the prince and royal family, in their virtues and puissance, make the union possible, but the merger of peoples follows the natural progression.

Alexander registers some anxiety about the entire process, however, and the more he discusses merger the more negatively imperialistic — that is, defined by dominance and submission — it becomes. The very next stanza compares past great empires to these accumulating rivers:

Even so those soveraignties that once were small, 
Still swallowing up the nearest neigbbring state, 
With a deluge of men did th’earth appall:  
And thus th’Egyptian Pharaohs first grew great; 
Thus did th’Assyrians make so many thrall;  
And thus the Romaines rear’d th’Imperiall seate;  
And thus all those great States to worke have gone, 
Whose limits and the worlds were all but one.\(^{30}\)

The hope that, under Henry, the Stuart dynasty and therefore British power might extend to the limits of the world resonates in later elegies when the prince is compared to Caesar, but Alexander’s poem aligns the Romans with unflattering company — the pharaohs and Assyrians. The language used to describe each empire highlights the cost to neighboring states — “swallowing up,” “th’earth appall”, “make so many thrall.” Moreover, these great empires have all come to nothing and are now scorned in memory: “Their states that by a numbers ruine stood, / Were founded and confounded both with blood.”\(^{31}\) The stanza manifests the negatives of Henry’s imperial myth, and perhaps register’s Alexander’s anxiety about the fate of Scotland, once the prince’s ruling seat, now a neighboring state in danger of losing its identity as England assumes it into itself.

\(^{30}\) Ibid., l. 41-8.

\(^{31}\) Ibid., l. 49-50.
Considering these fears, Alexander insists that both Henry and the Scottish people remember his Scottish roots. The union can be achieved, and can be a great thing for the nations, but it must not efface Scottish identity – as he apparently felt Britain potential did. Alexander reminds the prince of the past contention between the English and the Scottish peoples even in his celebration of the union:

And though our nations long, I must confesse,  
Did roughly woo before that they could wed,  
That but endeeres the union we possesse,  
Whom Neptune both combines within one bed.  
All th’ancient injuries this doth redresse,  
And buries that which many a battel bred.  
A discord reconcil’d (if wrath expire)  
Doth breed thte greatest love and most entire.32

Past hatred only makes the present love stronger. Alexander recognizes the importance of the union — and the fragility, a seemingly impossible fate threatened so often through both Scottish and English history — for establishing Britain as a world power, a “Mightie state, / Now border’d but with th’Ocean and the skies.”33 He recognizes England’s leading role, too: the ancient kings had presaged “That this united yle should once advance, / And by the Lion led, all Realmes orecome.”34 Still, in his celebration of the martial prowess of a united Britain he insists that the Scottish subjects are equal with the English: “The Lion and the Leopard in one.”35 Yet a tension exists between equality and difference, and perhaps “one” once again suggests incorporation. While Tristan Marshal has claimed that this poem proves Alexander the most

32 Ibid., l. 265-71
33 Ibid., l. 209-10.
34 Ibid., l. 261-2.
35 Ibid., l. 640.
enthusiastically militant of Henry’s followers, his militancy is entangled in sensitivity about Scotland’s secondary role.36

Henry in the poem assumes the role of conqueror, a militant prince serving as the hand of his father, subduing other nations and expanding the Anglo-Scottish empire, a “Gallant thunderbolt of warre.”37 He appears rather similar to the other conquerors Alexander had critiqued, but Britain is filled with so many warlike men that the only hope for peace on the Island is to turn them against enemies on the continent:

No, since this soyle that in great spirits abounds,  
Can hardly nurce her nurcelings all in peace,  
Then let us keepe her bosome free from wounds,  
And spend our furie in some forraine place.  
There is no wall can limite now our bounds,  
But all the world will need walles in short space,  
T'hold backe our troupes from seizing on new thrones:  
The marble chaire must passe the Ocean once.38

The English and Scottish might be consolidated in their enmity against Catholic forces on the continent – though Alexander makes no religious distinction here – forming a new nation. Just as scholars have suggested that English identity was formed against the Spanish, or European identity against the Islamic world, Britishness according to Alexander might achieve unity and coherence against the continent.39 The implicit condemnation of war and empire fades when


38 Ibid., l. 625-632.

Alexander begins participating in the prince’s militant myth. As Arthur Williamson notes, “[t]he power of the idea of a British crusade and a British mission is difficult to exaggerate. It had captured the imagination of the Scottish public.” At first, this military glory belongs generally to the nation – to all the warlike Britons so perfectly suited for battle. In this, the peoples of the island are united and other borders are pushed back: “There is no wall can limite now our bounds, / But all the world will need walles in short space.” The possessive pronouns all unite, ‘our bounds,’ ‘our troups’: imperial expansion is a British national project. The salubrious effects on British unity, however, are purchased by the Alexander’s view of the world, which as we will soon see, the prince also adopted: the world divided into small, conquerable blocks; each centered on a throne, acquirable by a conquering prince. Geographical borders take precedence (as demonstrated by those walls), and any egalitarian sentiment is inevitably stymied. The turn to the ‘marble chair’ in part begins the transition from a national to a dynastic focus, which is continued in the next stanzas:

What furour ore my judgement doth prevaille?
Me thinkes I see all th’earth glaunce with our armes,
And groning Neptune charg’d with many a saile:
I heare the thundring trumpet sound th’alarmes,
Whilst all the neighbring nations do looke pale;
[...]
I (Henrie) hope with this mine eyes to feed,
Whilst, ere thou weart a crowne, thou wear’st a shield,
And when thou making thousands for to bleed,
That dare behold thy count’nance and not yeeld.


42 Alexander, “A Paraenesis,” l. 633-7; l. 641-4. This bloody battlefield scene runs throughout the celebration of Protestant heroes, and will appear again frequently applied to Friedrich V, as we will see shortly, complicating the nationalist ambition by substituting a German hero.
‘Neighbring nations’ indiscriminately offer themselves as the conqueror’s prize; Henry in this poem, at least, opposes himself not to Rome or the Islamic world, but instead extends his empire like the Greek Alexander, one of his most frequent parallels. By the culminating scene of the battle, however, the lens turns entirely to the prince, omitting the British people. As the prince aged, he would increasingly favor this dynastic-imperialist view, which negated both glory and difference among his subjects. Henry alone was to be the lynchpin holding these diverse territories together.

It is worth noting that Alexander writes in 1604 as an outsider, though eventually he insinuated himself into court circles (starting with Henry’s in 1607). Shortly before his Paraenesis to the Prince, Alexander had mourned the royal family’s departure in his lyric. He pictures Scotland in mourning for the king’s departure and adds:

This hath discourag’d my high-bended minde,
And still in doale my drouping Muse arrayes:
Which if my Phoebus once upon me shin’d,
Might raise her flight to build amidst his rayes. 43

The British Union is experienced, at least when it first happens, as Scotland’s loss and subordination, and Alexander’s verse to Henry works through this feeling of bereavement, holding on to the royal family through the pious prince.

As Alexander’s poetry makes clear, immediately after the move to England Henry had already become entangled with his father’s project of unification. The early years of Henry’s adolescence corresponded with his father’s attempt to perfect this British Union, and it will therefore be worthwhile to pause and briefly survey the debate. James desired the full unification of his kingdoms, in both Parliament and Church, and tracing Britain in the historiographical

myth of the Isle, he imagined the British Empire as peaceful and removed, separated from the continent by the ocean. By 1607, hereditary antipathy and religious differences prevented James from achieving this perfect union. While James’s Britain was adopted by many poets and thinkers, British historiography has demonstrated that the novel ideal of “Britain” found manifold expression. John Morrill attempts to organize these responses to the union into four categories: those who strove for a perfect union, like James; those who desired the incorporation of Scotland on the model of the Anglo-Welsh union of 1536-43; those who desired a federal union, in which each nation would retain its native institutions and a new set of federal institutions would overlay them, as happened eventually in 1707; and finally, “pontoon-builders” – those politicians, mostly English, willing to improvise union in the moment, without ever desiring the change of any institution.44 As Morrill would acknowledge, each group could contain wildly different conceptions of the final product of empire.

**Henry in England**

When King James arrived in England, he offered something the English people had lacked for decades: a royal family, with multiple sites of royal power. Even in his youth, prince Henry emerged as ideologically opposed to his father45, and the court of the young prince gathered some of the most talented poets, artists, and religious thinkers in the kingdoms, and indeed from throughout Europe. Henry’s connection to Britain grew more prominent as he began to assemble followers and set his own political and cultural agenda, but Henry frequently, if

44 Morrill, “Thinking about New British History,” 24-5.

subtly, implied that his ascension would herald a new direction for the British Empire. By fairly early in the first decade of the seventeenth century, the prince had clearly begun to participate in sculpting his own personation, though through so much subsequent rewriting the prince’s own sense of his role can only be hesitatingly reconstructed. Yet it is at least clear from contemporary dedications and Henry’s own actions and interests that the prince imagined his role transnationally, invested both in the British Union and overseas colonization. In the few years between his adolescence and his death, Henry assiduously cultivated the image he had inherited, establishing his own centrality for British expansion.

Henry apparently embraced the role scripted for him. The prince took an active interest in restoring England’s navy; he not only practiced military maneuvers tirelessly, but he maintained correspondence with some of the most respected military minds of the period, including Maurice of Orange, one of the prince’s idols. He campaigned to be called “Patron of the Virginia Plantation,” and when the Northwest Passage Company was first chartered, Henry was named the head and supreme protector. The names scattered across Virginia re-enforce Henry’s centrality in the project: Cape Henry, Fort Henry, Henricopolis, Henrico College. Like Alexandria, this newly acquired territory did not reflect English expansion — at least, not for Henry, and not necessarily — but instead announced the conquest of a single heroic prince. Perhaps the prince’s ambition, even arrogance,courted future disaster, even if it was enormously popular; several critics have read a pronounced egotism behind these moves, and noted how James’s poets subtly cautioned the prince, tempering his militancy. The political actions also insinuate Henry’s vision of Britain and the world. One of his followers, Robert Cotton, summed up the prince’s attitude in a short but loaded phrase: Henry held “ambitious desires of extending
Expansion, rooted in fixed geography — “territories” — largely informed how the prince comprehended the politics of his time, how he viewed the relation both between prince and subject and between geographically dispersed peoples. Henry’s colonial imperialism encouraged him to view the world as divided into smaller, conquerable blocks that presented themselves to an intrepid prince. Just as the Stuarts had united England and Scotland under themselves on terms of presumed equality, foreign places in America and on the continent likewise promised themselves to the victorious prince. Not only is Henry’s imperialism belligerent and aggressive — ever expanding and consuming — it also tends to re-enforce dynastic hierarchies and obscure national difference. Henry himself had glibly negated national difference between the English and Scottish — and perhaps not exclusively for the religious reasons prompting other followers to favor Protestantism over nationality.

Henry’s own model, as far as it can be traced, was of course derived from and replicated by many of the poems, masques and dedications. Comparisons to Alexander continually flattered the prince, from poets, essayists and preachers. According to Williamson, the prince “became most forcefully associated in England with the overreach of Alexander the Great. This persona was driven by a need to cross boundaries.” In the poems after the prince’s death, writers lamented their loss of a conquering Caesar, an Alexander. George Chapman, for example, claims the prince promised “Cesarian Commentaries, (More then can now be thought);” for Cyril Tourneur, the prince was “An Alexander, or a Cesar;” even a more religiously-minded poet,
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47 Williamson, The Myth of Conqueror, 76.

48 George Chapman, An Epicede or Funerall Son on the Most Disastrous Death, of the High-borne Prince of Men, Henry Prince of Wales (London, 1613), l. 290-1.

Josuah Sylvester, the prince’s chief writer, understood the loss in part through this classical
typology, and Sir William Cornwallis, writing in Sylvester’s anthology, claims hyperbolically
that Henry has replaced Alexander as conqueror par excellence: “We need admire no longer
Philipp’s Sonne: / Never was Life in little better donne.”50 A prince who had never stood on a
real field of battle makes for a dissonant parallel to Alexander, but these writers – and the prince
himself – insisted that Henry would rule – or would have ruled -- over the same kind of quickly-
expanding empire as the Macedonian prince.

Henry’s Britain was therefore linked with expansion, both east and west, but especially
tied to the colonial policy in the New World. The expansionist element not only contrasted
significantly with his father’s Britishness – who, to be fair to James, had to navigate the
complications of even a three kingdom composite monarchy, perhaps tempering his enthusiasm
for further conquest – it also obviously destabilized the borders of Britain. In Henry’s myth,
rather than unity on the island, Arthur presaged a foothold on the continent; Henry pushed
Arthur’s agenda further, presaging a global Protestant empire. But if British identity could
include even those Protestants on the continent, if Henry’s colonization could convert and
transform even the indigenous population of the Americas to “British,” what constituted
Britishness? Here, perhaps, the unifying power of the prince becomes most manifest: for Henry,
British identity became synonymous with subject-hood. He defined Britain, as his favorite
comparison, Alexander, makes most clear. Alexander himself gives coherence to his empire and
unites the people, and Henry, in his hubristic imagination, will mirror the Greek conqueror. The
British prince, however, presents a higher purpose for his subjects; he is a baptized Alexander:
the British are united not only under him, but under God.

50 Sir William Cornwallis, “Elegie on the Untimely Death of the Incomparable Prince, Henry,” in Lachrymae
Lachrymarum (London, 1613), sig. E3v.
Henry’s self-appellation encapsulates the complexities and foci of his identity. Among is closest admirers, first, and then more broadly, Henry styled himself Moelidaes, Prince of the Isle. An ancient name for the crown prince of Scotland, the title was invested with mythological British significance, derived from Arthurian legend through several sources.\(^5\) It also, as Prince of the “Isle,” unites England and Scotland and ignores the archipelagic component of his crown. Moelidaes invokes Britain. As Scottish writers turned to Britain in their poetry on the prince, his own personation similarly embraced his role in the larger, transnational project. The Union, of course, failed in 1607, unable to overcome the nationalist bickering and long-held antipathies between England and Scotland. James insisted that it had already been partially accomplished in his own person (“The Union is perfect in me; that is, it is a Union in my blood and title; yet but in embrione perfect”\(^5\)), but the parliaments remained unwilling to co-write a perfect union. If James’s ancestry made him a hereditary metonymy of the larger union, however, Prince Henry carried the same heredity – or even a wider multinational pedigree -- with a very different, and to many Englishmen more attractive, image of Britishness. As we shall see, the prince, his followers, and even less enthusiastic English writers, sensed that Henry would be crucial in completing his father’s project. His life, after all, was in some ways metonymic of the British problem. While the prince was baptized in Scotland, he came of age in England as English poets negotiated with the princely image they had inherited from his childhood. Like many figures throughout the seventeenth century, Henry comes for the English authors of his masques to represent a certain kind of Britishness, more expansionist and imperial than his father’s – though sometimes these qualities are simultaneously questioned. Occulted under the learned historicism
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\(^5\) Quoted in Smith, A Modern History of the British Isles, 27.
of Britain in the name, however, lies a truer and deeper identity, as Henry himself was fond of
proclaiming: Moelidaes revealed becomes Miles a Deo, soldier of God. If the anagram unites
British and Protestant identities – they both are contained, after all, in the same name – it also
implies that Protestantism lies deeper in the nature of the prince, a real identity waiting to be
discovered, as the prince himself waited to finally embrace his calling on the battlefield. Like so
many heroes of Elizabethan Romance, Henry stood poised to cast aside the pastoralism of
Britain for the epic of Protestant empire. Even Henry, it seems, read his role through established
cultural genres. Yet the transformation of his name suggests that the epic might not always have
been associated with state building, for the church offered the higher calling.

Some of the period’s most accomplished poets, throughout Britain, contributed to
defining and celebrating the prince’s imperialism, poised to write his epic. The facets of the myth
proved especially attractive during Henry’s years in England, drawing significant and diverse
attention: colonialism, imperialism, Protestantism; the hope that English militancy might be
reinvigorated and the hope that the English church might be fully reformed. On a wider level,
Henry drew dedications from a vast assortment of writers, themselves often on the far fringes of
Henry’s artistic and religious circles.53 While scholars have noted that the prince’s interests
inspired these dedications – in Britain, in Protestantism, in Empire and colonization – the
dedications also reveal how amorphous and contested these aspects of the prince’s image could
be. Hugh Broughton, for example, the Hebraist and scholar whose conflict with Archbishop
Whitgift drove him to the continent for much of his adult life, dedicated a series of works Henry
in 1610-11 from Middleburg, apparently encouraged by the prince’s renowned Protestantism.

53 Henry attracted the dedications of over 100 works, “a heterogeneous collection of sermons, prayers, panegyrics,
Timothy Wilks (London: Southampton Solent U Press, 2007), 66. For a full account of the dedications, see John A.
Butchel, “‘To the Most High and Excellent Prince’: Dedicating Books to Henry, Prince of Wales,” in Prince Henry
His confidence was perhaps well-founded, since he once preached before the prince. Several French Protestants dedicated works to Henry, including Pierre Erondelle, in Marc Lescarbot’s Nova Francia (London 1609), whose Huguenot religion made him favor English colonial projects over the colonial expansion of France.

This transnational British identity, however, was not just attractive to religious thinkers and poets on the fringes of English society; it excited some of the major English writers of the period, including Michael Drayton, who dedicated his Poly-Olbion to Henry, and Ben Jonson, who wrote two masques for the prince, both loosely associated with Henry’s creation as Prince of Wales. Jonson’s prominent role in celebrating Henry’s investiture is somewhat surprising, especially considering his complex and often less-than-adulatory relationship with the prince. Though almost a year separates Barriers (January 6, 1610) and Oberon (January 1, 1611), they might easily be considered together, both associated with the prince and his creation and thematically unified. Moreover, Jonson chose to work with material he often scorned – Arthuriana (in The Barriers) and Fairyland -- rendering the masques aberrations in his canon. If rarely used by Jonson, both mythologies were deeply implicated, through Spenser and dozens of poets and historians, in nation-writing projects. Both frames belonged to the wider nation of Britain, even if English writers often appropriated their mythology for narrower discussions of nationality. In Jonson, the materials clearly refer to the wider union, the entire Isle. Jonson surfeits The Barries, which as the first performance marks Henry’s ascendancy as another center of royal influence, with the traditional iconography of pan-Isle Britishness: the “isle” was “the happiest of the Earth,” set apart by Neptune; it remained unconquered, with “Britain, the only name made Caesar fly.”54 Scholars have located the origin of this inclusive Britishness in Henry

54 Ben Jonson, The Speeches at Prince Henry’s Barriers (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1994), l. 172-3; 175. Line numbers will be cited parenthetically in the text.
VIII’s rough wooing of Scotland, inflecting it with a suspect Anglo-centrism. And undoubtedly, Jonson strives to rhetorically marginalize the Northern Kingdom. Yet his interests – and even some of his militant hopes – actually align closely with the poetry celebrating the prince in Scotland; around Henry, the national differences might be overcome.

*The Barriers* hinges on the fulfillment of Merlin’s “misticke prophesies” regarding “the union of this isle,” and, though deferent to James, Jonson suggests that the prince augurs a fuller and more perfect union in the near future – “brighter far, then when our ARTHUR liv’d” (23). James’s role in unifying the island serves as Henry’s highest example. According to Jonson, the Stuarts effect such a perfect union that it both mirrors and completes how Henry VII had united Lancaster and York:

```
   Henry but ioyn’d the roses, that ensign’d
   Particular families, but this hath ioyn’d
   The Rose and Thistle, and in them combin’d
   A union, that shall never be declined. (333-6)
```

Just as William Alexander had in his earlier poem, Jonson appropriates the War of the Roses, after which Henry VII settled the country into a unified peace, as a model for what James and the future Henry IX might accomplish. Like the union of the Roses, James’s ascension to the English crown united two warring peoples into a single identity (in this case: British), erasing even the memory of division. Optimistically, Jonson purports that even “Ireland that more in title, then in fact / Before was conquered, is his Laurels act” (337-8). Yet in 1610, three years after James’s planned union had failed, Jonson’s masque obliquely suggest that Henry will have to complete it. Even the praise of James hints at Henry’s interests – for example, the restoration of the navy (a priority of the prince rather than the king) (339-41).

Jonson’s appropriation of Arthur and fairyland to celebrate the militant prince clearly reflected on the hopes already circulating around the young and promising heir, implicitly tying him, as Henry himself wished, to Elizabethan Chivalry. As scholars have noted, the choice to portray the prince as a descendant of the moon in *Oberon* reflected upon the fact that, ideologically, Henry was perhaps closer to the former queen than his father. Even by the performance of *The Barriers* in 1610, after the unpopular peace with Spain and James’s sustained commitment to pacifism, the image of Elizabethan militarism had become increasingly popular, and the masque capitalizes on surging Elizabethan sentiment. Mary C. Williams notes *The Barriers’* success, claiming that audience members “must have been deeply stirred by the vision of England’s future under such an able and valiant prince;” contemporary accounts suggest that they were. The speeches make clear, however, that the prince offers not a vision of England’s future, but rather a glorious future for the United Isle. Jonson’s masques had previously supported James’s desire for union, and the turn to Britain in Henry’s masques repeats a crucial interest from the past. In both the earlier and later masques for James, however, Jonson never appropriated Arthur, and his use of the materials of Elizabethan heroism clearly suggest he saw in Prince Henry an alternate kind of Britishness. Critical debate on Jonson’s masques for Henry revolves in some ways around Jonson’s opinion of this British


57 Williams, “Merlin and the Prince,” 222.


identity. Jean MacIntyre suggests that Jonson may have hoped to shift his source of court patronage to the prince, as several poets began vying for Henry’s attention as he established his court, and she reads *The Barriers* as an enthusiastic endorsement of the prince. More commonly, scholars import a cautious disapproval from Jonson’s later career backwards into the masques. Jonson had, after all, notoriously failed to eulogize the prince, and he seemed to share James’s trepidation over Henry’s more militant inclinations. According to Williamson, the masques open up a rift, a “rival myth,” in the prince’s personation, which centered on Stuart fertility and encouraged Henry to be content with the archipelic empire he would inherit. In this, Jonson seems perhaps to be pushing Henry toward James’s Britishness, a kind circumscribed by the borders of the two islands. Even here, it should be noted that Henry’s inheritance already stands as multiple kingdoms, with all the multinational problems that scholars of British history have noted. Still, the militancy of Henry’s myth, even qualified by Jonson, inevitably destabilizes the fixed borders of the union.

Both of Jonson’s masques take up this issue, at least insinuating that he viewed Henry primarily through a British perspective. *Oberon* has received more critical attention than *The Barriers*, but rarely has it been read through a multi-national, “British” lens. In *Oberon*, an antimasque of satyrs and nymphs is confronted by Silenus, who prophesies the arrival of the fairy prince. Henry, as Oberon, appears in a chariot pulled by polar bears and restores order. Even the scene of *Oberon’s* performance, which included a large curtain painted with England, Scotland, and Ireland, and marked, “Separata locis concordi pace figantur” [May what is
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separated in place be joined by harmonious peace],” conjures the union. The competing royal and national perspectives, along with the uncommon subject matter, have made Oberon something of a critical enigma, given standard assumptions of the masque. Especially in New Historicist Criticism, which possessed a special affinity for the genre, masques have been treated as a medium perfectly suited to representing and therefore enacting the monolithic power of the crown. Stephen Orgel, for example, has focused on the all-encompassing royal gaze, the way physical performance reproduces relations of power. Jonathan Goldberg detects in the masque and antimasque both the revelation and mystification of royal power. With Henry’s coming of age, however, another potentially-competing site of royal power emerged, and the militant young prince often resisted – both symbolically and directly – the will of his pacifist father. Just as the composite monarchy came concomitant with several sites of influence, Henry’s coming of age further fragmented royal authority – presenting a future king with goals differing from James’s own. Jonson’s Oberon stages this conflict and reproduces some of the inherent tensions, and it therefore fits poorly inside rubrics that interpret the masque purely as a means of conveying and assuring James’s authority. In Oberon, for example, both Orgel and Goldberg see the shift from Oberon (Henry) to Pan (James) as unsettling. So, Orgel notes, “Jonson first establishes a fairy iconography for Henry that has little to do with classical imperialism and involves the masque in a lurching gearshift.” The conflict – the incommensurability of the poetic materials – reflects the difficulty in reconciling the identities of prince and king. Goldberg sees the loss of unity as another contradiction which is a secret strength of sovereign power. Both readings, however,


overlook Henry’s influence. Critics have since complicated the function of the masque, often pointing to Henry as another source of royal authority. Tom Bishop, Martin Butler, and others have reframed the masque as a symbolic competition, keenly recognizing the instability of even royal images: masques were not monolithic propaganda, but instead “symbolic transactions between those who were competing for position in and around the courtly arena.”

Orgel’s early claim, however – that the iconography “has little to do with classical imperialism” – is worth note, because it intimates a desire to read imperialism in the masque – which, I think, Orgel is right to do – along with misleading assumptions about the character of early modern empire. There was, of course, no single and defined imperialism in the period, but, like nationalism, it was a concept being reconstructed in an international arena. If fairyland does not reference classical imperialism, its connection to Spenser’s work certainly reinvigorates the Protestant imperialism characteristic of many Stuart Spenserians – a kind of imperialism which, as Colin Kidd has shown, purposefully distinguished itself from the Roman model. Both masques seem particularly unwieldy, that is, because Jonson attempts to construct an alternate Britishness, a kind of union that might enjoy success under the future king, even if his father’s project had apparently failed.

The other masque Jonson composed centered more directly on the prince as soldier. The Speeches at Prince Henries Barriers feature Merlin’s prophecy of the isle unified, anoint Henry – Moelidas – by handing him a shield inscribed with past British heroes, and survey “British”


history. Jonson’s speeches lead into a barriers in which the prince and six nobles of his court met with fifty-eight challengers from throughout the three kingdoms in a stylized combat. The Barriers celebrates the martial fulfillment Henry and his followers desire – Arthur, after all, was an imperial king with a foothold on the continent – but it sometimes appears to pull back in cautious admonition. As criticism suggests, the creation of the prince’s Britishness was often against James’s open resistance; according to the Venetian ambassador, James only reluctantly allowed Henry to stage the Barriers. Roy Badenhausen has drawn out the conflict between the pacifist James and his popular and militant son, and suggested that James wanted to discourage displays of military force.67 David Bergeron qualifies assumptions of paternal jealousy by noting that Henri IV’s recent assassination undoubtedly provoked some fear for the prince’s safety, though he admits tension between the royal pair.68 Focusing on the masques celebrating Henry’s “creation” as Prince of Wales, Bergeron notes that contemporaries debated the ambiguity of ‘creation,’ and poets like Jonson who participated in the festivities understood that they were involved in scripting the prince’s mythology. If Jonson used the materials inherited from early celebrations of the prince – and indeed other Protestant heroes – he recognized that the public occasion presented an opportunity to subtly reconfigure their meaning. Henry’s own poets likely would have been troubled that both Jonson and Robert Cecil, who was commissioned by James to research how exactly to “create” a prince, played large roles in designing the ceremonies. Jonson, however, composed the masque for the prince, and as other have noted, was not fully associated with James’s court until later in his career; the majority of his early masques had been


composed for Queen Anne. Moreover, Jonson willingly adopts the prince’s symbology and attempts to write a kind of Britishness fitting the prince.

The Britain Jonson offers to Henry is perhaps defined foremost as expansionist. The militant images continually undercut any pacific advice. So, while Jonson scripts cautious platitudes which seem to sanction James’s avoidance of war (“civill arts the martiall must precede” (202)), his list of British heroes includes leaders of the crusades and the kings of English victories over the French. The masque laments the fall of “Chivalry,” the militancy which, it suggests, was so characteristically British: “shields and swords, / Cob-webd, and rust” (36-40). It is rarely easy to disentangle the economic virtues of a king or queen from their militancy in the masque’s history, in part because a strong economy is necessary for a strong defensive army. Even the admonition hints that militancy might fit Henry, if James has already established the “civill arts.” Immediately after the warning, the masque admits that, after economic and domestic arts have been secured, “fate shall call you forth,” and the list of British heroes offers an expansionist pattern for the prince: Richard the Lion Heart, Edward I, Edward II, Elizabeth I, Prince Edward and Henry V – royals who all pushed English glory onto the continent (and even into the holy land). The list of military conquest presented in The Barriers complicates the purported circumscription of Henry to England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland. Although scholars have noted that Henry is presented with a shield rather than a sword – suggesting a defensive rather than expansionist militarism – that shield also contains the noble history of Henry’s forbears who extended the boundaries of Britain beyond the sea: “So here in Wales, Low Countries, France and Spain, / You may behold both on the land and main / The conquests got, the spoils, the trophies reared / By British kings, and such as noblest heard / Of all the nation” (318-22). Britain is here a “nation,” and the inclusion of French and Spanish territory
as part of British conquest reinvigorates the English desire for a foothold on the continent – a relatively recent loss from which the English were still smarting. Henry’s connections to Denmark and various German dukedoms perhaps promised a similar encroachment onto the continent.

Most surprisingly, even Jonson imagines Henry’s Britishness as defined by religion. This has almost always been overlooked, perhaps because of Jonson’s own early Catholicism and his antipathy toward fervent Protestantism. And it may be Jonson merely catered to Henry’s known preference. Yet like the zealous Protestants who desired a union of the Isle on religious terms, Jonson hints at the providential role an Isle united under Henry might play. Heroes of the crusade are Henry’s primary models, the “two brave Britayne Heroes, that were grac’d / To fight their Saviours battailes” (208-9). The masque portrays the opportunity for holy was as a blessing, and with the Counter-Reformation forces advancing on the continent, Henry has seemingly been born at a key moment in history. In fact, Jonson insists that even expansionist militarism succeeds only when properly – and divinely – directed: battles for God’s glory are the “cause that should all warres begin and end” (220). In a subtle but unmistakable image within the crusades, Britain becomes another Israel: they march behind Richard “with S. GEORGES crosse, / Like Israels host to the aegyptians losse, / Through the red sea” (241-3). Jonson’s metaphor is complex, and obviously it is difficult to reconcile the image of an oppressed people fleeing slavery through the sea with a conquering army wading through the blood of its slaughtered enemies. The connection between the British heroes and Israel’s host, however, apparently centers on their divine election, as both peoples have been chosen to lead God’s forces – though the British, like the English in the crusade, make up only part of God’s army.
The insights of historians of Britain have influence English literary scholarship most, perhaps, in the call to deconstruct how British identity served English power, often erasing Scottish, Welsh, and Irish sources. As Baker has noted, “[i]n writing the history of England as a nation state today what we are writing is the textual history of the English rulers writing their own textual history, and doing so, quite often, by ‘unwriting’ – suppressing, assimilating, ignoring – the textual histories of the other not yet or never to be nations.”

Jonson’s desire to invoke Britain in this context is undoubtedly suspect, another English attempt to claim the Scottish prince. Yet in the very appropriation, Jonson constructs a kind of Britishness remarkably different from anything in his masques for the king, and the manner in which he claims the prince demonstrates the openness of British identity in the period. The lands of British conquest – Wales, Low Countries, France and Spain – are obviously problematic, as Jonson reinscribes Wales, the traditional center of Britain, as a victim of British expansion. Jonson’s masque becomes part of the English appropriation of Welsh history, a wider agenda which Philip Schwyzer has admirably documented.

Even during his creation as Prince of Wales, Jonson does nothing to connect the prince’s ancestry to the Welsh, and seems uninterested in the Welsh roots of the Arthurian myth the masque employs. Though named British, all the kings and queens are English, and reference key moments in English history – for example, Queen Elizabeth at the victory over Spanish Armada provides another model for the prince.

Even Jonson’s focus on the shared Protestantism of England and Scotland implies certain problems and erasures. Spectators especially sensitive to English and Scottish myth might recognize the Egyptians, the forces of Satan in the providential narrative, as legendary ancestors
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of the Scottish people. Indeed, Jonson likely evoked this mythology only a few years earlier in the *Masque of Blackness* (1604). More problematically, the crusading army is led by an English king carrying the banner of St. George\(^7\); St. Andrew is conspicuously absent. If Henry is to lead a united British crusade against Counter-Reformation Rome, Jonson’s masque has carefully worked to establish this as an English struggle, led by an English prince and part of their national history, excluding the Scottish people. Not only does this masque overlook the prince’s Scottish origins, it also neglects the fact that the Scottish soldiers were, by far, more active players in the Protestant cause on the continent. The expansionist militancy collaborates with this rewriting, however; a Britain turned outward against Rome, united under the prince, no longer focuses on internal divisions, histories, and competition. By expanding outward, Britain might be perfectly united. Considering Jonson’s masques cater so directly to Henry’s apparent interests, it seems the prince himself understood the complexity of the British context and hoped to consolidate his father’s empire. As in Alexander’s poem, however, unification requires an outward turn; peace threatened Britain.

Given the focus on Britishness throughout Jonson’s masques for Henry, unique in his canon, *Oberon* and *The Barriers* pose the question of the relationship between Britain and the prince: did Jonson construct Henry’s Britishness to please the prince? Was Britain in the masques, even a more militant and expansionist Britain, an attempt to court James, who still desired the union? How did Jonson imagine the British Henry shaping English and European history? As Bishop notes, masques attempt to create an image projecting into the future, and Henry’s early death undercuts potential meaning in Jonson’s masque: “By the force of its imagining, it seeks to make itself an inevitable coordinate for future representation … Masques

\(^7\) Though, as Richard McCabe has shown, even the English St. George had complex, non-Anglo roots.
being much less semiotically self-contained than plays, one result of Prince Henry’s early death is that a whole array of symbolic precedents that *Oberon* may have sought to assert never came into being.”72 This Britishness, without Henry, quickly dissolved, leaving this potential unrealized. Yet even at the time, Jonson’s vision competed with others who attempted to claim stake in the prince, one of many overlapping visions.

A marked regionalism provides a strong counterbalance to the dreams of British imperial glory and was equally present in English reception of the Prince. Richard Davies, who authored a regional response in Chester to the prince’s creation viewed Henry as belonging particularly to his county. In *Chesters Triumph in Honor of Her Prince*, a masque performed on St. George’s Day, 1610, in Chester, a small English town on the Welsh border, to honor Henry’s creation as Prince of Wales, the local connection to the prince far outweighs any nationalism. Pressure against the body of scholarship on nation-writing has recently been exerted from the opposite direction: not only did transnational identification remain strong, but local identity retained a firm grip on most English people. As John Adrian has recently argued, “Even in the age of emerging nationhood, English men and women were still profoundly influenced by – and even drew their primary identity from – the parish, the town, and the country.”73 This criticism suggests that our traditional picture of the period has not only been Anglo-centric, but perhaps even more London-centric, again distorting the importance of Englishness. Chester, as a proud and ancient community, a borderland between England and Wales, imagined that they possessed a very personal relationship with the prince. An attachment to place pervades the political triumph, and Cambria appears with Britain and Chester as speaking characters. Local sentiment
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seems strongest at the opening of the poem, as the “poore Palatines” worry about how the princely audience might receive their provincial work. Davies recognizes his remove from the cultural capital, and he seems anxious but determined to claim the prince as uniquely his own.

The neighboring country, Wales, shared the prince and is also personified in Davies’s work. The triumph represents the Welsh as both militant and fiercely proud of their nationality, and Cambria vows to defend the prince “whilst Cambers Race doth Breath… We scorne that Wales such weaklings should afford.” ‘Race’ is the most important nodal term in Cambria’s speech, and the personified Wales employs it in a way similar to the common early modern understanding of ‘nation’ — a community related by birth and descent.74 In Britain, the three nations are set as equal, and an allegorized Peace promises prosperity for them all: “Who while the Scotch the English faire entreate, / And me embrace withal, I’le make them great. / No forraigne Nation shall affront their force.” A cautious suspicion of Scotland permeates the lines, however, and Davies insists on the necessity of all three peoples equally applying themselves to the health and safety of the British Empire.

Oversimplification of these masques and poems is almost unavoidable, however, as all manifest regional, national, and international identities in some degree. Even these local communities negotiated their identity not only from within the rising national sentiment, but in transnational networks that gave meaning to local character. The allegories themselves imply a complex mix of local, national, and transnational sentiment in how the writer understands Chesterian identity, with all three communities speaking separate in their praise of the prince. English nationalism, British nationalism, regionalism or transnational Protestantism could all be extracted from the masques, depending on one’s frame. Jonson and Davies differ in focus, but

74 See Liah Greenfeld’s useful discussion of the etymological history of ‘nation.’ Greenfeld, Nationalism, 5-8.
they approach the same vexed issues through much of the same imagery and language. Even in the regionally focused *Chester’s Triumphs*, Davies turns to a religious type that greatly expands the prince’s influence and prefigures how Henry’s Protestant followers represent him after his death:

No massacre nor bloody stratagem,
Shall stirre in Peaces new Jerusalem
No civil Discord, nor Domestick Strife

The type of the New Jerusalem, and the implication of a united kingdom of Israel, applies far beyond the local borders of Chester; as we shall see, England, Britain, or the International Church can all be read equally into the type. As we have seen, Jonson himself had also subtly invoked Israel in the masque.

“O what a frame of Good, in all hopes rais’d / Came tumbling down with him!”

While much of Henry’s imperial vision was to be reworked after his death, the central terms – Britain, Protestant, expansionist – would be maintained, if themselves opened to interrogation. This was, after all, the enormous promise that had been lost. Once again, however, the complex concepts allowed for significant disagreement, and writers from various nations and regional groups worked to claim the deceased prince for their political purposes. The Scottish mourning for the prince confirmed much of the prince’s own militant image, but like the poetry from Scotland earlier, it again highlighted Henry’s role in the British Union. Writers like Alexander recognized his roots as a Scottish prince, and his death became a second bereavement – for they already had felt keenly the court’s relocation to England. In elegies written for the prince by Scottish poets or published in Edinburgh, these sentiments complicate the already poignant loss felt throughout the Isle. The Scottish writers in England and in Scotland remain closely networked, their poems crossed with dedications and mutual praise; as we shall see with
many collections of elegies, the death of the prince briefly revealed literary communities, bound
together for various ideological reasons. In Edinburgh, national sentiment united writers most
often, though religious conviction often complicates these sentiments. Alexander, for example,
writes a dedicatory sonnet for William Drummond’s poem, printed in Edinburgh by Andro Hart,
who printed most of the elegiac material on Henry in Scotland and is described by the DNB as a
“fervid presbyterian.”

William Drummond of Hawthorndon’s elegy for the prince, *Teares on the Death of Moeltades*,
registers much of this complexity. Kerrigan has admirably demonstrated the depth of
Drummond’s work in a British context, and he has diagnosed the tension between “feelings of
provincial isolation and national sentiment in a British context.” At the same time, as Kerrigan
notes, Drummond was first published in the pan-British and Irish collection (and Dutch),
*Mausoleum* – though *Mausoleum* itself was printed by Hart in Edinburgh, and (neglected by
Kerrigan) contained only two supplementary sonnets and short poems, and not his more complex
*Teares* itself. Drummond’s poem broadcasts his self-imposed exile from the English court, far
less Anglicized than Alexander and the other court poets who had (at least, eventually)
accompanied the royal family. Like most of Drummond’s verse, it is highly ornate and
influenced by international mannerism, steeped in classical mythology and rhetorical
sophistication, alliteration and allegory. Critically, it has generally been considered the best of
the poems produced for the occasion. Ideologically, the poem also manifests its distance from the
court and the religious politics of England, for the central issue of the poem never becomes either
Stuart dynastic glory or an aggressive internationalist Protestantism. Drummond does admittedly

---

75 A. J. Mann, “Hart, Andro (b. in or before 1566, d. 1621),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* Oxford
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lament that Henry never had the chance to stand on the field above “Huge heapes of slaughtred Bodies long … In Turkish blood,” or to have “made old Rome, / Queene of the World, thy Triumph, and thy Tombe.” But the mourning for Henry extends through even the Catholic countries in Drummond’s poem and seems more courtly and chivalric than either national or religious: “Tagus bewailes his Losse, with Golden Streames, / Rhein with his Townes, faire Seine with all She claimes” (l. 117-8). Spain never appears in the mourning imagined from London, and France holds only a partial and tenuous claim; but Drummond equates them with the mourning from Germany — from the Rhine, in fact, whose prince, Frederick V, attended Henry’s funeral as chief mourner after Charles, and would shortly marry his sister.

Instead, Drummond focuses on the lost potential itself and addresses much more directly the compelling fact that the prince’s image remains ideologically open, a blank slate for future writers to claim. Drummond does subtly claim Henry for Scotland, with the repetition of his title, Moeliades, but he seems surprisingly less invested in the Prince’s Scottish heritage than many of his countrymen living as ex-patriots in London. He focuses rather on how he might be adopted by others for political reasons. It is worth noting that Drummond’s poem was published in 1613, almost a year after the prince’s death, perhaps because of his remove in Scotland; but his delay also allows him to survey the vast field of elegies already commemorating the prince and diagnose trends. Like many poets in England, Drummond laments the lost heroic potential, both the poetic and national loss:

A Booke had beene of thy illustrous Deeds. 
So to their Nephewes aged Syres had tolde
The high Exploits perform'd by thee of olde;
Townes raz'd, and rais'd, victorious, vanquish'd Bands,
Fierce Tyrants flying, foyl'd, kill'd by thy Hands.

And in deare Arras, Virgins faire had wrought
The Bayes and Trophies to thy Countrie brought:
While some New Homer imping Wings to Fame,
Deafe Nilus dwellers had made heare thy Name. (l. 50-8)

As in Shakespeare’s Henry V, Drummond imagines the military success of this Henry as something that would establish the new nation, passed down over generations, stories that are told by “aged Syres” that define the character of a people. Henry’s military glory would return to his ‘Countrie’ – an ambiguous word, as in all praise of the prince, but even more so given Drummond’s place – and would inspire a national epic. The nation founded by this epic would presumably be Britain, the Scottish and English fully unified by Henry’s heroism. The prince, for Drummond, should have become one of the founding narratives of an empire, but his death robbed the British people of that foundation. Still, Drummond admits remaining potency in the prince’s image.

The British ramifications of the prince are central to the collection of elegies published by Andro Hart which first presented Drummond’s work, Mausoleum or the Choisest Flowres of the Epitaphs. The edition, published once again in Edinburgh, excerpts poems from Scottish and English poets associated with the prince, including William Drummond, Walter Quin (the Prince’s tutor who accompanied Henry to St. James), George Wither and George Chapman. Like so many of these collections, Hart’s work was a multinational poetic project, and recognized as such, even if the monolinguism and later unity of Britain obscures this. As in much of the material from the Scottish presses, the sentiment in the poems often focuses on the British Union while at the same time recognizing the component parts. Henry belongs to the entire Island, but each people claims him as especially their own. Robert Allyne highlights this competition in his brief elegies:

Two Kingdomes strove for Interest in one Prince
Heavens claim’d me from them both, and rest me hence:  
Scotland my Cradle, England hath my Herse,  
The Heavens my Soule, my Vertues live in Verse.\textsuperscript{78}

There are conflicting tendencies to both unite under the prince — to view the loss as a British, or even worldly loss — and at the same time localize it as particularly painful for one group or people. An anonymous poem, published in the same collection, connects the people: “Great Britaine now but great to all appears, / In her great losse, and Oceans of teares.”\textsuperscript{79} Alexander repeats the common cradle/grave theme, but sees the loss as the first unifying sorrow experienced in the fledgling empire: “This the first tempest is, which all this Isle did tosse, / His cradle Scotland, England tombe, both shar’d his life and losse.”\textsuperscript{80} The “strove” of Allyne’s verse, however, implies a lingering divide. The poems continually enact circles of relation and influence, the closer — nationally, ideologically, emotionally — one was to the prince, the more the loss is felt. And Scottish poets are often at pains to represent themselves as more nearly kin to the heroic prince; they, after all, knew him from his birth and raised him in his childhood: “Cradle” seems much more significant than “Herse.”

Even Allyne quickly moves from national/local competition to generalizing the prince. In an epitaph immediately following the preceding lines, he has Henry claim: “I liv’d three Kingdomes hope, foes terror, parents life. / I di’d their dearest losse; their joy; their endlesse grief.”\textsuperscript{81} Ireland, which had no part in the struggle over ownership, merges with the other two peoples to feel the loss. In Walter Quin’s Epitaph, the loss is extended even further: Henry was

\textsuperscript{78} Mausoleum or, The Choisest Flowres of the Epitaphs, Written on the Death of the Never-too-much Lamented Prince Henrie, (Edinburgh, 1613), sig. A4v.

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., sig. A3v.

\textsuperscript{80} William Alexander, An Elegie on the Death of Prince Henrie (Edinburgh, 1613), l. 43-44.

\textsuperscript{81} Mausoleum, sig. A4v.
one “on whom, while he on Earth drew vital breath, / The hope of many Kingdomes did relie.”82

The ‘many,’ here, is rather ambiguous; perhaps it merely recognizes the composite monarchy of the Stuarts (Scotland, England, Wales, and Ireland). As Henry’s Britain potentially encompassed Virginia and the continent, “kingdoms” remains open and could easily be supplemented, especially when one considers the train of German, Dutch, and Danish mourners at his funeral, exceeding even the international company that had gathered for his baptism.

While many of the Scottish writers resided in England and participated in contemporary religious and political polemic, their original loyalties encouraged them to reflect on the prince’s Scottish roots. If the prince is Britain, then Scotland is subtly refigured as the new nation’s source. English elegists focus less often on nationality, but instead engage with the vast array of competing communities not based on geographical borders – both the pan-Protestant church and smaller, local associations like the universities or the prince’s household, or even an abstracted community of like-minded Spenserian poets. The competition over the prince’s image is, therefore, more divisive and multifaceted. Sometimes, English writers did continue an interest in the British project. Richard Niccol’s elegy, “The Three Sisters Teares,” specifically invokes a competitive model that highlights the divisions between the nations of the Atlantic Archipelago while at the same time stressing their (at least potential) unity. The loss of Henry, in fact, is felt most severely in that it compromises the fragile unity established under James: all three daughters of Albion mourn the loss of their future King. England, or Angela, speaks first, and

82 Ibid., sig. A1r.
she owns most of Niccol’s sympathy, dominating the poem and labeled as the “fayrest of the three” and the “eldest borne,” though all three are given voice.83

Niccol’s poem brackets these nations off from the rest of the world in a way unique to many of the elegies. Henry’s loss usually represents a blow to the entire world, at least the entire Protestant world, and the Protestant nobility mourned across Europe. Niccol’s poem does represent Henry’s death as a blow to the Protestant cause, but it seems a more purely national loss. England, with their true religion and through their militant prince, would have replaced “The worlds great Idoll, Rome, at whom with wonder / The Nations round about doe gazing
stand, / As sodaine blow her neck of Pride had broken, / Hath quak’t, when shee hath heard my
name but spoken.”84 While this victory unites the isle and merges them as a single people under a single victorious monarch, few other Protestant nations take part in the triumph. A clear distinction is drawn between the people who share the island and those outside: Angela herself claims that Neptune

Who iealous lest his seed commixt should bee
With other mortals, round about us runnes,
And from the world, as being in doubt to lose us,
Hath made his waves a silver wall t’inclose us.85

The English, Scottish, and Irish peoples share the same mythological source — all daughters of Albion, son of Neptune — and are all carefully removed from the world to prevent mixing with other peoples. It is a very nationalistic poem, that is, that celebrates also a tenuous British nationalism and links it exclusively with English Protestantism. Part of this Anglo-centrism and

83 Richard Niccol, The Three Sisters Teares Shed at the Late Solemne Funerals of the Royall Deceased Henry, Prince of Wales (London, 1613), I. Personification of the nation, which both Helgerson and MacEachern have seen as important in the early formation of nationalism, is especially prominent in these elegies.

84 Ibid., I. 209-12.

85 Ibid., 227-30.
apparent disregard for other Protestantisms might stem from the fact that many supporters of Henry were drawn as much by “antipopery” as Protestant conviction. As Armitage has shown, this was especially true of those Englishmen interested in empire.\textsuperscript{86} Still, antipopery opened the possibility of further international collaboration – and Britain itself perhaps provided a model. Even Niccols at least hints that he shares sentiments with more zealous internationalist Protestants. The cause of the princes death seems cautiously but implicitly blamed on the King’s policy of working with the Spanish — or perhaps just on Catholics infiltrating the borders:

\begin{quote}
Know that the chiepest cause why wretched we
Have lost in Israel our second light,
Is their false, wicked, close, commerce with those,
That are their God, their King and countries foes.\textsuperscript{87}
\end{quote}

As in Jonson’s masques and, as we shall see shortly, other sermons and elegies, “Israel” remains an open and ambiguous nation.

Many English poets imagined Henry’s importance in more minute social organizations – his court of Saint James; the universities; the scattered supporters who shared the prince’s ideology. These circles of community, it should be noted, are especially germane to elegy. As a recent scholar of the genre has noted, “elegies are sociable, uniting communities disrupted by death, promoting civic values or negotiating loyalties and allegiances within smaller sodalities.”\textsuperscript{88} In a way, the elegies take the place of the prince, attempting to hold together the communities he had founded. The explosion of elegies upon his death highlighted the prince’s importance for binding people together: elegies grew in collections of likeminded followers, all

\textsuperscript{86} Armitage, \textit{Ideological Origins}, 65. It is also important to note that this anti-Catholicism was not simply contemporary hysteria, but a reasonable response to the continental Counter-Reformation; its frame, that is, was always continental. See Scot, \textit{England’s Troubles}, 4.

\textsuperscript{87} Nicchols, \textit{Three Sisters Teares}, l. 507-510.

connected in some way to the prince, communities that now were threatened by the loss of their head. They demonstrate how the prince had provided a site for shared religious and literary collaboration. Josuah Sylvester published three versions of his elegy, each part of a collection expanding with each publication until the last contained almost a dozen poets; Cambridge published soon after the death, and Oxford followed shortly after, smarting competitively from their secondary status; dramatists published together, and Spenserians obliquely referenced the community of the knowing in their works in cross-pollinating dedications.\(^9\) Temporary coteries solidified around the dead prince, many of which had existed during Henry’s life and were comprised of poets whom he had patronized. The collected anthologies leave fossilized records of the variety of associations headed by the Prince. The poetry of these collections turned inward, the group self-influencing, mimicking style and thought of their fellow poets – as, for example, Donne’s famous attempt to match the obscurity of Lord Herbert’s poem, published along with his in Sylvester’s third edition. These smaller communities themselves could be models for larger international organizations, as Chapman implies of St. James, “where all the prime spirits met / Of all our Kingdomes.”\(^90\)

But the elegiac literature does not only contract the community; just as often, it pushes borders outward, as Henry himself had intended to do. The prince was also celebrated and mourned in foreign lands, as Protestants abroad agreed with English and Scottish elegists that Henry’s death was the world’s loss and a significant blow to international Protestantism.

---

\(^9\) As Dennis Kay has shown in his investigation of English Elegy, Spenser had established the elegy as a genre of communal mourning — but an esoteric and elite community, prohibiting the kind of range expected for a national hero. Because of the prince’s interest in scientific thought and pious religion, many of the elegies establish a community in which “people, who share the Prince’s piercing eye, are naturally inclined to allegory, and to the prophetic, apocalyptic Spenserian modes.” *Melodious Tears: the English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Oxford U Press, 1990), 136. See also, O’Callaghan, *Shepheards Nation*, 13-5.

\(^90\) Chapman, *An Epicide or Funerall Song*, l. 130-1. Henceforth given parenthetically in the text.
Williamson has traced private letters after the prince’s death and claims that the prince’s image and meaning had crossed geographic borders: “Prince Henry, it appears, was quite firmly rooted in the German Protestant mind as symbol.”91 A Dutch Protestant, Johannes Luntius, wrote to his friends in England that everyone in the Netherlands was deeply affected (besides Catholics, of course); letters from Paris agreed; a German named Daniel Buwinckhausen claimed “it is a very great loss to us Germans also.”92 While the mourning crescendoed in England and Scotland, all the Protestant nations felt their loss and wrote to claim some stake in the prince, just as they had almost eighteen years before at his baptism. He had, after all, been destined to lead the united Protestant forces, prophesied to defeat Rome. Around Henry, these mourners in many languages shared the same literary space. In Leiden, the professor of history Dominico Baudio lamented the prince’s death with many of the same tropes as the English in his elegy. He writes of Henry’s death, “Complorat orbis Christianus extinctum / Lumen Juventae.”93 The prince, like all these heroes, was a shared cultural symbol throughout the northern Protestant nations. Too exclusive a focus on England, or even Britain, can mislead, and the variety of these myriad elegies once again demonstrates the way in which the nation tends to over-write plurality – and the way in which the nation itself is a pluralistic composite.

The radically shifting borders in the elegies strained interpretation of the prince’s community, intermingling both nation and church. No single focus can organize the literature on Henry, but instead the mourning is, as Kerrigan has noted of “British literature” in the period

91 Williamson, The Myth of Conqueror, 163.
92 Quoted in Williamson, The Myth of Conqueror, 163.
93 Dominico Budio, Monumentum consecratum Honori & memoriae Serenissimi Britanniarum Principis Henrici Frederici (Leiden, 1613), sig b1v-b2r.
generally, “expansive, multileveled, discontinuous, and polycentric.”

Considering contemporaries insisted on Henry’s central role in uniting the people, this complexity became somewhat problematic. As his subjects— including many of his closest followers -- mourned, they often borrowed biblical metaphors to explain his importance. John Holles, son of the Earl of Hertford and an ambassador to Brussels, in his letters during the immediate aftermath of the prince’s death refers to Henry as “the corner stone of our church, the sword and target of our king and state, the glory of Christendom and this age.”

Holles ties religious and national roles, before raising them to a higher and more abstract level. The ecclesiological image — “cornerstone of our church” — was of course a loaded term. Not only is the ‘our’ ambiguous, likely referring to the Church of England but, given the religious disposition of the audience, perhaps extended much more broadly, the role of cornerstone itself evoked decades of interdenominational polemic. Though many Catholics, including, for example, Thomas More, agreed with Protestants that Christ was the cornerstone of the church, Protestant critique adamantly (and usually fairly) claimed that the papacy read Peter as the cornerstone. A series of weighty verses informed this controversy. Some implied that the church was indeed founded on Peter, for example Christ’s famous commission in Matthew 16:8: “And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” The majority, however, unambiguously refer to Christ himself, for example:

The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone (Luke 20:17; 1 Peter 2:7; Matthew 21:42).

94 Kerrigan, Archipelagic English, 82.

The image ascribes to Christ the kind of community-evoking quality that I have discussed in relation to Henry, the ability to both found a new community and hold it together. It also is part of the larger metaphor of the Church as a temple.

If Holles in his letters refers directly to the role – ‘cornerstone of the church’ -- much of the elegiac literature hinted at it while leaving Henry’s exact status open. George Chapman, one of the central poets in the prince’s court, returns often to the imagery of a temple and uses it as a way of interpreting Henry’s loss in multiple spheres. Like most of his works, Chapman’s elegy is learned and obscure, filled with classical allusion. Dennis Kay notes the “verbal allusions” to Spenser and “emphasizes Henry’s inheritance of the leadership of the Leicester/Sidney group.” For Kay, the poem is “a scarcely veiled claim to laureateship, and to poetic primacy.”\(^{96}\) Chapman also, however, seems deeply attuned to the prince’s foundational importance for the ambiguous national community (one might well counter: laureate of what?), and in his elegy he explores the meaning of the prince’s loss. The poem transitions from a commonplace discussion of Henry’s exemplarity into the architectural metaphor through the fulcrum of “Pattern.” As a pattern for other men, Henry also offers a blueprint for making God’s “Manly Temple.” (l. 27, 34). This makes his loss still more pernicious:

When (without perfect knowledge, which scarce
Of many kingdoms reach) no other stone
Man hath to build one corner of thy Phane,
Save one of these? (l. 35-8)

Henry is among the few possible cornerstones in God’s temple — the key stone that assures the integrity of the entire structure. Chapman’s verse implies that this temple is an international construction, since many kingdoms have been searched to find this building block. The vexed

\(^{96}\) Kay, *Melodious Tears*, 125ff, 201-2.
history of the debate about the church’s cornerstone invested the allusion with messianic significance — a role unavoidably associated with Christ. In Chapman’s poem, the temple is ambiguous, and admittedly it is never explicitly denoted as the church, and Chapman’s allusive and allegorical style indeed frustrates any simple reading. Still, the poem at least conjures an idea of the Church, especially with the repeated focus on the prince’s piety and religion, tied into this building he founded:

That, as a Temple, built when Pietie
Did to divine ends offer specially
What we enjoy’d; that wondrous state exprest
Strange Art, strange cost. (l. 293-6)

Henry’s death results in the building’s destruction: “O what a frame of Good, in all hopes rais’d/
Came tumbling down with him!” (l. 174-5). His corpse reminds Chapman of the broken down ruins of some ancient, famous town. It is perhaps too much to claim that the Church wrecked itself upon the death of the prince, but his death dashed many of the hopes of the international Protestants. Whatever the community — the nation, the church, or even just the prince’s household — the heroic figure seems necessary for it’s cohesion, and it soon breaks apart upon his death. Chapman stresses the relationship between the prince and the temple, paralleling the “frame of Good” with the prince and almost making the prince alone the structure. The second line neatly mimics the united fall of both Prince Henry and the temple in its rhythm: “Came tumbling down with him!” Even if Chapman laments the loss of national glory, then – and is this the English or British nation? – the image of the temple is so laden with religious meaning that the national community must be understood in part through the religious community.

Chapman had been one of the prince’s foremost poets, a member of his court and an enthusiastic admirer. Though some critics have read an anxiety about the prince’s militancy into
Chapman’s drama[^97], his elegy reveals how fully he felt the prince’s death as a personal and communal loss. Chapman had dedicated his *Iliad* to Henry and completed his translation of Homer after Henry’s prompting, and even after the prince’s death, he choose not to rededicate the work in the 1616 *The Whole Works of Homer*. In fact, the 1616 edition adds engravings which “the poet uses … as part of a strategy to heighten the praise of his late patron.”[^98] As John A. Buchtel has shown, the engravings mimic the *impressa* of Charles V, a device that celebrated an empire of unprecedented expanse, succeeding and surpassing Rome. After Henry’s death, at least, Chapman mourns the loss even of the prince’s militancy, the sole British hope to challenge for the right to be Rome’s successor. Like Henry’s other followers, Chapman had represented him as a Caesar, an Alexander, and his imperial hopes are almost certainly part of the structure ruined by his death. In the elegy, however, Chapman turned from the militancy to a mourning steeped equally in biblical and classical imagery.

Chapman’s depiction of Henry is common, if perhaps unusually esoteric: the prince often appeared in the elegiac poetry as a sort of national Christ figure. His biographers consciously borrow biblical language to describe his life (“increasing every day in favor with God and man”).[^99] Writers imagined the prince’s suffering as Christ-like, and perhaps more surprisingly, and potentially more blasphemously, they imagined his death as exculpatory; Prince Henry had died for his people’s sins. John Donne, for example, invests the Prince (had he lived) with a


[^99]: John Hawkins [misattributed to Charles Cornwallis], *The Life and Death of our Late Most Incomparable and Heroique Prince, Henry Prince of Wales*, (London, 1641), 11.
pseudo-Christ-like role: “he had stayed below, / To rectify our errors.”100 Other poets are more
direct with their comparisons. Chapman himself portrays the prince as a kind of Christ-like
sacrifice: “There there the person lies/ Whose death should buy out all mortalities” (l. 582-3).
Like the other heroes in this study, Henry plays a role in the nation similar to Christ’s role in the
church – a foundation, a definition, an adhesive. The frequency of the comparison between the
two, however – and indeed the significant overlap in the conceptualization of Henry and Christ –
stems from the muddied distinction between the Protestant Church and Henry’s British nation.
As we have seen, the nation not only remained an open construct – with Britain, especially,
being rewritten through the prince’s ambitions – but for many writers religious and national
communities remained entangled. In fact, for some of his most devoted, yet also most godly,
followers, Henry’s role verged on idolatry precisely because of this confusion. While historians
continue to view Protestantism as the shared source that enabled the creation of Britain – as
many Scottish and English theologians had hoped during the period – this religious foundation
both pushed borders outward and simultaneously frustrated attempts to imagine Britain as a
classical empire, centered around a militant young emperor.

Many scholars have demonstrated the suspicions of court poets regarding the militant
facets of Henry’s myth — Ben Jonson’s famous use of the shield rather than the sword in The
Barriers, for example — but more fervent Protestants viewed the imperialist side of Henry’s
image with equal trepidation. Even a Protestant with unimpeachable Puritan and internationalist
leanings, George Wither, objected to the hyperbolic role Henry was given in the contest with
Rome. Wither blames Henry’s death on the people’s consecration of the prince as an idol: while
setting their trust in the prince, believing that he will surely lead an army to overcome Rome,

100 John Donne, “Elegie upon the Untimely Death of the Incomparable Prince Henry,” in The Complete English
they “mak’st meane-while another Whore of him.” Wither captures the image-making inherent in the adulatory poetry on these Protestant heroes, and he complicates its relationship to a more iconoclastic Protestantism generally. Good Protestants — as Henry was, Wither is sure to point out — rely only in Christ; the British had come dangerously close to setting up Henry as another Christ. Even after death, they have not learned the lesson: “Yet cal’st thou on thy Prince still; as if he, / Could either Saviour or Redeemer be.” Wither objects to Henry’s usurpation of Christ’s role as head of the church community, and claims that Henry’s martial glory “almost made this Ile Idolatrize.” This kind of imperialism – setting up earthly heads – implicitly becomes a kind of idolatry when the nation are church are aligned, and while Wither might encourage the bellicose response to Rome, he worries about the elevation of a single man over the transnational religious community. Henry’s imperial project, his desire to become a Protestant emperor, inevitably apotheosizes him as another pope.

The prince’s own left-leaning Protestant followers subtly objected to the imperialism which divided the world into hostile and conquerable ‘territories.’ Many of the writers constructing Henry’s image were conditioned to prefer religious identification over national, as for example, the religious refugees from France who were important in writing the prince’s myth. Their primary frame was not national or dynastic, but religious. Henry’s role, therefore, needed to remain instrumental: he was used by God rather than an active conqueror himself; he was to be Moses rather than Alexander. The Protestant conception of the community, like the church, was less attached to geographical borders and more committed to an egalitarian relationship between

102 Ibid., sig E1v.
103 Ibid., D3v.
the people of God. The conglomeration of national, dynastic, and religious assumptions in the prince’s personation often caused friction, and the difference between those who viewed Henry as an English or British prince and those who viewed him as a Protestant prince were exacerbated after his death. Williamson notes regarding Henry’s death, “A nation mourns its living symbols, those who stand more for possibility than for actuality, those who in their deaths frustrate a national goal which has seemed attainable but which has remained just beyond grasp.” But inside that mourning and possibility lay division. Because the nation remained in formation, and the church in flux, the overlap between the two allowed Henry’s followers to read unity onto the massive elegiac output. Yet Henry’s death never frustrated purely national goals; indeed, the king and much of the court, still arbiters of ‘national’ policy, cautiously but firmly resisted the prince’s warlike machinations. The very fact that the German Duke Frederick V succeeds Henry in the heroic tradition challenges these national assumptions. Instead, his goals and desires belonged equally to the internationalist Protestants who had assumed the Prince’s myth upon his arrival in England and wrote most prolifically upon his death. All parties continued to negotiate the meaning of that loss, and the meaning of the prince, as they mourned.

Though tempting, it would therefore be a mistake, to view this continual return to the religious community as something like a ‘rise to a religious sphere’ for Henry’s communal significance. Instead, the early modern sense of the religious and national community is more unified, an object out of focus through a probing lens: sometimes appearing as a single, cohesive object; sometimes overlapping; sometimes two distinct and separate iterations. Perhaps this becomes most apparent in the other great type used to explain the prince, which surpassed even Alexander after Henry’s death: Josiah, the good kind of Judah. Josiah invokes not only the

heroism of the godly king, but the great national typography of Israel. Throughout the writing on these heroes, Israel is a term loaded with both national and religious significance. For Henry, the half-Scottish, half-Danish Prince of Wales, who held ambitions to lead the united Protestant armies of Europe, the metaphor of the church as Israel highlights better than any other the complex intermingling of national and religious sentiment. For a short time, the hope that England might be Israel, the elect nation, captivated some patriots – though the duration and popularity of this sentiment have often been exaggerated. By the early Stuart period, as counter-Reformation forces reclaimed the continent, Israel more often represented the shrinking Protestants under duress – the people of God. As we shall see, Israel has very different borders depending on the intentions and ideologies of those mourning the prince.

**Typology of Israel**

Arguably the most important type for the church, and one already discussed in the previous chapters, is Israel: the people of God had been represented as a nation throughout the Old Testament. After Solomon, of course, Israel had split into Judah and Israel, a divided kingdom, which became important during discussions of British unification. (James, ‘the British Solomon’, ruled over the united kingdoms of the Island, just as Solomon ruled over a united Israel.) This type, however, inevitably complicated political and religious thinking about a subject’s relationship to Protestants abroad. For the internationalist Protestant party backing Henry, Israel aligned more properly with the pan-Protestant church than either the English nation or united Britain. Of course, claims were made for a special divine favor on the English (and similar claims by the Dutch, German Territories, Swedes, etc.), but disagreements between the more aggressive internationalists and the early Stuart court encouraged a more transnational reading of Israel.
Since his baptism, the prince had drawn both biblical and classical imagery. As much as his followers celebrated Henry as Alexander, the conquering general, the type of Josiah, another militant and reforming king, complimented and reformed the classical example. Though it had been used to describe past Protestant heroes, and would continue to be used throughout the tradition, the type of Josiah fit Henry particularly well, for Josiah was a prince who, it had been hoped, would reunite and reform the divided kingdom of Israel, just as the Stuarts had reunited (though perhaps not yet reformed) Britain. The type not only explains Henry’s death, but it hints at the lost potential mourned by so many Protestant poets. Under Josiah, it was hoped, Israel and Judah might reunite. Josiah, too, had portended the reform of Israel’s worship before his untimely death. Even before the Prince died, writers and preachers in his circle referred to him again and again as Josiah — the King of Judah and reformer of God’s church. Josiah was Henry’s “parallel,” according to Josuah Sylvester, the most favored court poet. After the Prince’s death — for Josiah, too, had died young — the type seemed even more convincing. Daniel Price, Henry’s court chaplain, drove the message in again and again in the deluge of memorial sermons he published in the following years. In a sermon on Math 26:31, for example, published with another under the title of “Lamentations for the death of the late Illustrious Prince Henry: and the dissolution of his religious Familie,” Price draws out the comparison, noting 1-1 connections between the life and death of Henry and Josiah. Henry is “our Josias,” and he died for the sins of his people. In his lament, in fact, the prince and the King of Judah seem almost conflated through Price’s attempt to mimic the language of the Old Testament:

Witnesse Iosias the dearing of God, the apple of his eye, the signet on his right hand;

---


Prophetcied of three hundred yeeres before his birth: lamented among the posteritie of the lewes, after his death: yet Iosias must be smitten; Iosias, whose remembrance is like the perfume that is made by the Apothecary, sweet as hony in all mouthes, and as musicke at a banquet of wine; he that was a patterne of reformation to all succeeding Princes: yet Josias must be smitten.107

In the last line, Price seems to be thinking about how well Henry fit the ‘patterne.’

Yet, Josiah, if a ubiquitous comparison, is by no means a simple one. It flirted with politically dangerous content, and the unspoken associations linking other figures in power to more sinister biblical characters, as well as the insinuation that the church was in need of a great reformer, likely offended the court. If Henry was Josiah, did that imply that James was the wicked and Idolatrous Amon? And what could it mean in this context that Josiah’s priest had found the law of God in the temple and Josiah had restored its legal status? It would seem to imply, though it may be dangerous to openly advocate, a return to worship based exclusively on what could be demonstrated from the scriptures. The type inevitably hinted at discontent with political and ecclesiastical authorities. An anonymous work printed first in 1590, *A Reformation of Religion by Iosiah*, illuminates Josiah’s contemporary meaning. The work is a typical call for further reformation, claiming a special significance for England, and a failure of the English people to live up to God’s calling: “as with Israel and Judah, so with us the Lord hath dealt, towitt, that as the girdle cleaveth to the loynes of a man, so hath the Lord tyed himself to this whole nation, that we might be his people.”108 This should be rectified, the author claims in a very Foxian manner, by princes replicating

that most singular example of Josiah, the anointed of the Lord, who unto Judah was the breath of their Nostrils, the Crowne of their head, yea, the joy of their heart, and who of the Lord was so accepted, as by his spirit he witnesseth of him, that like unto him was

107 Ibid., 454.

there no King before, that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soule, and with all his might, according to all the Lawes of Moses.\textsuperscript{109}

Reformation in the sense of this pamphlet follows Josiah’s focus on the scriptures and calls for an overhaul of English worship. The prince – Elizabeth when first published, James and then Charles during later iterations – should take on the reform, “goe in hand a fresh with the worke left unperfect, that we adde those things in the Church which be wanting, and cut off the things which are superfluous.”\textsuperscript{110} Herein lies Josiah’s chief significance, the reformer of worship in Judah.

Not only did the type critique the English Church, however, but it raised the same debates about the national (English? British?) community which had remained central in Henry’s career. The exact contours of the metaphorical Judah seem difficult to establish. Much of the post-Armada confidence that the English were indeed an elect people evaporated during James’s reign, and fervent Protestants turned again outward to their coreligionists abroad. Henry is seen by his followers as an international prince, the hope of international Protestantism, while remaining at the same time an English prince. Judah, at some points, seems to align merely with England, or perhaps an Anglo-centric Britain. At other moments, however, the trope of the Church as Israel broadly extents Henry’s potential influence: he is the Josiah to all of Christendom, destined to end idolatry and usher in peace. At still other times, the divide between Israel and Judah reminded writers of England and Scotland, and Scotland, at least, saw itself as the more holy, Judah, with their Prince Henry Josiah. As Conrad Russell has argued in his discussion of the British problems igniting the civil war, the one thing Scotland knew they had was the better religion, the truer church. The religious writing therefore also engaged with the
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prince’s community, remaining as complex and multifaceted as any of the elegies. The typology associated with Israel again pushed Henry’s borders outward, though in a markedly different way than the imperialism of Alexander.

The sermons printed by Price, Henry’s chaplain and a noted anti-Catholic polemicist, after Prince Henry’s death revive many of the same concerns found in the elegies – that the death of the prince will disperse the community, that the Catholic world might triumph, that Britain had sustained a great national loss. Indeed both the title and the imagery of his work demonstrate a strong Donnian influence, with a focus particularly on decomposition and disintegration. It also offers an example of how these problems were often filtered through the Protestant understanding of the international church, furthering complicating the attempt to write Britain. The sermon already quoted, on Mathew 26, frames itself as another of the elegies:

A Great Prince is falne in Israel; the ioy of the Christian world is deceased, Ichabod, the glory of Israel is departed: Howle ye poore Firre Trees, your Cedar is fallen, Lachrimis non verbis, miserationibus non orationibus opus est.

I know it is contrary to the grounds of Art, presently, at the first entrance, to hoise vp sayles in such a sea oflamentation and sorrow: But misery observes no rules of Oratory.111

Price’s purposefully antiquated parallelism, mimicking the language of the Old Testament, his heavy reliance on metaphor, and his self-conscious discussion of his rhetoric all mark the sermon as participating in the elegiac commemoration of the prince. As Barbara Lewalski has shown, Price and many of the poets mourning the prince would have esteemed Lamentations and a few of the Psalms as prime exemplars of the elegiac form.112 His first sentence, however, sets up the complexity of Israel, and the borders of that godly and metaphoric nation continue to shift over

111 Ibid., 440.

the series of Price’s sermons. Even in the first line, the prince belonged to Israel and was the ‘joy of the Christian world’; the parallel presents Israel first as international Protestantism.

Price returns continuously to his central verse in a staccato, sententious style. The meditation echoes Chapman’s sentiments traced earlier in this chapter: “I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flocke shall be scattered.”113 Once again, the death of the prince will, Price fears, dissolve the community Henry had founded and cemented. Once again, too, the analogy places Prince Henry in the role of Christ – the good shepherd, ruling over his sheep. Other metaphors in Price’s work stress the centrality of the prince — he is the sun, orbited by happy planets; he is the Cedar, envied by the firs. The most complex and important analogy, however, remains shepherd and sheep, so closely bound to its original antitype that Price sometimes elides the distance between Henry and Christ: “And the sheepe shall be scattered: his poore followers haue no better phrase then the sheepe of his flocke, silly, simple, innocent creatures: Wolues haue dens, Foxes holes, Birds of the heauen nests; but Sheepe wander out of the way in the wildernesse, Errant in montibus agni, they haue no Citie to dwell in.”114 Here in Price’s meditation, ‘his’ becomes both Henry and Christ, for servants of the one were disciples of the other. Against all the claims for British centrality — claims which Price himself makes — the metaphor dislocates the subjects of the prince and the servants of Christ from any fixed geography: ‘they have no Citie to dwell in’. For Price, the scattered sheep, the mournful nation of Israel, have more explicitly transnational connotations than anything in Chapman’s verse.

In Price’s first sermon after the death, which is dominated by an extended comparison of Henry and Josiah, Israel almost always stands in simply for the English people. This is most
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evident in his discussion of culpability. God smote Henry, just as he had once smote Josiah, because of national sin, and the sins Price lists are recognizably English:

a remnant of Baal in the land, resembling our Papists. Secondly, Priests and Chemarims, fit parallels to our Priests and Jesuits. Thirdly, in the 5. verse, there were some that swore by the Lord, and sware by Malcham, equalling the false-harted, halfe hollow-harted Hipocrsites of two Religions in these dayes. [Ver&s;e 6] Fourthly, in the 6. verse, some that turned backe from the Lord, like to our Ephraimitall Apostatical reuolters. Fiftly, some that sought not the Lord, nor inquired after him, shadowing the Atheists of our land. [Ver&s;e 8] Sixthly, in the 8. verse, such as were cloathed with strange apparell, the characters of the guls and gallants of our dayes. [Ver&s;e 9] In the 9. verse, some that daunced vpon the threshold so proudly; the note of the quaint Crane-paced Courtiers of this time. Lastly, those that filled houses by cruelty and deceit; the brand of the sinfull and couetous Citizens of this Citie.\(^\text{115}\)

The City referenced is clearly London, and shortly Price connects the sins directly with the land in a common nationalist trope: he asks “whether the sinnes of this Land, and especially this Citie and Court, be not equall to any of any Land.”\(^\text{116}\)

The type of Israel, however, contained within it the possibility of more international readings, and Price’s sermon preached the very next day extends the focus to include all members of the true church. The transition goes almost unnoticeed; Price claims only that he spoke of the shepherd during the first sermon, and he will speak of the sheep during the second.\(^\text{117}\) But the sheep now represent all the members of the true church scattered throughout the world, never contained geographically. A kind of exile imposed on the sheep, in fact, precludes a purely national reading; they are never gathered together: “One must be like a Pellican in the wildernesse, another like a Storcke in the desart, some like the Turtle on the house-top, others like Doues in the holes of the rockes, they cannot be together, but like grapes

\(^{115}\) Ibid., 457-8.
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\(^{117}\) Does the unspoken transition suggest that Price has not fully thought through the relationship between the two, not used, in contemporary vernacular, the judgment to discern their differences?
after a vintage, here one, there one.”\textsuperscript{118} Price stresses the importance of church unity against this menacing division, a division potentially exacerbated by the prince’s death: “Remember, branches must grow together, members agree together, sheep feede together.”\textsuperscript{119} The transnationalism of the message would have been even clearer to Price’s original audience, for all three short phrases insinuated long-established, biblical metaphors for the church: a tree, a body, a flock of sheep. At times in the second sermon, Price seems anxious that the death of Prince Henry threatens to dissolve the religious community into the national or local community. The opportunity to unite all Protestant nations against Rome, ever precarious, is nearly lost: the sheep shall be scattered. Just as Henry played an important role for many — especially Scottish — writers in cementing the British Union, he also represented for several of his zealous religious followers the potential of a larger pan-Protestant union In these moments, mourning for the prince and the borders of Israel become most international: “Oh, why is there not a generall thaw through-out all mankinde? why in this debashed Ayre do not all thing expire, seeing Time lookes vpon vs with watry eyes, disheueld lockes, and heauie dismall lookes; now that the Sunne is gone out of our Firnament, the ioy, the beau[tie, the glory of Israel is departed?”\textsuperscript{120}

Henry’s role as ‘the great Captaine of our Israel’ was repeated again and again, often in these international contexts, and while that could refer to his national role — and usually did, at least in some sense, as crown prince — it also potentially implied his importance to the wider Christian Church. In Price’s sermon two years later, upon the second anniversary of his death, he carefully rewrites the prince’s myth to have been primarily about this religious kingdom. His exemplars were never classical, imperial, or national, but instead biblical: “as Alexander was
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incited by Achilles example, and Caesar by Alexander: So David moveth Solomon, and Iosias is enflamed by Davids religious profession… Prince Henry was the true representation of these… lovely Isaac, loving Ioseph, Princely Iosiah, true hatred David, beloved Daniel, holy Samuel, faithful Timothy were his patterns.”¹²¹ George Wither makes the same move in his elegy for the prince, but Price’s stronger dismissal of the Alexanderian template — a comparison so prized by the prince during his life — captures the growing shift from Henry’s national to religious significance. Prince Henry, according to Price, cared little for the unjust expansion of empire, but instead for the safety of the church. The sides have been drawn apart, and Price’s frustration with the nation and the court are apparent during short and vitriolic outbursts against James’s peace: “Peace being alienated from its own grace, and become the truce of lust, and rust of valour, the death of the army, and decay of the navie.”¹²² With the Catholic threat still looming and the nation sidelined, the Church, far more than the English or British people, needs the hero.

**Britain’s Lost Empire**

By the mid-seventeenth century, English and Scottish Protestants had adopted other heroes, and religious war ravaged the continent, but Henry’s image continued to linger as a site of lost potential. Indeed, the disastrous early years of the Thirty Years War made Protestants feel the loss more keenly. In the decade leading up to the Wars of Three Kingdoms, Henry’s myth made a temporary comeback, as he once again became a site of political combat, adopted by both the court of Charles and his most adamant critics. There were three biographies of Henry, and their publication history demonstrates the challenge of disentangling the presentation and reception of the Prince during his lifetime from the polemical use of his image during the reigns


¹²² Ibid., 11.
of his father and brother. W.H. (identified by Roy Strong as most likely William Haydon) wrote a series of anecdotes, a biography that reads almost like an anticipation of Boswell, which William Christian printed at Leiden in 1634. It was dedicated to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, Henry’s sister, wife of the Frederick V, prince Palatine, and (as we shall see in the next chapter) a rallying figure for Protestant internationalists. A second biography was written by Henry’s Treasurer, Sir Charles Cornwallis, and printed in 1641. Cornwallis is in fact credited with two works that year, a shorter “Discourse of the most Illustrious Prince Henry,” printed by John Benson, and “The Life and Death of our Late most Incomparable and Heroique Prince Henry,” printed by John Dawson. Strong suggests that the “Life” was actually written by John Hawkins, who is credited in the manuscript version of the account.\(^{123}\) Both printers hope they will interest the young prince Charles, later Charles II, and dedicate their works to him. Henry’s first biographies therefore appeared not immediately after his death, but instead the first during the high tension of the 30s, and, remarkably, two during the crisis year of 1641.

Part of any investigation of these works must ask why they were finally printed only in the build-up to civil war. What polemical or political purposes did Henry’s life continue to serve, and how had this changed in the decades since the prince’s death? What can this tell us about the role Henry — along with the other heroes — played in formation of national and religious identity? Despite some attempts to reimagine Henry as a “Laudian saint,” the dead prince shadows over his brother Charles during the growing tension of his reign. Henry offered English and Scottish people an alternate possibility, an idea of a different kind of British identity that may have fructified under the elder brother: militant, Protestant, committed to a simple, biblical worship and the transnational cause. Henry’s posthumous image offered, in a way, an alternate head

around which British national identity might be constructed. Even years later, the biographies remained interested in nation and empire.

All three life-writers invoke the prince’s national and ethnic identities as they narrate the Henry’s life, rehearsing the British problems which Henry had hoped to solve. In Haydon’s biography, the anecdotes often return to the ethnic makeup of the prince and his claim to multiple nations. England and Scotland receive a particular focus, and — though the writer prioritizes England — he stresses that the Prince had seen them as united:

Beeing asked of a Nobleman, whether after his Father hee had rather be King of England or Schotland? He demanded, whether of them was best? And answere being made, that it was England, then (said he) would I have both.124

The answer demonstrates Henry’s wit, but his claim at the time, given the context of the British Union, also reinforces the crown’s ability to unite the two peoples. In some ways, the question itself seems impertinent, for Henry would of course imagine himself king of both, just as his answer declares. Henry insists on treating the two nations as equal under him — and perhaps even erasing national distinction. Adapting the saying of Virgil, he claims even more pointedly, “Be it English or Scot he, no difference will I make.”125 The subjective claim — that what matters is what the prince ‘makes’ of nationality — demonstrates how the union will work.

Haydon’s biography seems most likely aimed at an English readership, however, and it works to establish even this inclusive Henry as primarily an English prince. Even if Henry ceased to descry national difference, people certainly recognized the many foreign bloodlines that merged in the future king. Yet while the prince recognizes that he has descended from the nobility of many nations, he prizes his English heritage above all:

125 Ibid., 12. [Tros Rutilusve fuat nullo discrimine habebo]
The King asking him whether he loved Englishmen or Frenchmen better? Hee answered, Englishmen. The King demanded the cuase thereof; because, said he, I am a kin to moe noble persones of England, then of Fraunce. Then the King asked him, whether he loved the English or the Germanes better, hee answered; the English. Whereunto the King replying, that his Mother was a German, hee answered, Sir, you are the cause thereof. \(^{126}\)

The question itself moves from Catholic to Protestant powers, reinforcing the Prince’s strong connections throughout Northern Europe. Indeed, through his mother, the prince was linked not only to the Protestant power of Denmark, but smaller Protestant courts throughout the Empire. The preference for England above France can easily be answered, for more nobility stems from his English ancestors; but the German blood in him is never denigrated as less noble, simply less important than the ‘English’ half he inherited from James. Of course, framing James himself as English rather than Scottish is already a polemical move, making England again synonymous with Britain, but the point for the English in this particular anecdote is that Henry, at least, sees himself first and foremost of their nation.

On the other hand, the later biographies stress the international character of the prince, understood through an anti-papal lens. Hawkins’s work celebrates the prince’s role in the pan-Protestant marriage of Henry’s sister Elizabeth and Friedrich V, Prince Palatine, which was accomplished “for great Britaines eternal felicity, and terror of all Papists,” (a bold but unconvincing claim by its publication in 1641).\(^ {127}\) The nationalist sentiment in Hawkins’s work resides alongside pan-Protestant sentiment: he notes the loss “of all the whole Land (who said, her losse, above all was most unspeakable,” presumably though ambiguously referencing either England or the United Britain.\(^ {128}\) The nation feels the loss primarily because of the prince’s piety, and his strong anti-papalism: “Popery with all the adjuncts and adherents thereof, he hated

\(^ {126}\) Ibid., 13-4.
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As happens so often — and will be more closely examined later in this chapter — the internationalism of the church and the more nationalistic sentiment around Britain become confusingly entangled in Hawkins’s discussion of religion. During the deathbed scene, Prince Henry confesses his belief in “the Religion and Church wherein hee lived; which his highnesse acknowledged to bee the onely true Church, wherein onely, and without which there was no salvation. Then of his faith in Christ onely, by him, and in him, without any merits of his owne.” The first block of the first sentence — especially ‘the Church wherein her lived’ — implies that Hawkins’s biography is invoking the creed of the Church of England. The insistence on it being the “onely” true church, outside of which there is no salvation, radically extends the church in focus. As we saw in the first chapter, Protestant reformers universally agreed there was no salvation outside the church; they disagreed, however, over the extension and visibility of the people of God. Few, if any, would have claimed that England was the ‘onely’ true church — it was, usually, part of a larger network of true churches throughout history and throughout the world, either dialectically opposed to Rome or, especially during the Caroline period, in some ways including Rome. When Hawkins laments for Henry as “the Prince of our Israel” in this context, it has again become very difficult to disentangle the nationalist from the pan-Protestant meanings. Yet the stress, especially considering the anti-Catholicism and the year of publication, seems to favor an international role for Prince Henry. Just as in Price’s sermons published over twenty years earlier, the full loss of the prince remained unknown and unmeasurable, his potential for the nations and the church irrecoverable.
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Conclusion

Henry’s brief career therefore highlights some of the crucial features of the pan-Protestant heroic tradition. In an age of personalistic nationalism, these figures were seen as essential in the formation and preservation of national and religious communities. Poets and clergymen almost universally claim that Henry binds his subjects together: he is the cornerstone of the temple, the shepherd of the flock. As these metaphors imply, however, writers plumbed ecclesiology for their discussion of the British nation Henry established, and the borders between church and nation remained vexed. Early moderns could significantly disagree over the prince’s primary loyalties while praising him with the tropes, types, and images long associated with the pan-Protestant heroic tradition. Through the polyvalence of language, the discourse surrounding Henry’s image once again reveals competition within apparent unity, and religious, national, local and transnational communities remained entangled in the imaginations of many of the prince’s followers. This confusion suggests that historians have been right to admonish too facile a confidence in the existence of early modern nationalism, for the lingering transnational elements continue to compete with and even partially define the nationalist sentiment.

The most important transnational context for Henry was the British Empire. Not only is the multi-kingdom component a neglected feature in scholarship on the prince, but Henry’s novel and in many ways unique Britishness has received little attention from historians of early modern Britain. English and Scottish writers competed to stake their claim in the prince, born in Scotland but created in England, who offered a British identity radically different from that of his father the king – expansionist, imperial, Protestant, and even continental. Indeed, in Henry we might see how Britishness itself could still be firmly anchored to the continent throughout the period, and Henry’s image served as a site for debate and collaboration in the Jacobean writing of
Britain. Death changed the story but perhaps only reinforced the importance of his image, and
the dead Henry, the sainted Protestant, retained some of his ability to create and hold
communities together. On a practical level, with the money dried up and their martial leader in
the grave, his followers dispersed and struggled to find — many unsuccessfully — adequate
livings at other courts. (Sylvester is a particularly poignant example of this, his reputation in
English letters never recovering the prince’s death.) But on an ideological level, the Prince as a
national or religious hero remained important in the identity of Englishmen over the next
generations. As this chapter has shown, his death subjected his image to further competition, as
writers struggled to control its meaning and appropriate it for their own uses. As discussion of
foreign religious wars became increasingly divisive, the image of Henry – a young prince who
had desired to lead armies in Germany against Rome – was recast more and more as a religious
hero, which allowed the appropriation of this heroic role once more by a foreign prince. The
complex nationality of Henry had paved this trajectory, but popular disapproval of Jacobean non-
intervention galvanized the English adoption of foreign leaders.

Protestant fervor energized England in the months leading up to Henry’s death; between
the Jules-Cleves crisis and the impending marriage of Elizabeth Stuart and the Prince Palatine, it
marked a high-point of Protestant self-confidence. As Williamson notes, “In England, those last
months before the arrival of the Palatine Elector were characterized by an escalation of
Protestant agitation against Catholic Europe, and at the center of that aggressive talk sat the
image of Prince Henry as the conqueror knight, like a shrine to which the national sacrifice to
Mars must be addressed.”¹³¹ Early in the second decade of the seventeenth century, war seemed
unavoidably approaching, and under Henry confidence in British military capacity peaked. And

yet once again Williamson’s assumption of nationalist significance is belied immediately by the quoted material, the anonymous “French Herald.” The anonymous author exhorts Henry, “If it be not your self... then I see no Generall in the world when our Christian Amry must come into the field.” The survey for potential leaders extends far across Europe, and the army headed by the prince is the Church Militant, the Christian army which presumably includes all faithful Protestants. It was not England alone on edge, not even a reinvigorated and powerful multinational Britain, but the entire Protestant world. Certainly Henry’s symbology had important national ramifications, but more and more, as internationalist Protestants gathered around the prince, his society was understood through metaphors of the church, and more and more it looked like a visible manifestation of the church militant.

This study of nationalism in simpler terms is a study of how people viewed their relationship to one another. As Baker notes of British history, “a kind of resonant dis-harmony” exists in the attempt to recover these lost positions, since all the traditions, and sometimes even the aesthetic forms, were on the losing side. Though Henry’s court was never associated with the marginalized people of the islands, it did for a short time forward an idea of Britain – a Protestant transnationalism – that was eventually overcome by nationalism and erased from history. And yet, a transnational history, as John Morrill states of British history, is “a story of not what is, or even what was, but what was in the process of becoming.” Often, as many scholars have suggested and this chapter has argued, heroic figures helped cement communities together, becoming the shared heritage of a nation. However, as this chapter has also attempted to show, conceptions of community still widely varied, and for many English, Scottish, Dutch
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and German writers it remained imbedded in the metaphors provided by ecclesiology. In the next chapter, I will discuss a more radical break between nationalism and internationalist Protestantism, something never fulfilled under Henry in part because he, as England’s crown prince, could himself unite the concepts. According to Williamson, Henry’s death coincided with the “end of Puritan hopes.” ¹³⁵ This, however, is not entirely accurate. As the next two chapters will show, Henry’s death marks the end of the Protestant hero who embodies both nationalism and Protestantism – though Henry himself had often failed in that task. It marks a more definitive break between the nation and the church, as stricter Protestants begin adopting heroes from other nations and slowly moving away from their own peace-loving and somewhat ostentatious court. The last two heroes of this study challenge a national focus more directly while enshrining themselves in the pan-Protestant cultural imaginary: the German Friedrich V, Prince Palatine, and the conquering Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus. After Henry’s death, the torch of Pan-Protestant heroism passes once again outside of England to Henry’s friend and future brother-in-law: Friedrich V, Prince Palatine.

3. “A League that Shall not End, till Thames and Rhine Leave Off to Run”: Dreams of an Anglo-German Protestant Empire

The ceremony of the marriage between Elizabeth Stuart, James’s only daughter, and the German Elector Prince Frederick V took place on February 14, 1613. It was a lavish affair, the most extravagant of James’s reign and according to a recent monograph devoted to the marriage, “the pinnacle of Protestant European festival.”¹ In all, the masques, fireworks, and feigned sea-battles commissioned by the court to commemorate the union cost over 93,000 pounds, nearly bankrupting the monarchy. The celebrations lasted for five days in London, and were extended for months on the couple’s parade through Protestant lands and back to Heidelberg. Even those who resided far from London throughout Britain listened enthusiastically to the reports of the ceremony, eager to hear the many full and triumphant accounts quickly printed by the London presses.² To many — both inside England and on the continent — the marriage signaled a decisive shift in James’s pacifist politics toward alliance with the more militant international Calvinists of the Protestant Union, the association of Reformed German states led by the Palatinate.

From the English court, however, this alliance remained somewhat more cautious, qualified. The vast cacophony of voices commenting on the wedding — national and

---


² One pamphlet opens, for example, claiming that it was written “to give satisfaction to certain of my acquaintance in the country, most willing to understand the manner of the tryumphes holden at the royall marriage.” *The Mariage of Prince Frederick, and the Kings Daughter, the Lady Elizabeth, upon Shrove-Sunday last* (London, 1613).
international; court and country; poet and preacher — offers a complex mixture of competing ideological interpretations of the match, and the bulk of the material published for the occasion has only recently begun to receive sustained attention. In Germany, theater historians and musicologists have traced the influence of the court performances on later Baroque trends, and recently scholars of German culture have studied the artistic results of cultural interaction (English, Germanic, and Danish). From inside English scholarship, the focus has generally been on court festival, especially the masque, and its political and ideological meanings. Frances Yates initiated discussion on the art and policy surrounding the wedding over four decades ago, and since scholars have confirmed, developed, and complicated her vision of the masque as a novel and clear “policy statement” of Protestant unity. Most recently, a monograph devoted exclusively to the marriage was published to mark its 400th anniversary. *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival* brings together a diverse and interdisciplinary group of scholars to investigate myriad aspects of the marriage celebrations and propaganda. The engaging articles offer a model of how best to treat a “transnational,” “transcultural” event; in their words, the volume “maps out the cultural, temporal, artistic, and geographical range of these magnificent celebrations, situating them within the broad context of Protestant Europe.

---

3 Surveys of court theater in Heidelberg date back over a century: Frederick Walter, *Geschichte des Theaters und der Musik am Kurpfälzischen Hofe* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1898); Gerhard Pietzsch, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Musik am kurpfälzischen Hof zu Heidelberg bis 1622* (Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1963). Also, as the recent monograph notes, a revival of interest has led to several major exhibits on the couple (2003, 2004).


before the Thirty Year’s War.” The work and insights offered in this book, as will be obvious, provide a foundation for much of this chapter, a base from which to think about issues of church, nation, and heroism.

Still, much of this excellent scholarship focuses primarily on the masques and festivals put on at court, and the diverse array of epithalamia remain understudied. With a few notable exceptions, literary scholars have generally neglected the occasional verse associated with this event, and much of the verse is particularly rich in ideological meaning. In part, this stems from a continued scholarly interest primarily in the reaction of the court and the political elite (as evidenced by the focus on the masque). The context offered by the scholarship on the festivities — which highlights the same themes and tropes appearing again and again across Europe and interprets their regional significance — deepens the meaning of the poetry; yet also, engaged readings of neglected poets, preachers, and pamphleteers demonstrate ways in which publications from outside of court challenge or re-imagine the meaning of the event, despite the best attempts of the court to maintain strict control.

This chapter offers perhaps the best evidence for the transnational celebration of these heroes: the English and the Germans of the Palatinate recognized they were collaborating in their celebration of a great Protestant occasion, if they may not, as we shall see, have agreed precisely

7 Smart and Wade, The Palatine Wedding, 12.

on its meaning. My argument in this chapter will build on the growing recognition of division in the apparent unity of the ceremonies. Surveying both the vast occasional writing and the official ceremonies in England, the Netherlands, and Germany, I will argue first that there was a subtle struggle to appropriate the event’s meaning: James and much of the court ceremony attempted to frame the marriage in terms of national – and exclusively dynastic – significance, while other English writers, along with many Germans, highlighted the implicit pan-Protestant meaning. Once again, much of this disagreement is masked by the way the national and religious communities continue to overlap. Indeed, many hoped the marriage accomplished an alignment of the religious and national communities, making the political union of the nation coterminous with the pan-Protestant church. The marriage opens the question: what does – and what should – a pan-Protestant union look like? The militarism of the pan-Protestant vision, however, separates it most radically from James, who imagines the wedding as one step further to allow the Stuart line to affect an international peace. In the pan-Protestant interpretation, far different from James’s, English national identity threatens to be elided in the face of a wider Protestant empire.

Through this militarism, the past hopes recently placed on Prince Henry are transferred to the German Frederick. Frederick, writers hope, will fill the void left by Henry’s death and assume the mantle of militant pan-Protestantism. Once again, this is an imperial vision, and it is – surprisingly – based in part on the ideas of expansion and imperialism attached to Henry and the British Union. Indeed, as we shall, see, many writers who celebrate the marriage view it as an expansion of the Anglo-Scottish merger effected when James took the crown. As a German Prince, however, Frederick questioned assumptions of an Anglo-centric Protestant empire – even if his marriage had grafted him into the Stuart line – and some English Protestant poets and
writers, already growing disillusioned with James’s pacifistic foreign policy, began a subtle shift in pan-Protestant hopes away from London and toward the Palatinate.

**Competing Narratives of Union**

Much of the complexity of the event starts with James and the official ceremonies staged by the court. While the exact intentions of the king probably will remain irrecoverable, it is unlikely that he intended the pan-Protestant exuberance that the event precipitated. It seems equally questionable how fully James meant to imbue Frederick with the hopes of militant Protestants, given the fact that he later abandoned his daughter and son-in-law after their ill-fated decision to accept the crown of Bohemia and was searching for a Catholic match for the Crown Prince before and after the wedding. And yet, many of the masques and performances he commissioned offer the possibility of a Protestant reading. The celebrations at court register an ambivalent investment in the cause — at least, many scholars have detected an investment. Frances Yates, in her reading of Protestant unity, points to way that the masques rehash some of the most important patterns of militant Elizabethan Protestantism. The masques, festivities, and decorations all, according to Yates, forecast a return of England to the interventionist role it had under Elizabeth. Jerzy Limon discovers even more unity in the ceremonies: the entire event should be read as “one surprisingly consistent text that is logical and creates meanings on several levels.” The traditional interpretation of the ceremonies highlights the harmony and collaboration between the masques, as each of them appropriates the same themes – for example, the cycle of elements. Even if the event can be read as a coherent whole, however, contemporaries apparently did not, and James quickly disproved any promises of intervention.

---

9 Yates admits, however, that this may not have been James’s intent: “It was not fully realized at the time that this view of the alliance was not that of James himself.” Yates, *Rosicrucian Enlightenment*, 7.

Kevin Curran has challenged the apparent unity by noting the difference between James’s intent -- balancing this Protestant marriage with a Catholic match for his son to ensure European peace -- and the hope of militant Protestants: “for many, the Protestant dimension of the Palatine wedding presented an opportunity to refashion British national identity as religiously interventionist; to move away from a form of national rhetoric narcissistically focused on the internal cohesion of Great Britain.”

If the dominant message from court had, in recent years, become insular and isolationist, an equally compelling form of transnational, outwardly-focused British and Protestant identity had been kept alive by the cult of Prince Henry. Both Barbara Lewalski and Curran detect traces of Henry’s influence remaining in the masques, though now muted, after his death. Though the performances do display a kind of overarching unity, a closer investigation shows the entire event as “fragmented and muffled,” divided over a set of ideological questions: “to who does this marriage ‘belong’? To which set of political values? Where does fictional authority lie in the Palatine wedding celebrations?”

Curran has rightly noted the dissonance in the ceremony, the ideological battle for control. This battle involves both ownership and meaning, as Curran claims, but on a larger level, I think, it involves how writers and spectators understood the political and social relations through which they interpreted their world. English writers celebrating the occasion belonged simultaneously to the nation and the church, and their participation in the marriage celebration, rather than exclusively a political decision about what British-ness should be, worked to determine the meaning of their participation in the Protestant church. Curran’s insight into the fragmented and multifaceted

---


nature of the reaction to the wedding can be highlighted even more clearly by including the epitaphamia and sermons written to celebrate it, especially by those poets and preachers who, as they often themselves note, lived and wrote far from court.

Regardless of the diversity of reception, and the many hopes of fervent Protestants for a trans-national religious community, I agree with Yates, Limon, and the many critics who argue that the court intended the masques as a unified and coherent whole: the repeated imagery, the performances tied together by elements (earth, fire, sea), the meticulous planning by court, the sheer investment in the occasion. The masques, processions, and fireworks dealt with such powerful and pervasive images, however, belonging to the cultural imaginary of all of Northern Europe, that they often were not received in the simple, defined way the court may have intended. Indeed, James may well have understood this, and capitalized politically on the ambivalence of images and themes. Insinuating a Protestant focus within a more complex display of Stuart power and European peace facilitated James’s preferred political approach of appeasement. It seems clear from the myriad reactions that no single consistent understanding of the “policy statement” was derived from the events. A basic account of the important themes and messages, however, especially as illuminated by James’s ongoing search for a Spanish match and his later career, can help frame some of the more radical poetry.

James, it is worth noting, seemed aware of the potential for misinterpretation — the ideological danger of the event. In Thomas Campion’s Lord’s Masque, the only masque commissioned by royalty — in fact, by James himself — the opening theme involves Orpheus commanding Mania to release Eutheus, poetic madness, from his imprisonment. Jove has sent Orpheus, and Jove’s power guarantees control over poetic fury, which has a tendency to wander. On this occasion, however, with the explicit backing of Jove, the work of poets should be
Nor are these Musicks, Showes, or Reveles vaine
When thou adorn'st them with thy Phaebean braine;
Th'are palate sick of much more vanitie,
That cannot taste them in their dignitie.
Iove therefore lets thy prison'd sprights obtaine
Her libertie and fiery scope againe:
And here by me commands thee to create
Inventions rare, this night to celebrate,
Such as become a nuptial by his will
Began and ended.\textsuperscript{14}

Poetry is clearly hazardous, locked up with several other “franticks.” The scene fronts the dangerous misinterpretation that threatens both James and the poetry of the celebration, and it registers an anxiety about the ability to manipulate reception. The masque is at least thinking about those “palate sick” men who do not interpret the masques “in their dignitie.” With Jove’s backing — the poetry begun and ended by him — the poets should stay in line for the event; but the potential for misinterpretation, however flawed, remains.

Uneasiness about the “franticks” makes up a larger part of the masquing than other critics have noticed. The “franticks” are not only imprisoned with poetic fury in Campion’s masque, but they play a role in the other masques as well — one of the repeated themes throughout the celebration. In George Chapman’s \textit{The Memorable Maske}, the main character first introduced is Capriccio, who, as Limon points out, was also a character in Henry Peacham’s \textit{Minerva Britanna}, an “unstaied mind.”\textsuperscript{15} More pointedly, the masque in an aside attacks religious “franticks.” The half-French, half-Swiss wit Capriccio complains conventionally of the

\textsuperscript{14} Thomas Campion, \textit{A Relation of the Late Royall Entertainment Given by the Right Honorable the Lord Knowles, at Cawsome-House neere Redding: To Our Most Gracious Queene, Queene Anne, in her Progresse Toward the Bathe, upon the Seven and Eight and Twentie Dayes of Aprill. 1613. Whereunto is Annexed the Description, Speeches, and Songs of the Lords Maske, Presented in the Banqueting-house on the Mariage Night of the High and Mightie, Count Palatine, and the Royally Descended the Ladie Elizabeth} (London: 1613), sig. C2V.

\textsuperscript{15} Limon, \textit{The Masque of Stuart Culture}, 150.
sinfulness of riches to Plutus (a case of not knowing one’s audience), and the god of wealth
scorns him in turn as a Puritan. The bellows Capriccio wears upon his head seem to confirm his
foolishness: “a Religion-forger I see you are, and presume of inspiration from these Bellowes;
with which yee study to blow up the setled governments of kingdoms.”\textsuperscript{16} Capriccio, as a man of
wit, of course objects to the label and proves himself no Puritan; but all the Jonsonian and
ceremonialist anti-Puritan rhetoric comes through already in this masque, perhaps surprisingly in
the main performance celebrating the marriage that held such promise for English Puritans. They
are, according to Chapman, foolish and given to fancy, their thoughts blown about by the winds
in their mind. The attack on Puritans lacks context in the masque, and seems to exist almost
solely to assert an anti-militant agenda, to ensure the people that this marriage signaled no
change in James’s policy of general peace. Indeed, the threat imagined by Puritans is
noteworthy; at a time when so many militant Protestants hoped that this match would shift the
religious and political map, the masque criticizes the Puritanical desire to “blow up the setled
governments of kingdoms.”\textsuperscript{17} As we shall see, much of the writing that originated outside of the
court imagined that the marriage effected just such a rearranging of political borders. Implicitly,
Chapman aligns the Puritans with the Jesuits, another common move, and the line asserts a
preference for the status quo, the already existing political and religious organization.

In Francis Beaumont’s masque, a similar scorn for country people — not uncommon in
masques generally — stands out, apparently connected to this fear of zealots. One of the anti-
masques, the one presented by Isis, ushers in a group of commoners. The preface describing the
masque explains that “the Match shall likewise be blessed with the love of the Common People,”

\textsuperscript{16} George Chapman, \textit{The Memorable Masque of the Two Honourable Houses or Innes of Court} (London, 1614), Sig. D3V.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., sig. D3V.
but the dance itself seems to care little about their opinion. Along with the other country people — a shepherd, a country wench, host, hostess — dance a He and She Baboon and a He and She Fool. The procession is led, in fact, by the She Fool. The entire performance is met with “perpetuall laughter and applause” which was “above the music.” Beaumont employs both classist and misogynistic stereotypes to undercut and reinterpret and unwanted enthusiasm. The masque exerts a marked social pressure on those who would interpret the match as a victory for pan-Protestant interests, and frames the misinterpretation as an aesthetic failure in the audience — one based in their circumscription outside a community of knowers. It mattered little to the court what the ridiculous fools in the country thought of the marriage — or at least, so the masque suggests.

Other scholars have discussed the masques and their politics in detail, but I would like to quickly reexamine some of the recurrent themes, both to attempt to understand the court’s narrative of the event, and to use their view as a counterpoint for interpretation of the poems and sermons produced by writers who were not connected to the court. Curran has admirably discussed the Protestant militant literary culture, the remnants of Henry’s circle, and he has demonstrated how the sanctioned celebrations pushed back with a focus on James’s authority and an interpretation of the event as purely — or at least, most importantly — dynastic. Curran examines Campion’s *The Lords’ Masque* and finds that “the primary aim … is to construct the court as the source of national myth, with King James as its vocal centre point.” All the masques, as masques generally do, were meant to focus on the power and authority of the King, to interpret the King as the source of all political and social unity. Thus, in Chapman’s masque,
too, we find James as the sun, bright enough to expel all error from Britain. According to
musicologists and scholars of dance, even the choreography aimed at a fundamentally dynastic
interpretation of the marriage: “The masque dance performed by eight couples thus animated and
embodied the key theme of peace through dynastic marriage for the international audience.”

While this view of community – centered on and defined by the monarchy – exists inherently in
the genre of the masque, other court celebrations continually re-center every meaning of the
event on James and his line. And this reading successfully influenced how other writers
discussed the occasion. Even outside the court ceremonies, Christof Ginzel has found sustained
attention to developing a dynastic foundation in the Neo-Latin epithalamia, though often this
foundation buoyed hopes for future imperial expansion. These too, as Ginzel shows, are
problematically political, and the focus on expansion opens the troubling and unwanted
rearrangement of political borders. The court, apparently, viewed this marriage primarily
through a dynastic lens, shoring up the power of the already well-connected (through Anne of
Denmark) Stuart line.

With the talk of the Stuart dynasty comes a stark focus on British meaning and
uniqueness, oddly pushing against all the talk of the “wedding of Thames and Rhine” (the central
conceit of Campion’s masque). For Chapman, the match exemplifies general, classical morals:
the marriage of honor and wealth, aided by virtue. The central premise of Chapman’s masque —
that Plutus has become enamored with and devoted himself to honor — reinforces the supposed
ethical and hereditary superiority of the nobility; wealth belongs to the most honorable, who are
also, therefore, the most virtuous. The masque employs much of the language of British

21 Anne Daye, “Graced with measures: Dance as an International Language in the Masques of 1613,” in The
Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival, ed. Sarah Smart and Mara R. Wade (Wiesbaden,
Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013), 303.

22 Ginzel, “‘Iam video Babylona rapi,’” 126.
exceptionalism similar, for example, to many of Shakespeare’s history plays, the kind of language that many scholars have highlighted in their argument for an emergent nationalism; it celebrates the island, cut off and in isolation, just as contemporaries were hoping the match would draw it closer to the continent:

That this Ile is (for the excellency of it) divided from the world (divisus ab orbe Britannus) and that though the whole World besides moves; yet this Ile stands fixt on her owne feete, and defies the Worlds mutability, which this rare accident of the arrival of Riches, in one of his furthest-off-scituate dominions, most demonstratively proves.23

Britain resides alone and removed from the world, only it not subject to degeneration. Both the words and the masque machinery reinforce the claim. “Divisus ab orbe” was a phrase used often in British – and especially Stuart – iconography, including, for example, in Part of King James’s Entertainment in Passing to His Coronation. There, Ben Jonson explains that the phrase is “alluding to that of Claudian, -- Et nostro diducta Britannia mundo; and Virgil, -- Et penitus tot divisos obe Britannos.”24 “Divisos ab orbe” registers both the singularity of Britain, disconnected from the continent, and also the re-unification work that James had done by assuming both the English and Scottish crowns. The Palatinate has oddly been elided in this celebration, and at times the masques seem to militate against any hope for an internationalist reading. In fact, the phrase resonates even more with a religious exceptionalism, again dampening the hopes of internationalist Protestants who believed that religion linked them with the Palatinate people.

The quote was excerpted in whole from one of Jerome’s letters and it had become part of the discourse of ecclesiological history that, as Charles Prior has shown, served an important and

23 Chapman, The Memorable Masque, sig B3R. As David Norbrook has shown, the unperformed masque of truth specifically countered this topos. Norbrook, “The Masque of Truth,” 87.

24 Ben Jonson, B.Ion his Part of King Iames his Royall and Magnificent Entertainement (London, 1603), sig. A2V.
polemical role in establishing the British church. \footnote{25} English divines who attempted to prove the hereditary freedom of the British church turned to a quote in Jerome’s epistles, \textit{Epist. Xlvi ad Paulam} [around 388 A.D.]: “Divisus ab orbe nostro Britannus, si in religione processerit, occiduo sole dimisso, quarit locum, fama sibi tantum et Scripturarum relatione cognitum.” \footnote{26}

While this undoubtedly left the British church a Christian church, part of Christendom, it did stress its jurisdictional integrity. In the masque, Britain as a church and a nation stems from — and is almost coterminous with – James. The national and dynastic foci merge. James is again the sun, a learned king outshining all other kings; and from him through Elizabeth extends the greatness of the British (?) race:

\begin{quote}
Blest was thy Mother, bearing Thee,  
Thee only Relick of her Race,  
Made by thy vertues beams a Tree,  
Whose armes shall all the Earth embrace.\footnote{27}
\end{quote}

What exactly Mary Stuart’s ‘race’ was, and how it lines up with the English more generally, remain unclear, but the masque emphasizes James’s glory. Upon seeing him, the “Virginians” turn from worshiping the sun to worshiping him (or “truth” — the two are elided).

The critical interpretation of Chapman’s masque has mirrored interpretation of the event more generally. If the masque did praise James and his foundational importance, it did not do so simply. Increasing interest in both politics and historical context has challenged D. J. Gordon’s 1975 reading of the masque as one of “elegant simplicity,” and Chapman’s work is now

\footnote{25} “[T]he institution of the Christian Church in which they all claimed communion was distinguished by a contested history and hence the business of religious polemic was always firmly rooted within a vast and complex historiographical tradition.” Charles W. A. Prior, \textit{Defining the Jacobean Church} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 4.


\footnote{27} Chapman, \textit{The Memorable Masque}, sig. F3V.
recognized to be embedded in some of the most dense and pluralistic political discourse of the period: colonialism and imperialism. David Lindley, noting the patronage obligations pulling at Chapman, claims the masque offers a “complex perspective upon the Virginian enterprise”; Particia Crouch draws out this complexity to locate at least three competing perspectives in a multi-vocal exploration of early modern English colonialism, especially by focusing on the printed material, which added Chapman’s more radically Elizabethan epithalamium to the text of the procession and masque. Crouch claims that the masque criticizes the greed and failures of the Virginia project while at the same time offering further involvement from James as a solution – one that Prince Henry had advocated. It at first seems odd that contemporaries viewed the colonial project in Virginia as connected to the marriage – though, as other scholars have noted, both were important to Prince Henry. Virginia also, however, raises the Protestant imperialist thinking that animated the marriage, for Chapman, at least (and perhaps his Prince) apparently viewed the expansion of Britain in America as correspondent with the merger with the Palatinate. The kind of missionary project assumes absorption, incorporation – just as the Germans would be -- or were already -- part of the same body. William Symonds, a divine who vehemently supported the Virginia colony and held a rather shoddy record of conformity, had explained this incorporation in a 1609 sermon through the same trope of marriage:

Lord finish this good worke thou hast begun; and marry this land, a pure Virgine to thy kingly sonne Christ Iesus; so shall thy name be magnified: and we shall haue a Virgin or Maiden Britaine, a comfortable addition to our Great Britaine.

---


30 Chapman, The Memorable Masque, sig. A3V.
Difference is effaced as the new world is simply another “Britaine,” and the incorporation is a “comfortable addition,” because of conversion. By making the American Indians brides of Christ, they become almost British. As we shall see, the marriage of Christ and his church became one of the most important types for understanding the union of England and the Palatinate, too. Yet this incorporation – the erasure of national difference – was equally desired and dreaded, and it remained almost an impossibility in the case of Virginia. The inclusion of Virginia signaled very clearly that the event hailed empire, but a clear version of cultural hegemony – the imperialism of a later age – did not fluidly emerge. Chapman’s reliance on the sovereign – even if his treatment of the Virginia project, as Crouch has suggested, may not have pleased James – does front the kind of dynastic imperial project that the other masques suggest.

The strength of this dynastic line, then, will result in world peace, another major theme of the court celebrations, victory over all the religious warfare currently marring Europe. The Protestant aspect of this, as many critics have argued, was muted at court. Victory results not from a dynamic Protestant prince conquering Rome in the apocalyptic struggle, but rather from the peaceful unification of all people together under a powerful and noble imperial line. Beaumont’s masque, invoking the peace that transpires during the Olympian Games, praises Jove/James for such a blessing. Campion makes James responsible for the peace more directly, as the peace of the world rests on Jove’s ability to control the raving franticks. According to Curran, the threat to peace in the masque “suggests not only a general threat to James as privileged national mythmaker, but also the more specific rhetorical disruption of Protestant militancy.”31 The militant Protestant narrative – and the discord of commentary -- threatens to undermine the peace that James creates and buttresses through his monarchical and divine

power. James imagines a peace very different, in other words, from the imposed peace of the imperial conqueror, the kind imagined by Prince Henry’s circle: instead, James’s is a universal, collaborative peace, a kind which likely cannot easily be imagined by Protestants accustomed to thinking of the church as a small and oppressed band eternally opposed to satanic forces.

Though Limon claims that the public festivities — the fireworks and processions — conveyed the same message — at least, by design — as the masques and entertainments at court, the audience expanded greatly, and that message was subject to the misinterpretations that James feared. In an event that promised such massive ramifications for international Protestantism, few writers shared the foci of court. Celebrations for the marriage included both a feigned sea battle and fireworks which were available to the wider London public. The success of these events seems questionable: accounts of yawning noblemen, barely able to resist the soporific tedium, clash with the breathless pamphlets chronicling the occasion for the public. Each event was narrative and symbolic, opening myriad exegetical possibilities. Despite attempts at court to mute the Protestant elements, they remained in place in the celebrations, perhaps remnants of Henry’s planning, and were exaggerated in public interpretations. Not only the Stuart dynasty, but “British” itself becomes derivative, less important, in much of the response to these public events from outside of court. Many misread — perhaps even intentionally and creatively misread, offering new frames for the interpretation of the event to the public — the ceremonies because they did not view them primarily through a “British” lens. Curran has already discussed John Taylor’s account of the feigned battle at sea, which added the Spanish Armada as an interpretive lens.32 The planned struggle of a united Christendom against the Turk instead was

32 “[T]here is certainly the suggestion in his [Taylor’s] account that the celebration of English naval power expressed a desire to use the Anglo-German union as a springboard for a more interventionist military policy.” Curran, “James I and Fictional Authority,” 56.
read through the Catholic/Protestant conflict. Indeed, the frequent mention of the Turk did not
necessarily preclude this understanding, as scholars have shown how fluidly all threats to the true
Protestant church — both Catholicism and Islam — were conflated.\textsuperscript{33} Since Luther, Protestant
iconography had tended to group the pope and “the Turk” inside the apocalyptic binary.

The fireworks, like the sea-battle, apparently faltered at several points and bored the
king.\textsuperscript{34} The pamphlets describing the event, however, race eagerly through the stories told in the
air: an Amazonian queen, St. George and the Dragon; a hart chased by fiery hounds; the
allegorical siege of a castle.\textsuperscript{35} How much of this the audience would be able to interpret seems
somewhat questionable. Yet the show provides another opportunity for conflating national and
transnational figures and for importing a more militant Protestant reading. As many scholars
have noted, the battle between St George and the dragon would likely have recalled the first
book of Spenser’s \textit{Faerie Queene} (at least, after pamphlets had told the spectators that they
viewed St George and the Dragon), hearkening back to Elizabethan heroism.\textsuperscript{36} Interestingly,
however, the English hero of Saint George may have been read in a very non-nationalist way.
Frederick, as a recent knight of the Garter, the order of St George, installed less than a week
before the fireworks, may have been understood as St George in the fireworks scenes — and in

\textsuperscript{33} On the sea fight, see Iain McClure, “The Sea-Fight on the Thames: Performing the Ideology of a Pan-Protestant
Crusade on the Eve of the Palatine Wedding,” in \textit{The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court
Festival} ed. Sarah Smart and Mara R. Wade (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013), 267-288. Also,
Taylor, like many authors of Epithalamia from outside of the court, fears his status as an outsider, and knows that
some may say that he should not write of princely things. He claims upon opening that he writes for those “who are
far remoted, not onely in his Maiesties Dominions, but also in foraine territories.” John Taylor, \textit{Heavens Blessing,
and Earths Ioy} (London, 1613), sig. A3R.

\textsuperscript{34} See John Chamberlain to Alice Carleton, 18 February 1613, in \textit{The Letters of John Chamberlain}, 2 vols., ed.

\textsuperscript{35} Taylor, \textit{Heveans Blessing}, sig. B1R-B2V.

\textsuperscript{36} Curran, “James I and Fictional Authority,” 55; Graham Parry, \textit{The Golden Age Restor’d: The Culture of the Stuart
other appearances, for St George runs throughout the ceremony. Yates, in fact, claims that “It was clearly intended as an allegory of the Elector Palatine as St George.”

In the same way his grandfather, William of Orange, had been portrayed as St George in Dutch propaganda (discussed in the second chapter), Frederick stands in and re-prioritizes the religious over the national implications of the image.

In Curran’s words, again, “The religious associations of the Palatine marriage thus problematized the relationship between monarchical rhetoric and national identity. It threatened to bypass the authority of the king by scripting his island into a role that was larger than ‘British’.” Spectators of the events or readers of their printed account witnessed not an encomium of James and the Stuarts, but rather a celebration of the church; the predispositions of many of the viewers determined how the artistic production would be read. Even more, militant Protestants simply did not see the marriage in purely national or dynastic terms. It was a transnational event, and poets and preachers shared themes and devices and stories with their counterparts across northern Europe — England, the Netherlands, the German territories, Denmark. The poetry from outside the court demonstrates the ideology from which these misinterpretations arose and a desire to frame the event according to their own narratives.

Perhaps the starkest difference between court poetry and the poetry advocating for an international understanding of the event is the minatory apocalyptic context invoked by the internationalists. In these poems, the world is clearly divided into two camps, and vitriolic anti-Catholicism is prevalent. Ginzel claims that this political edge is even more apparent in the Neo-Latin poetry: “Latin texts, poems for the most part, were regularly used to convey often

---


controversial political messages, whereas English verse in many instances merely flattered and entertained.”

Much of the same controversy, however, fills the English verse. George Wither, whose poem will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter, invokes this mode in one of the earliest Epithalamia. Anthony Nixon, a Jacobean pamphleteer and the author of a “hymn to Protestant unity” on the occasion, *Great Brittaines Generall Joyes* (1613), similarly assumes this context (though admittedly it is not overt), and claims the union “Shall check the Popish pride with fierce Alarume.”

Robert Allyne, in his “Tears of Joy shed at the happy departure from Great Britaine,” claims that the marriage is resisted by “all the force of hels confederate band” but that it will eventually produce an heir “To ruine Tibers pride, and Ibers power.”

Even the translation of Joannes Maria de Franchis’s “Of the Most Auspicatious Marriage,” which Ginzel claims has been notably bowdlerized of dangerous politics, still presents the world as a struggle between Protestants and Catholics, God and Satan:

```
Fret Babel, now defeated, rage and kick,
Thy superstition and idolatry
Falls much confounded by this Frederick,
Whom Fates ordain’d with Brittish Crown to marry,
That both professions being ioy’d in one,
Might bring thine errors to confusion.
139. Their Crowne and heart united, shall unite
Their love and faith, as long as heavens endure…
The Palatine with Britain ioynd, shal bring
Earths golden daies again, Times blessed spring.
```

Outside of the court, the union takes place — and must be interpreted — in this framework: the

---


people of England and the Palatine joining together to resist an infernal and seemingly insuperable enemy. While little of this can be found in the masques, the prophecy of Sybil at the end of Campion’s, delivered in Latin (perhaps because of its dangerous politics?) at least made this interpretation possible: “One mind will join the two nations, one set of loyalties, One worship of God, and one love. Each will have the same enemy, the same friend, The same prayer when in danger and the same valour in war.”43 Not just the couple, but the peoples also are uniting together against the same enemy and in the same religion.

In much of the poetry, the Stuart line itself is deemphasized, and the focus is on how the marriage joins the two nations rather than the two princes. Nixon, for example, claims that “by their match, great Kingdomes are combinde” and stresses the importance of this unity repeatedly;44 Wither “hope[s] that this will the uniting prove / Of Countries and of Nations by your love.”45 Britain itself, in these unions, is not subordinated exactly, but muted, now part of a larger political community. Allyne, while admittedly holding on to some English exceptionalism — it is an island, removed from the world — claims that Germany and Britain are essentially the same: Germany is equally pleasant, “irriguat with another Thames,” containing “many Londons.”46 He brings Scotland into the union, recalling and perhaps implicitly offering the British union as a model for the Anglo-German union, “A league, that shall not end, till Thames
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45 George Wither, Epithalamia: Or Nuptiall Poems upon the Most Blessed and Happy Mariage between the High and Mightie Prince Frederick the Fifth, Count Palatine of the Rhein, Duke of Bavier, &c. and the Most Vertuous, Gracious and Thrice Exceellent Princess Elizabeth, Sole Daughter to our Dread Soveraigne, Iames (London, 1613), sig. B3R, l. 189-90.
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and Rhine / Leave off to run, or heavenly orbes to move.”

A final theme pushed by those outside of court is that this marriage represents a reinvigoration of Elizabethan Protestant heroism. Numerous scholars have convincingly traced attempts to frame Elizabeth Stuart as *Elizabeth rediviva*, often with the princess’s willing assent. Withers is in some ways again the most explicit: “And think that fate, hath new recald from death / Their still lamented, sweete Elizabeth” (somewhat ironically, of course, since Wither, especially, has lost little time lamenting her after her passing). And Frederick, as will be shown, was asked to carry the mantle of Sidney, Leicester, Essex, and Henry. In some ways, this revival complicates the transnationalist sentiment at the time of the wedding; the Elizabethan edge can be a celebration of narrow nationalism, or at least of England’s place in the larger Protestant association. Frederick’s place at the vanguard of Protestant heroes, newly established in the line that had formerly included only British Princes (with, as the past chapters have shown, transnational connotations), establishes the church’s priority over the nation, for now a German hero demands the allegiance of English subjects. With this kind of militancy no longer in favor at court, however, a kind of competition over what British-ness meant was initiated. For James, in the masques as later, it centered on him and his line; for these more militant Protestants, the boundaries of relation seemed to be extending — including Frederick and the people of the Palatinate, just as they had his grandfather and the Dutch before — and Elizabethan sentiment itself becomes almost counter-national.

In some ways, then, the central contested issue between the narratives from court and
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those loosely grouped together from the fringes of power was not over how Protestant the union was — or even how militantly Protestant, though that was indeed a point of disagreement — but rather over whether the Protestantism or British-ness of the match took foremost importance. Which community was this marriage about and how might that community take concrete political form? There seems to be reason to suspect that in this marriage, Protestant sympathy was already moving away from the house of Stuart and settling on more active foreign Protestant leaders. The many sermons preached on the occasion demonstrate this more clearly, and would have provided the primary patterns through which most Englishmen and women thought about the event. For many priests, the marriage occasioned the opportunity to discuss, not the glories of Britain, but the shape, qualities, and beauties of that other great kingdom to which they belonged: the church. As we shall see, as Frederick assumes the role of British hero, so, too, the Palatinate begins to take the prestigious role in the defense of God’s church formerly held by England.

Replacing Henry

Whatever James’s actual intent, many of his actions before and after the wedding signaled exactly what internationalist Protestants desired. As is well known (and as was well-publicized in the period), James took Frederick with him to Theobalds during preparations for Henry’s funeral and left the sickly Charles at Whitehall; rumors quickly added that the two moved on to Royson to pursue hunting, a “powerful statement.”50 English Protestants throughout the country registered this tacit anointing, and one of the dominant themes in all the poetry and prose produced on the occasion was the ascension of Frederick into the line of Protestant heroes, a position left vacant by the recent and lamented death of Henry, Prince of Wales. Prince Henry

50 Matthew O’Brien quotes the diary of William Trumbull, a Puritan-leaning Protestant, to show how the event was understood by contemporaries. “Admirable Service’: William Trumbull and the Palatine Couple as Icons of the International Calvinist Community,” in The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival, ed. Sarah Smart and Mara R. Wade (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013), 105.
died on November 6, 1612, only months before the wedding. Frederick had already long-since arrived, and preparations for the wedding were well-underway. Henry had, in fact, an active role in these preparations. Scholars have noted the massive change in the tenor of the marriage ceremony affected by Henry’s death: not only did Henry’s own planned masque fall from performance, but Elizabeth chose to cancel her more openly Protestant masque as well. Why exactly she scrapped her performances remains speculative: perhaps, it has been suggested, she lacked confidence to promulgate an internationalist agenda without her brother’s support; perhaps her mourning overshadowed the optimism of the ceremonies, or she canceled her performances out of respect to her brother’s death. Only the masque James commissioned from Thomas Campion had royal backing.\(^{51}\) More significantly, perhaps, the death of the beloved prince cast a pall over the period leading up to the ceremonies, and was not forgotten even in the celebration itself.

Most of the poets and preachers who celebrate the marriage at least gesture to the mourning that had recently engulfed England. Augustine Taylor, for example, frames his epithalamium as a dream, and when the Bridegroom comes to court the Princess, he finds her in sorrow. He comes “To comfort her that seem’d so much lamenting,” and she claims “I have lost a friend, / Which winged Fame can nere too much commend.”\(^{52}\) The sorrow for Henry strangely dominates the Epithalamia.\(^{53}\) Almost every writers sees the marriage as answering in some way, English (and international) sorrow over Henry’s death and – more importantly – the uncertainty that had resulted when the Henry – a Protestant hero seemingly destined to defeat Rome – had


\(^{52}\) Augustine Taylor, *Epithalamium upon the All-Desired Nuptials* (London, 1613), sig. B1V.

\(^{53}\) Epithalamia were, it should be noted, capable of adapting to contemporary circumstance. Virginia Tufte, in her study of epithalamia, shows that the form could address a mixed array of topics stemming from its classical roots. Tufte, *The Poetry of Marriage*, 87-8.
died before Rome had been culled. Anthony Nixon elides the distance between death and marriage and makes Frederick’s journey to England answer both: he “didst for our Prince lately with us greeve. / Thy welcome first, was a sad Funerall, / Which now’s transformd to a ioyfull Nuptiall.” John Taylor opens his Epithalmium with England “oprest” over Henry’s death. Christof Ginzel has noted how prevalent this genre mixing was in the Latin poetry, as well – unfinished mourning filled the wedding songs. The marriage follows so closely upon the funeral that, especially for writers of an internationalist inclination, the heroic prince’s death could not be ignored and was attached unavoidably to the couple’s marriage.

Frederick did, of course, grieve for Henry with the English. He held a place of honor at the funeral — the chief mourner — and many sources, both in England and in the Empire, presented him as a divinely provided comforter during James’s time of mourning. Henry had, after all, been essential in securing Frederick’s marriage with his sister Elizabeth, and the two had grown close during the months Frederick resided in England. Frederick’s presence and participation in the ceremonies positioned him well for taking on the mantle of heroic Protestantism that had been associated with Henry; he stood nearby, a ready successor. James in some ways facilitated Frederick’s assumption of that role, and his actions after the funeral signaled his royal blessing, perhaps more forcefully than he intended, given his later continuity in a policy of conflict-avoidance. It was apparent to many poets that Frederick had stepped into the space open by Henry’s death, that he, in his marriage of the most powerful Protestant monarch’s daughter, had established himself as the Protestant church’s primary defense against
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Rome.

English divines are similarly unable to commemorate the marriage without looking backwards into the grave. Andrew Willet, a former tutor to the prince and a court preacher, laments Henry in a passage embedded in his discussion of the church and the marriage, *A treatise of Solomon’s Marriage* (1612-3, 1634). For Willet, in marriage Frederick must first console Elizabeth:

> the Lord hath provided for her a comforter in steed of her worthie brother departed, hee shall be a solace unto her, and bring her to forget this heavinesse of her Fathers house ... for although in like manner that cruell fever did as it were put out one of her eies for the time, in the death of Prince Henry, yet is it renewed againe, in her noble spouse: that now shee seeth again wt both her eies; Prince Charles, her dearest brother, and Prince Frederick her amiable spouse.\(^{57}\)

Willet here begins the transition that so many preachers and poets attempted. Frederick’s value is not simply as a comfort, but rather more: a replacement. The marriage with Frederick brought back to life part of her body — her eye, her vision — which for a time had died. The Palatine prince offers the promise of restoring the loss – both for Elizabeth, and, as other poets will add, for the English generally. The role James at least suggested by addressing so much attention to his future son in law, that vacated by Henry, has been assumed by Frederick. The passage however, had a delayed poignancy in print: while it was written and printed for the marriage, it printed again 1634, thirteen years after Willet’s death and twenty-one years after the wedding, and just over a year after Frederick’s death.

> Historians have traditionally located the terminus of Elizabethan Protestant heroism, the legend inaugurated with Sidney and Essex and inherited by Henry Stuart, at the prince’s death.\(^{58}\)

---


In a national context, this is largely true: Henry was the last prince claimed by the English (though even this, as we have seen, was complicated) who fully embraced and made himself the leader of the militant Protestantism movement. Critics have qualified this end date, however. Barbara Lewalski, for example, has suggested convincingly that much of the militant virtue of both Henry Stuart and even Elizabeth I was projected onto Elizabeth Stuart after Henry’s death. More recently, Jaroslav Miller has cogently argued that upon Henry’s death, the English population adopted Frederick as his natural successor and the focal point of Protestant hopes; there was a “distinct and conscious attempt in English dramatic and literary propaganda to revive the Henrician militant legacy by associating it with the Elector Palatine.” Frederick, therefore, did not just replace Henry, but re-inflamed the militaristic hopes that Henry had kept alive in England during the early years of Jacobean peace.

Henry’s meaning was transferred almost entirely onto the German prince, and this enthusiasm for Fredrick outlasted the occasion. Miller offers and insightful reading of the imagery and language used to glorify the Prince Palatine in England, and he shows how consciously English writers linked Henry and Frederick. He analyzes the play, *The Hector of Germany* (1614), by the herald William Smith, in detail to show that the “creation of a Palatine myth was contingent on the identification of Frederick with Elizabethan chivalry and generally accepted symbols of English national virtue.” In the play, Palsgrave Robert, a thin allegory for Palsgrave Frederick, becomes conflated with the great English heroes of the past, especially the
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Black Prince and Henry Stuart. Numerous contemporary allusions drive this reading in, and the play baldly employs “the traditional Elizabethan iconography of chivalrous virtue and militant anti-Catholicism, which were most often symbolized in knightly tournaments and membership of the Order of the Garter,” which Frederick had received one week before the wedding.63 Similar attempts were made by the poets Robert Allyne and Henry Peachem, according to Miller. Frederick’s assumption of Henry’s role was in fact one of the primary tropes employed throughout the English Epithalamia celebrating the marriage.

Miller’s insightful reading cogently establishes the place of Palsgrave in the play – a clear historical analogue to Frederick – in the line of Elizabethan heroes, knights of the Garter. But the play also registers the complexity of this move, and the playwright himself rewards biographical investigation. William Smith had, like Elizabeth, married a German spouse and had lived for several years in Nuremberg. His writing demonstrates a sustained interest in several key genres of nationalist discourse – topography, history, and heraldry – but he often, as in the play, incorporates both German and English history into a single volume. For example, Smith wrote a “Genealogical tables of the kings of England and Scotland, and sovereigns of Europe, to the years 1578-9” while residing in Nuremberg; he also composed, though never published, a Latin description of England and an English description of Germany, “How Germany is devyded into 10 Kreises,” in the early 1580s. After returning to England, he became involved in topography and eventually, after campaigning for himself, was appointed the Rouge Dragon Pursuivant of Arms in Ordinary, a junior officer in the College of Arms. Considering the personalistic character of nationalism in the period, his attachment to Arms and histories of noblemen, evidence by his extensive composition while with the College of Arms, demonstrate Smith’s

63 Ibid., 67.
investment in both his region and his nation; but he also continued to write of Germany in “A brefe description of the famous Cittie of Norenberg in High Germany.”64 Certainly, as the play will demonstrate, he never abandoned a kind of English patriotism common to Renaissance playwrights, but he also described himself in his manuscript as a “citezen of Noremberg.”65 Smith apparently moved fluidly between English and German identities, and his play – simply by engaging German imperial history, connecting it to English history – perhaps attempts to write a foundation for the union based in the -- sometimes scant -- historical relation between the people of England and the people of the Palatinate. For not only does the play establish Frederick as the next hero of the Garter, it also insists upon a shared religious and heroic history for the English and Palatinate peoples.

While Miller admits that “Frederick’s foreignness had a fundamental influence on the manner of his public presentation,” his analysis overlooks some of the interesting political complexities the foreignness caused – the debate over what constitutes “foreignness” -- because he is (rightly) more interested in tracing the continuity of the tropes and legends.66 For early moderns, “foreignness” remained a construct and could often easily be elided, especially by English Protestants during an event which resonated with such pan-Protestant meaning. There was more political contention caused by the adoption of this German prince than can be recognized in such a neat narrative. Indeed, simply the fact that the censors likely changed The Hector of Germanie, as Miller notes, shows how sensitive and dangerous the transfer of the
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mantle of heroism to a non-English prince could be. I contend, instead, that here once again, Frederick’s apotheosis into the line of Protestant heroes fractured the bonds between militant Protestantism and English patriotism; rather than continue national heroic tropes, applying those tropes to a foreign Prince forced the English to think of alliances that might supersede the national and the hereditary; it forced them to consider how the German prince might belong to them. Partially because of this challenge, myriad different ways of understanding the meaning of both the marriage and Frederick himself emerged; and once again, the church was central. Religious thinkers turned to metaphors of the church to understand their relation to the ruler of the Palatinate, to explain how his glory might also be theirs.

Despite James signaling his approval of Frederick as Henry’s replacement, lingering national and dynastic issues eventually undercut a fluid transfer. James had not always, of course, readily accepted even the militant Protestantism of his own son, and the popularity of a foreign prince, connected only by marriage, created further difficulties. James’s insistence on Elizabeth’s higher pedigree, for one, questions Frederick’s ability to effectively lead British Protestants. Rebecca Calcagno has argued that the well-publicized disagreements over precedence in the marriage, and all the dynastic, political and national associations that these entailed, complicated the fragile unity of the Protestant alliance: “Their national loyalties reveal international disagreements on how to organize and structure a Protestant Union, a problem crucial to its ultimate failure.”67 For Calcagno, in fact, the entire conflict over preeminence demonstrates stronger nationalist ties ripping apart the international Protestant Union from its inception: “The matter of precedence thus represents a struggle between James and Elizabeth,
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and Frederick, or between Britain and the Palatinate, for dominance.” It was a problem that Frederick was not royal, and Britain apparently — or at least the monarchy -- intended to retain precedence among the Protestant leaders.

At the time of the wedding, Frederick’s foreignness and rank also provoked some uneasiness in the nobles and poets that hoped to follow him as the new leader of a united Protestantism. John Chamberlain reported “scandalous speaches” in which “some wold embase his meanes, and meanness of estate and title to match with such a lady.” Queen Anna’s distaste for the union was notorious, and her derogatory epithet for Elizabeth — “Goodwife Palsgrave” — popularly known. The same fears of inequality in marriage made it difficult for Frederick to fluidly replace the royal and — equally important, I think — British Protestant heroes who had preceded him. Even poets not directly associated with the court did not always wholeheartedly endorse Frederick’s ability to replace Henry; often his is but a half-replacement, only a partial consolation unable to fill fully the void left by the heroic prince. Playing on the Prince’s full name, Henry Frederick, Robert Allyne notes the new prince, “bearing half his name, one half sets forth / Of him, whose all, is hardly match’d by two, / And therefore is too much, for one to do.” Frederick comes closest to replacing Henry, but there is an irreplaceable remainder.

There are also hints that, for some onlookers, the German-ness of the prince provoked as much discomfort as his sub-royal status. At least, there is a conscious attempt to re-frame Frederick as English — or, of English decent. Several poets reference the prince’s lineage, and one writer even publishes a royal pedigree that clearly demonstrates Frederick’s English
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heritage. James Maxwell, an apocalyptic English Protestant who wrote frequently on the ramifications of the match, offers an English Royal pedigree of the couple which traces them both through Eduard III: “Being both of them almost in one and the same degree of lineall descent (as I can shew) from 25. Emperours of Romaines, Greeks, and Germaines, and from 30 Kings of divers Kingdomes and Countries.” Maxwell, it seems, desires the match to be one of almost perfect equality, allowing the British princess and the German prince to blend seamlessly into an international union that mirrors the union of Protestant countries; national or dynastic ties should not cause controversy. The match incorporates and builds upon almost all of the great empires, from the English perspective: Greek, Roman, British, and German. And yet, even in this pedigree, Maxwell must recast Frederick as English: the impressive and puissant young prince stems from English bloodlines, the descendant of a most heroic king, if you only trace his lineage far enough back into history. Maxwell’s pedigree demonstrates the inherent tension, so common throughout the response to the ceremony, between a desire for an Anglo-centric interpretation and the recognition of wider, trans-national communities and descents that undermine any solid foundation for a purely nationalist reading.

Writers certainly tried to address this perceived inadequacy (or slight, depending on the national perspective), for a complex mix of both nationalist and religious reasons. In the Palatinate itself, as Hans Hubach has shown, court artists subtly challenged the assumed British superiority, and used heraldic signs to imply the preeminence of the Palatine Elector. The
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shows and triumph staged on the couple’s arrival were designed at least in part to challenge the
denigrating notion that Heidelberg remained an “uncultured, notoriously antiquated, and inferior
court,” and they were meant to impress the English travelers.74 One triumph remembers the
marriage of Frederick II and Isabella, daughter of King John of England; and the traditional
heraldry representing the occasion, as Hubach notes, showed the English king in an act of
subordination. Descriptions were soon printed in elaborate editions, and perhaps in part because
Frederick stood in as the next most promising Protestant hero after Henry’s death, a surprising
amount of the panegyric dedicated to the Prince Palatine was quickly translated into English. The
Palatinate, of course, had obvious interest in promoting the status of its prince, but English
writers joined in to address the anxiety for more complicated reasons. Protestant writers of both
nations, before and during the wedding, aim to establish Frederick as a mighty and heroic prince,
a conqueror whose puissance guaranties bloody and final victory against the forces of Rome.
Heroic tropes of both cultures — and a larger, shared Protestant culture — are rehashed and
reapplied.

The German Reformed view was almost unabatedly enthusiastic, and this view was at
least propagated, and it seems often adopted, by the English public. An early celebration of
Frederick as a Protestant hero came from his home university of Heidelberg, delivered by
Heinrich Alting, the “Publicke Professor of Divinitie,” and a close servant of the prince.75 Alting
had accompanied the Prince to England for the wedding, and was an internationally respected
professor. William Walker, “preacher of the word at Cheswick,” translated the work for an
English audience. In the dedicatory letter to Francis Lord Russel, Walker claims a close and
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75 Heinrich Alting, A Votive for the Auspicial Government of the most High and Mightie Prince and Lord, L.
honored friendship with the radical internationalist preacher Abraham Scultetus. The dedication optimistically references a network – through translation and acquaintance -- of Protestant connections, inaugurated by the marriage but ripe for future collaboration. As befits a group of internationalist Protestant preachers, the shared work is founded on scripture, that foremost storehouse for transnational history, imagery, and typology.

Walker claims that this oration offers “the perfect pattern of a compleat Prince,” not from classical sources, but instead from “his sacred Truth, the word of God.”\

Frederick represents a living exemplar of the Old Testament pattern, another of God’s holy leaders. In his dedication, Walker mixes patriotic and Protestant zeal, writing because of his “desire to communicate to all my Countreymen, that carry true Christian and English hearts this blessed tiding of the most heavenly course and resolutions of the most renowned Prince Elector, a Prince most Christian and Catholike, not in earthly Stile, but in heavenly truth.” England’s interest in this prince comes not only from the marriage, but even more from their participation in a higher institution — the church of God. He hopes to “congratulate with our Countrey, which hath so great a part in this happy newes, which all good men will welcome, no doubt, with glad hearts in themselves; and with grateful mindes to our most Gracious God, the Author of this, and all other mercies to his Church, and to his kingdome.”\

The diction alone manifests Walker’s separation from James’s interpretation: that “our Country” “hath so great a part” either oversells the participation of the commons, in James’s view, or undersells the role of the monarchy; the Stuarts did not have a part – they were not collaborating in a larger celebration – but rather, in James’s view, the celebration was about his dynasty. Walker transitions silently from the earthly country of
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England to the heavenly kingdom of God, at once removing the political and national barriers separating the English and the Germans of the Palatinate and reminding them of a higher, shared association.

Frederick’s virtues relate explicitly to his religious conviction. The Bible and history provide ample models for the Protestant Prince, and Frederick has studied these exemplars: “Christians doe study to be like David, Iosophat, Ezekias, Iosias, Constantine, Theodosus, and Charles the great” -- the last an ancestor of Frederick. 79 The list of types is familiar from our earlier consideration of these Protestant heroes – part of what connects the Protestant heroic tradition – and Frederick assumes a place in a long established line. Prince Henry had, of course, been “our Iosias,” and the others had all found expression in praise of the heroes. Moreover, Frederick possesses the “three undoubted markes of a most complet Prince. I. In that he praies that he may be Governed. II. That he may be Governed of the Lord. III. And that he may be governed according to the WORD.” 80 The first of the renowned virtues — the recognition that princes should be governed by God — receives perhaps the most extended treatment, and the praise sometimes borders on dangerous political assertion; it may have seemed even more radical in England, which had a stronger centralized monarchy. But Frederick’s service to God and the word overshadows his political obligations and highlights his relationship to the entire Protestant church. Again and again, Alting stresses that Frederick, like the best princes, recognizes that he is under the law of God, responsible to God’s community.

As in many of these treatises, the apocalyptic struggle against Rome contextualizes the praise and remains the dominant model for comprehending European politics. Protestants in
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Germany, in the midst of the counter-reformation, would have felt the drain of princes keenly. Part of Frederick’s virtue resides in the fact that he has resisted the allurements of Rome, the wealth and pomp: the papacy “encircles Christian Dominions on every side, and ceases not to solicit Princes with faire allurement of Riches, Regions, Honors.” Even without prolonged discussion, the references to Rome evoke the image of the small, oppressed, church of God, “encircled” by evil and struggling to maintain its place. On the continent, where the threat was perhaps more readily present, the necessity and relief of a powerful leader, defending the cause, was more urgent, and Reformed Protestants understood their leader’s commitment to the faith as a gift from God: “His peculiar people Palatine danceth for ioy, for his so manifold and exceeding favours. See whom the Lord hath annointed over his possession to be their Leader.” And perhaps, the oration hints, God may soon anoint him to lead far more than the Prince’s “peculiar people.”

Poets during the wedding celebration often embrace this heroic, militant Protestant vision. For Thomas Heywood, Frederick is “Of the religious Protestants protector,” “ally’d / To Mars his brood,” that is, directly descended from the heroic William of Orange. There is enormous promise and noble, heroic Protestant blood in the prince. Nixon, too, notes the prince’s ancestors’ resistance to Spain and Rome, now reinforced by Britain: “For if before the Palsgraves force did stand / Strong, both when Spaine, and Rome was bent thereto: / If then it chekt them, having but one hand; / Now ioynd with ours, what power hath it to doe?” For Joannes Maria de Franches, Frederick surpasses all other leaders as the sun does the moon and
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“in his power and courage can and dare / Rescue the oppressed world, restore the truth”; he is
“the new Hercules, the miracle of antient yeares revived.” The “new Hercules,” like the Old
Testament types, insinuates Frederick’s place in the tradition, for Hercules in the chain of heroes
had taken a specifically Protestant meaning – a hero who enforces justice against the wonted
tyrranny of the Roman Catholic Church. Throughout much of this writing, then, Frederick serves
as a replacement for Henry, both explicitly – in claims that he will indemnify the loss for
Elizabeth and the English people – and implicitly, in the re-inscription of the various types,
comparisons, and expectations from Henry onto Frederick.

The poems of the wedding almost always elevate Frederick to this role vacated by Henry
— though not without anxiety. He must stand in as the leader and defender of God’s true church.
Frederick’s marriage to Elizabeth relieves some of the tension of his foreign-ness. In a larger
sense, however, marriage and union are used to consider the ramifications of the wedding for the
relationship of the English and German peoples. For many writers, elevating Frederick to the
head of English Protestant heroism becomes possible because of the incorporation of the Palatine
into the religious and political union already uniting England and Scotland. This expansion is not
informed by relations of dominance and subjection, but rather by the (ideal, if not actual)
reciprocity of marriage. Indeed, on the continent, too, marriage demonstrated the compatibility of
the English and German people. The entire event is another repetition of the pattern established
with the marriage of another Frederick and the daughter of another English king, proving that
Frederick reinvigorates past virtues:

Herrn Fridrichen den Fuenftten/ Pfalzgrafen Churfuersten/ zc. Als einen jungen Phoenix

85 De Franchis, “Of the Most Auspicatious Marriage,” 34, 36. This in particular suggests Franchis’s familiarity with
the praise stemming from the Palatinate, for as Hans Hubach has shown, Hercules palatinus was a laudatory epithet
for Frederick popular in his homeland. Hubach, “Of Lion and Leopards,” 206. As we have seen, moreover, Hercules
became a common topos for this heroic tradition.
English writers, in collaboration with writers in the Palatinate, capitalize on the religious
meaning of marriage to explain how England and the Palatinate might become one people, the
religious and political borders aligned, together part of the church of God and able to resist
Rome.

The Marriage of Protestants

The reception of Frederick in England, then, was as divisive as the reception of the event:
he was universally praised, but subtle differences in the praise implied vast disagreement over
how central both he and the match might prove in reconfiguring British identity. So, too, can the
complexity of one of the most popular and most dense metaphors employed on the occasion –
that of the Church as the bride of Christ – offer readings that remove England from the center of
pan-Protestantism. Through a subtle typology, as we will see, many poets and preachers began
shifting their hopes away from the English court – which had already disappointed by its truce
with Spain – and toward Heidelberg. English pastors, especially those based outside of the court,
capitalized on the marriage as an opportunity to press an international Protestant agenda. Both
Andrew Willet (at court) and George Webbe (in Wiltshire) saw in the marriage a reflection of the

86 Johann Theodor de Bry, *Representatio & Explicatio Duorum Arcuum Triumphalium quos Fausti Ominis & Piae Congratulationis ergo Sereniss. Potentissimoq. Principi ac Domino, D. Friderico V.* (Oppenheim, 1613), 10. [Lord Frederick the Fifth, Palgrave, Just as a young phoenix rises and ignites the same from the ashes of his worthy forefathers and parents, so he [erschwungen] himself in England far over the sea, in order to wed the royal princess Elizabeth and so to suggest that the heroic mind and noble virtue in the house Palatine is not lost, but rather one still has at this time such heroes and Lords as their forefathers, as the [obgesagen] Henry XII and Ludovico Barbaro, consistency and worth, that were able to be married under the royal persons.]
45th psalm, a celebration of Solomon’s marriage to the Pharaoh’s daughter, a passage which, the clergymen agreed, typologically referred to the marriage of Christ and his Church. For both English preachers, the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth was therefore closely connected to theories of the international church generally; and for both the marriage, and these resonant typological suggestions, offered a new lens for understanding the international relationship between Protestant countries.

George Webbe resided further from court, and anxiety surfaces in his dedication about his right to preach on the marriage — a recognition that his praise of the marriage in fact presses a kind of militant Protestantism that was not popular at court. He calls his sermon the “poore Countrie present of a Punie Divine,” but hopes it will be accepted because of his devout service to the king. Even early within the work, Webbe remains defensive about his preaching: "Wherefore let no man tax it as ridiculous, or presumptuous, for us in the country to participate in any sort with this days triumph of the court, seeing that not the court alone, but the country also, and (if I not much mistake myself) whole Christendom is interested in today's business." Even in this hedging, Webbe betrays the reason for his trepidation: his sermon places the marriage in an international context, a victory for the “whole Christendom”; “foreign countries” and especially the “Confederate nations” rejoice in the match, along with “all true hearted Christians, whose hearts and minds are linked with the band of the same Religion.”
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88 George Webbe, The Bride Royall, or The Spirituall Marriage Betweene Christ and his Church (London, 1613), sig. A3r.

89 Webbe, The Bride Royall, 2-3.

90 Webbe, The Bride Royall, 3.
somewhat optimistically views the marriage as James’s public declaration of his support for a pan-Protestant cause in foreign policy, taking a strand in the apocalyptic struggle against the Catholic Church. James is “a religious and a learned Christian King, a Defender of the Christian faith; one who hath been the glory of Schooles, and the uniter of Kingdomes.”91 The king’s arranged marriage of his daughter to Palsgrave seems to recognize his place inside this larger association of the true church and to assume a role of leadership — the one militant Protestants had praised him for embracing while hoping he would start living up to.

Webbe rehearses the accepted Protestant doctrine of the church, without delving too deeply into distinctions, in his discussion of the marriage; the context of the true church, implicitly, is necessary for understanding the importance of the union. He needs to develop the characteristics of the true church that James — and now Frederick and Elizabeth — represent as figureheads, the social body that unites both court and country. Just as the marriage prompts the masques to consider various kinds of social, political, and religious union, it invites preachers to think about relation — the bonds of fellowship — among the members of the church. Webbe stresses the necessity of unity — of coherence — and asserts that salvation does not exist outside of the church: "Out of the Church there is no Christ nor Faith in Christ" and therefore "foorth the Militant Church there are no meanes of salvation."92 For this reason, the various sectarians that have broken away from the church have mistakenly damned themselves, and pose a serious threat to Christian unity: "confounded be all Katharists, Donatists, Brownists, Separatists."93 Rome, in Webbe’s view, is not part of the true church, and so the original Protestant schism was no schism, but a revelation of the true church formerly hidden. To make sense of the apparent

91 Webbe, The Bride Royall, 72.
92 Webbe, The Bride Royall, 55-6.
93 Webbe, The Bride Royall, 33.
wickedness even in the Protestant church of God, Webbe rehearses the distinction of the visible and invisible church, though he changes some of the terminology:

There is a twofold state of the Church, Outward and inward: The outwarde state of the Church standeth in visible assemblies, in the publike Ministerie of the Word and Sacraments, in the externall Discipline and Governement [...] The inward estate of the Church stands in the true knowledge of God in Christ, in comfort touching remission of sinnes and life everlasting, in the gifts and graces of the Spirit, and in Gods protection.94

Explaining the unity in some ways complicates the relation between church and nation, since the wicked are mixed in among the true English Protestants. James as figurehead of the church leads a very different body from the English/British nation.

Webbe provides a long list of metaphors for the church used in scripture, and foremost among them is that of a kingdom or city.95 The church international is a communion, and for Webbe this means that there are certain dues and duties of membership: "as they are companions of the Church, and as they are admitted into her society, so they must follow her, and to the utmost of their power seeke to promote and procure the good of her."96 Certainly, during a joyful wedding, this celebration of community was easy and uncontroversial; but, as Andrew Willet would soon find, when crisis tested that membership, the requirement of service ‘to the utmost of their power,’ became a more polemical doctrine. The fellowship of the marriage allowed preachers to make uncontested and facile claims which paved the way for later controversy. "Let us all set forward the god of the Church,” Webbe concludes, “with all our power, and bring such as belong unto us into the bosome of the Church, that they and wee may have fellowshippe with


95 For example, Luke 12.32; 1 Pet 1.4; 1 Pet 5.10; Hebr 12.28;

96 Webbe, The Bride Royall , 58. One of the most influential definitions of nationalism, notably, involves perceived relation and obligation: “nations are the artefacts of men’s convictions and loyalties and solidarities… [a community] becomes a nation if and when the members of the category firmly recognize certain mutual rights and duties to each other in virtue of their shared membership of it” Ernest Geller, Nations and Nationalism (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), 7.
God, and one with another: so shall wee have a joyfull communion in the kingdome of grace." 97

Again, the conclusion turns on the “kingdom” of God, the idea that all Protestants shared a fellowship and an obligation akin to citizenship.

Webbe, however, presses the fellowship beyond the nationalism of the time; the event occasions a kind of federalism that is never exactly and clearly articulated, but seems fitting of the church (in which, of course, Protestants held the priesthood of all believers). The marriage of these two Christian princes binds the church more fully together; through it “the friendship of confederate Nations [is] confirmed, Britanie and Germanie combined.” 98 Their union sets the two princes up to lead this international body, which is more important, according to Webbe, than any earthly society: "All other sorts of Societies amongst the children of men, are but vassals and homagers unto the Church." 99 Though offhand and not explained, this seems to be a radical claim about the priority and influence of the church: it is not only prior to all political organizations, but indeed provides the foundation for political organization. In this, Webbe hints, the fluid union between England and the Palatinate is paved, for both are Protestant nations. This, perhaps, distinguishes the preaching of the country from the celebration at court most clearly, and it contains the seeds of decades of disagreement over international policy. It subverts the court’s message of dynastic union and orderly, “settled” kingdoms. For Webbe and other radicals, the Church is the most important society, overriding earthly duties and associations. The marriage helped unite more visibly this already unified body.

Andrew Willet resided much closer to court, but his work on the marriage also foregrounds the typology of the church. The style of Willet’s sermon reflects his audience: it is

97 Webbe, The Bride Royall , 62.

98 Webbe, The Bride Royall , 81.

more learned, Latinate. And yet the message parallels Webbe’s work. According to Willet, the marriage is especially prudent because it is not about physical attraction or money; rather, it is a union “which religion began, and piety & vertue hath knit.” Willet’s praise for the union stands out even more conspicuously because of his later opposition to the Spanish match, and his sermon fronts an antipathy toward Protestant-Catholic marriages.

Blessed of God are those thrice renouned parents, which have not sought out a match for their daughter from among the Canaanites, but with faithfull Abraham, from the kindred and houshould of faith: which have maried religion to religion, and have matched the Gospell with the Gospel, and have set more by the pious education of both, then by the promised mountaines of gold.

A match with Rome would have been disastrous both for Elizabeth herself and, perhaps more importantly, for the English people. Instead, James has matched like with like, finding a marriage within the one metaphoric nation of the church. An apocalyptic framework precludes any real match between opponents: “And what true love can there be between a protestant and a Papist, a professor of the true faith, and a detester thereof.” Willet’s world is divided into the clear apocalyptic binary — the people of God and the people of Satan -- and he chides the “many, themselves protestants (but cold ones, you may well thinke) [who] doe suffer their wives to be popish recusants” -- a group which included and would include the current (secretly) and future (openly) king.

Willet imagines the union as a marriage of nations even more explicitly than Webbe, though at times, Willet’s nations primarily represent the nobility. He notes that joining Germans

---

100 Willet, A Treatise, sig. A3R.
101 Willet, A Treatise, 2.
102 Willet, A Treatise, 9-10.
103 Willet, A Treatise, 9.
with the English has established an attractive historical precedent; it has, in fact, been the one international union that has consistently worked. “This famous kingdome of our nation, hath ioyned in matrimonial affinitie divers times, with other adioyning countries, with Germanie, France, Spain.” The latter two matches failed, but the unions with the “valiant Germans” always proved profitable and successful, including James’s marriage to Queen Anne of “Denmark, which is part also of Germanie.” Willet calls on the Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in the book of Daniel, a prophecy about kingdoms and empires, to explain the different bonds cemented by the different matches: “The coniunction with France and Spaine was like to that mixture of clay and iron” which is intrinsically weak because it does not fuse together. For the match with Germany, however, Willet adopts another Old Testament reference on the binding of nations; it is like the wood joined together by the Prophet Ezekiel (in chapter 37), “whereby he signified, that Israel and Iuda should grow into one people.” Willet’s political rhetoric is somewhat confused and lacks clear definition — who exactly is included in the “famous kingdom of our nation”? — but the marriage and, even more, the scriptures provide a context for thinking about transcending political borders. Just as the two nations of Judah and Israel could again become one, the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth promised a way of joining the English and the Germans, two nations already part of God’s international church, a way they could “grow into one people.”

For both divines, then, the scriptures provided an interpretive framework for the political union, and the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth offered the potential of the people of England and the Palatinate merging together into a single nation. The focus on James as a “uniter of

104 Willet, A Treatise, sig. A1R.
105 Willet, A Treatise, sig. A1R.
106 Willet, A Treatise, sig. A1R-A1V.
Kingdoms” and the Stuart line’s skill in unification – his ancestors had, after all, joined the hostile houses of York and Lancaster – implicitly frames the match as the same kind of project. German writers agree, and they emphasize the union and expansion of empires enacted in this marriage; however, in this work, writers often intimate that Heidelberg has or will become central in the union. Writers both within England and on the continent sometimes understood the match as an aligning of religious and political communities: the true faith and the nation would share borders. Elizabeth’s marriage to Frederick, then, did not just cement a dynastic alliance, but meant that their peoples would be merged. This, indeed, represents arguably the dominant reading from Frederick’s court. In the procession back into Heidelberg, several allegorical arches were erected along the road, inscribed with Latin verses, which were helpfully explained in a dual language book, published shortly after, that translates the Latin into German verse and offers the meaning of each symbol in German. One of the most interesting recalls the Wars of the Roses ended by Henry VII’s marriage to another Elizabeth, which stands allegorically for the union affected by this marriage: “Darumb diese allhie felicissimi ominis ergo, zur Anbildung ebenmaessiger gewuendschter Einigkeit und Zusammenverbundenuess beyder Koenig und Churfuerstlichen Haeusern und Geschlechter Engelland und Churpfalz voergestellt war?” The German verse often expands the Latin, inflecting it with more of the rhetoric of unification: “Duae Familiae Regiae Anglicanae Stirpis olim divisae hic rursus unitae,” for example, becomes:

\[
\text{Die zween von Koeniglichem Stamm/}
\text{Lancaster und Yorck ist ihr Nam}
\text{So lang enander waren feind/}
\]

---

107 De Bry, *Representatio & Explicatio*, 9. [Thereby these [], therefore most happy were all, to the development of harmonious and desired unity and togetherness of both royal and noble houses and dynasties of England and the Churpfalz.]
This immediately follows another display which represented the unification of the people, in which the English thank God for Frederick, the Germans thank God for Elizabeth, and both unite together to speak the final lines:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Got will unser Gebet erhoeren/} \\
\text{Den wir im rechten Glauben ehren/} \\
\text{Auch vorthin segnen den Heurath.} \\
\text{Den er so sein gerichtet hat.}
\end{align*}
\]

The marriage serves both to unify the people and to confirm, as a blessing from God, that their faith is true. It set up the line for imperial greatness, under God, and also included both the English and the Palatinate people together in this religions union.

Given the recent death of Prince Henry and the sickly childhood of Prince Charles, the possibility of Elizabeth’s descendants ruling over both lands almost certainly seemed likely, and the political iconography found in Heidelberg’s celebration also can be found in English writers, especially those of an internationalist bent. Through their progeny, another unification, like the one between England and Scotland, might be achieved. Webbe hints at this when he also notes that Elizabeth’s ancestors were famous for uniting first Lancaster and York, and then more recently, England and Scotland. Elizabeth shared the name of two great rulers,

The first of that name, to this Land so happy, being the great Grand-mother to the father of our present Elizabeth, happy in her marriage, and by her marriage, first uniting the two Houses of Lancaster and York, whose dissentions did annoy this Kingdome with bloody ciuill warres, and then by the fruit of her marriage, uniting these two Kingdomes England and Scotland, which before were at continuall warres.\(^{110}\)

\(^{108}\) De Bry, *Representatio & Explicatio*, 8. [The two from royal line / Lancaster and York is their name / were enemies to eachother for so long / are in turn united.]

\(^{109}\) De Bry, *Representatio & Explicatio* 7. [God will hear our prayers because we honor him with right belief. Also sing the marriage henceforth, because he has directed his so.]

\(^{110}\) Webbe, *The Bride Royall*, 75.
There was not only a very clear collaboration in the celebration of the event, then – English, Dutch, and German artists joined in the production of ceremony – but, even more, a trans-national collaboration in establishing the event’s meaning. Poets and preachers across linguistic borders continually reference the same history, typology, and draw on ecclesiology to make sense of the present moment. It seems to many of English and German writers that the Kingdom of God might perhaps become a concrete political reality; the metaphor again determines how they think about the match.

Within this celebratory typology, however, exist hints that these divines hoped not simply for a political union, but in fact re-centered the hopes for internationalist Protestantism onto Frederick and the Palatinate. The marriage allowed them to share the German ruler, to become part of his people, but the typology they employed in praise also suggested that Heidelberg had usurped London’s place as the New Jerusalem. Both divines use the event to discuss the Church; both, as already noted, see Solomon’s marriage as a type for the marriage of their princess. It should be remarked, first, that these types were dense, complex, and importantly, part of a transnational cultural imaginary. Preachers in the Holy Roman Empire and Great Britain understood the marriage through the same pervasive image: the marriage of Christ and his Church. And yet, local differences shaped how the valence of the type was interpreted. The application of types was always an indirect science allowing significant imaginative freedom. Types never set up a simple one-to-one allegorical reading, but instead map one historical field onto another, a multi-dimensional mapping rather than a line connecting single points. They serve as the basis for the kind of historical thought scholars have described as layered, not a linear history, but a history folded over upon itself. As Erich Auerbach describes typology, it breaks history apart, subordinating each event to interpretation. It differs from modern history in
the “open” nature of the historical event, the necessity of interpretation:

In the modern view, the provisional event is treated as a step in an unbroken horizontal process; in the figural system the interpretation is always sought from above; events are considered not in their unbroken relation to one another, but torn apart, individually, each in relation to something other that is promised and not yet present [...] Whereas in the modern view the event is always self-sufficient and secure, while the interpretation is fundamentally incomplete, in the figural interpretation the fact is subordinated to an interpretation which is fully secured to begin with: the event is enacted according to an ideal model which is a prototype situated in the future and thus far only promised.111

Of course, the differences and the tension between past and present, figure and fulfilment, produce new meaning and change how both past and present can be read. This historiography meant that the event of the marriage, too, needed interpretation; such a significant moment in the history of the people of God needed to be read against similar events in the past with a mind on its final antitype in the apocalyptical future. The typology used to make sense of the day influenced how the wedding was viewed and also, equally, was chosen because of pre-established ideological convictions – beliefs “fully secured to begin with.” In this case, the frequent use of the forty-fifth psalm set up comparisons that were inevitably complicated, and often critical of James and the Jacobean Church.

The story of Solomon’s marriage has something of a vexed history. There existed, in fact, some debate over the exact historical occasion of the psalm simply because of theological discomfort with the Old Testament marriage. Although both English writers join the dominant line of interpretation and read the song as a celebration of the marriage of Solomon and an unnamed Pharaoh’s daughter, other interpretations were available. Even a divine as influential as Theodore Beza (1519-1605), Calvin’s successor at Geneva, dissents from the popular view: “I can not consent unto those which thinke it to be the marriage song of Salomon and the daughter

of Pharao: […] I se that that marriage is plainly & worthely condemed of the holy Ghost.**112

According to the passage that Beza cites from the book of Kings, Solomon’s forbidden marriages with idolatrous foreigners eventually led him from his faith and resulted in the fragmentation of Israel. Some ambiguity in these verses provoked the controversy, however, and questioned whether Solomon’s specific marriage to the Pharaoh’s daughter might have been permissible. As translated in the Geneva Bible, the passage reads

> But King Solomon loved many outlandish women: both the daughter of Pharaoh, and the women of Moab, Ammon, Edom, Sidon, and Heth,
> Of the nations, whereof the Lord had said unto the children of Israel, Go not ye in to them, nor let them come in to you: for surely they will turn your hearts after their gods, to them, I say, did Solomon join in love.**113

The daughter of Pharaoh, Solomon’s favourite, is separated from the others, and the prohibition, perhaps, applies only to the latter group. The King James translation stresses the latter group in the conjunction and therefore implicitly sanctions this interpretation:

> But king Solomon loved many strange women, together with the daughter of Pharaoh, women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites:
> Of the nations concerning which the LORD said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall not go in to them, neither shall they come in unto you: for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods: Solomon clave unto these in love.**114

Defenders of Solomon grasped onto this distinction and noted the conversion of Pharaoh’s daughter. John Carpenter (d. 1621), for example, raises the objection only to dismiss it:

> Moreouer, it is not vnknowne vnto vs, that albeit this Princesse was a stranger vnto vs and our Religion, whiles shee remained at her fathers house in Egypt: yet as she was not of the brood of those cankered hearted Chananites & nations which the Lord willed our Fathers to expell and roote out: so would not the king adventure either to touch her, or to bring her into his owne house, (although she was both a noble and beautifull Ladie) till time that was done and performed on her, which the Law in that case prescribeth: but cheifely, as she had forsaken her owne people and her fathers house then polluted with


**113 1 Kings 11:15-16 Geneva Bible.

**114 1 Kings 11:15-16 KJV.
many abominations: so turned she to the Lord God of Israel with all her heart, for the loue she had both to him and his holy Religion.\textsuperscript{115}

Solomon and this Pharaoh were allies, and the Egyptians were inherently convertible — none of “those cankered hearted Chananites.” Even Carpenter’s desire to defend Solomon from his detractors, however, reveals the disagreement in the period. If Solomon did fall irrecoverably — a point that Carpenter, at least, is not willing to countenance — it was through other, later foreign marriages. Calvin seems somewhat uncomfortable with the historical type — and perhaps this explains Beza’s rejection of the dominant interpretation — but he still reads the psalm as Solomon’s marriage with the daughter of Pharaoh. While he hedges on the legality, he notes what can be learned from the type: “even this thing also is iustly to bee accounted among the giftes of God, that a moste puissant king sought his alyaunce.”\textsuperscript{116} Pharaoh, while he might be an idolatrous pagan, is according to Calvin at least “puissant,” and this brings some glory to the match.

Still, writers could not overlook the fact that the Bible blames Solomon’s fall explicitly on his marriage with pagan wives, and Pharaoh’s daughter, though beautiful, was certainly flawed. As a most perfect “parallel” to the present occasion, the implications for the pious Elizabeth seem troubling. James fares even worse in the comparison, for as father of the bride, the type links him with Pharaoh, the mighty, idolatrous king who must be abandoned by his daughter. Biblical exegetes stressed that this Pharaoh was one of the best, not the Godless opponent of Moses, but an ally of Israel; nevertheless, he remained a pagan. The Geneva Bible explains the psalm as follows:

\textsuperscript{115} John Carpenter, \textit{Schelomonocham: Or King Solomon his Soliac} (London: John Windet, 1606), 56-7.

The majesty of Solomons, his honour, strength, beautie, riches & power are praised, &
also his marriage with the Egyptian being an heathen woman is blessed, so If that she can
renounce her people & the love of her countrey and give her selfe wholly to her husband.
Under the which figure the wonderfull majestie & increase of the kingdome of Christ and
the Church his Spouse now taken of the Gentiles is described.  

The necessity of Pharaoh’s daughter renouncing the love and faith of her country is stressed in
countless explications of the Psalm; her status as a proselyte excuses the foreign marriage.
Archbishop George Abbot (1562-1633), who presided over Frederick and Elizabeth’s marriage
and later supported them after Frederick’s disastrous ascension to the crown of Bohemia, is more
explicit about the required conversion in his interpretation of the psalm: it was written “for
instruction to the wife of Solomon, and so to the Church (especially of the Gentils) to turn from
false Gods, and their worship, to the imbracing of God in Christ.”  

Again, Abbot paraphrases
the tenth verse as advising Pharaoh’s daughter to “hearken unto, and embrac[e] the true and
saving knowledge of the onely true God, and be converted by it, […] and turn from the errours
wherein thou wast bred and born, inheriting them by education, and birthright.”  

Elizabeth, her
Father, and her country, hold the place of idol worshipers in the wedding prose. Even in Webbe’s
sermon, shortly after noting how well the text does “befit this present purpose, and paralell this
occasion,” he lists the qualities of the Bride/Church in a way that certainly does not flatter the
Stuarts:

as that Egyptian Ladie before her marriage with Salomon, was altogether Heathenish: so
this Ladie before her Spirituall marriage with Christ, was altogether Hellish. As her father
was an Egyptian, so the Churches naturall parents, Infidels: Thy father was an Amorite,
thy mother an Hittite, Ezech. 16.3. As she, before this marriage, was brought vp in

117 The Bible and Holy Scriptures Conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament (Geneva: Rouland Hall, 1560), 244.
118 George Abbot, The Whole Book of Psalms Paraphrased or Made Easier for Any to Understand (London::
William Bentley, 1650), 163.
119 Ibid., 168.
blindnes and superstition. So the Church, before Christ did spread ouer it the skirts of loue, was ouerwhelmed with errours and superstition.\textsuperscript{120}

“Brought up in blindness and superstition” – a seemingly unfit comparison for Elizabeth, whose religion and devoutness were celebrated throughout pan-Protestantism. And yet, the type is popular on the occasion, and Willet insists on its appropriateness: “In this princely couple is now this Scripture verified: in her Highnes, this; Hearken O daughter and consider, forget thine owne people and thy Fathers house.”\textsuperscript{121}

While the verse demanded that the Pharaoh’s daughter renounce her own people and their religion, the type proved malleable enough to leave open the possibility of a political union that would both include and transform English religion. Indeed, between Solomon’s rule over a united Israel and the promises in the psalm of imperial expansion, the type included the English people in Elizabeth’s merger with the Palatinate. James, of course, viewed himself as Solomon largely because of Solomon’s ability to join kingdoms, and he certainly would not have been flattered to have Frederick usurp his central position. The marriage of the Church and Christ, the antitype of Solomon’s marriage, had been referenced a decade earlier during the unification of England and Scotland, with James assuming a Solomonic role. In his \textit{Three Partes of Salomon his Song of Songs, expounded}, published in 1603, Henoch Clapham (1585-1614) notes the recent union as a parallel to the union discussed in the Song of Solomon: “when in \textit{Englands} vnion with \textit{Scotland}, we may behold (as it were) a new Coniuction of the \textit{White} and \textit{Red-roses}, for making one Nose gay. This naturall vnion, doth strongly call for our Churches vnion moe with Christ.”\textsuperscript{122} The union of Lancaster and York, as well as the union of Scotland and England, also

\textsuperscript{120}Webbe, \textit{The Bride Royall}, 9-10.

\textsuperscript{121}Willet, \textit{A Treatise of Salomons Mariage}, 26.

\textsuperscript{122}Henroch Clapham, \textit{Three Partes of Salomon his Song of Songs, Expounded} (London: Valentine Sims, 1603), sig. A2R.
surface during much of the poetry and prose celebrating the Palatine wedding, including, as we have seen, Webbe’s sermon. The marriage of Christ and the Church seems particularly congenial to the unification of Protestant peoples, though perhaps it is somewhat surprising, given their divergent histories, to find Elizabeth’s wedding with Prince Frederick celebrated in a way similar to the British Union. As in the marriage writing, the Anglo-Scottish national union also supplants or expands the integration of the houses of Lancaster and York and, Clapham suggests, draws both countries closer to God. As both nations enter into a deeper communion with Christ, the national and the ecclesiological communities neatly align, and James is therefore praised for facilitating the match.

During Elizabeth’s marriage, however, James is Pharaoh, behind the scenes as a more prominent and younger Solomon weds his daughter. The resonance of these comparisons – James as Pharaoh, Elizabeth as Pharaoh’s daughter -- stems also in part from the popular, though debunked, idea that the Scots were themselves descended from the Egyptians. Camden formulates the idea as follows: “about the same time, the Scotish writers falsely devised *Scota* the Egyptian Pharaoes daughter to bee the Foundresse of their nation.”¹²³ Though Camden speaks dismissively of this, it was a powerful cultural myth, along the lines of the British descent from Troy, and likely was recalled by the religious writing that represented Elizabeth as Pharaoh’s daughter. Elizabeth, as Scottish royalty, descended herself from a Pharaoh’s daughter, and became another daughter of Pharaoh on the occasion of her wedding. On the other hand, her groom descended from the first family of Protestantism. Frederick’s family, as Webbe notes, had been the first to set themselves against Rome, and a similar promise is shown by Frederick:

Himselfe of that name, which to the Popes hath beene alwayes terrible, and of that carriage, that in the eyes of all that feare the Lord, hath made him truely venerable: An other Salomon, for so doeth his Name in his Countrey language signifie.\textsuperscript{124}

Not only did differences in the way the English and Palatinate Churches worshiped and tolerated Catholicism imply the religious hierarchy subordinating the Stuarts, but their mythological ancestral lines set up the type and confirmed its meaning.

The antitype, the marriage of Christ and his Church, the fulfilment of the ancient marriage, was equally unfavourable to Elizabeth and her father. The perfect Christ took his spotted and sometimes idolatrous spouse as an act of charity; any perfection the Church possesses Christ has bestowed upon her. As Webbe admits, the Church in this world is “not wholly free from some outward blemishes” — probably not something one should write of a bride on her wedding day.\textsuperscript{125} Willet claims similarly that Christ’s perfection makes the Church simultaneously perfect and flawed: “I am black and yet comely.”\textsuperscript{126} The Church, like the daughter of Pharaoh, comes to the union inherently imperfect and reliant upon the groom for proper instruction in religion – in fact, even for the grace necessary to be properly religious. Both English writers discuss the Church in these sermons within a context of anti-Catholic polemic, eager to controvert Catholic – and at times High Church -- positions: the lingering pagan vestments and ceremonies, the two forms of worship, meritorious action. Because of this, they insist upon the complete dependence of the Church upon Christ, her spouse:

But this beauty she hath not of her selfe: it is God that maketh our crimson sinnes as white as snow. Isay. 1.18. Man by his nature now corrupted is become deformed, and hath no power to do any thing, that is good ... So then this beautie that Christ delighted with, is not of nature, but by grace altogether.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{124} Webbe, The Bride Royall, 79-80.

\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., 25.

\textsuperscript{126} Willet, A Treatise of Salomons Mariage, 18.

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., 18.
The typology, once again, does not set up one-to-one relationships, and Christ and Frederick are not exact parallels; but the prevalence of the type does at least establish the possible semantic field through which contemporaries would understand the match and does unavoidably indicate that the religious authority in the match was firmly rooted in the Palatinate.

The type has obvious superficial problems that would be apparent to almost any early modern who heard these sermons preached. The Stuarts align with pagans, and Frederick with perfection — Christ or King Solomon. The type favours the German prince so much it is tempting to wonder why English preachers employed it: what could they hope to gain from the comparison? How did they want the more dangerous associations to be read? Their sermons hint, at least, that they were well aware of the unflattering comparisons, but the publications also suggest that they were made purposefully. While both preachers hedge against the implicit critique, they never renounce the appropriateness of the type. Webbe articulates a distinction between the Old Testament ceremony and the current marriage clearly after he begins working with the psalm: “a Kings Daughter; not the Daughter of a superstitious Pharaoh, or descended of an Aegyptian King; but the Daughter of a religious and a learned Christian King, a Defender of the Christian faith; one who hath been the glory of Schooles, and the uniter of Kingdomes.” In other words, the new marriage presents a better version of history. Willet, similarly, in a circumlocutory aside, mentions “our Salomon,” restoring James to his preferred status. Still, in

---


that ancient marriage, both see a perfect parallel to the current union, and both seem to believe
that Elizabeth has moved in her worship to a truer church.\textsuperscript{130}

The implications of this – of Frederick bearing the truer religion – can once again be seen
more fully in a German publication, a sermon of Frederick’s internationalist court preacher,
Abraham Scultetus (another work that was quickly translated into English). Frederick’s preacher
is best known for his strong support of international Protestantism, and he was often accused,
once the Protestant cause during the Thirty Years War began to disintegrate, of zealously
encouraging Frederick to accept the crown of Bohemia. He accompanied the marriage party to
England, befriended Archbishop Abbot, Bishop John King and other internationalist divines, and
even preached once, in German, in the Earl of Essex’s private Chapel.\textsuperscript{131} It is possible that he
was familiar with Willet’s work or had heard the type of Solomon’s marriage used in preaching
associated with the occasion. Like the two English divines, Scultetus rehashes the typology of
the church to discuss the wedding, and in his description of the church it becomes clear that he
also is a Protestant internationalist who views the Palatinate as central in this newly-minted
relationship. Heidelberg, not London, is now Jerusalem, the city of God’s people and the site of
the Church’s reconstruction. Scultetus centres his sermon on Psalm 147, the return to and
rebuilding of Jerusalem after the Babylonian captivity, and he notes that it fits the occasion well:

Wie viel mehr will sich gebueren/ dass wir/ welcher vorfahren nicht nach sibenssig/
sondern nach sibenhundert Jaren/ auss dem Bapstischen Babylon gerissen/ und gleichsam
in ihr alt vatterland wider gefuehret senn/ dem Allmachtigen Gott dafur lob uund dank
sagen [...]Aber viel ein groesse jammer war den unsern vorfahren im Bapsthumb/ da viel
fromme herzen sic hunter die Inrannen des Bapsts drucken/ und die Schaendliche

\textsuperscript{130}The fact that no Provision was made for Elizabeth to retain her own worship, as usually happened with foreign
queens, once again demonstrates the density of the religious readings: it could mean at the same time that they
practiced the same religion or that Frederick’s was recognized by Elizabeth (and even James?) as superior.

\textsuperscript{131}Abraham Scultetus, \textit{Die Selbstbiographie des Heidelberger Theologen und Hofpredigers Abraham Scultetus
Abgotteren wider willen ansehen musten.

[how much more then ought wee, whose forefathers were pulled out of popish Babilon, not after seuenty, but after seuen hundred yeers of captiuity, and brought againe together into their old country, sing laud, praise and thankes vnto almighty God for it? [...]But farre greater miserie did our forefathers endure in poperie, when many honest and wel-affected hearts were forced to bee kept & pressed downe vnder the Popes tyrannie, and to behold (against their wils) shamefull and horrible idolatrie.]

Reading the marriage through the re-establishment of Jerusalem, Scultetus imagines a new age of the Church inaugurated by the dynastic union. Counter to most Protestant interpretations of the Church, Scultetus claims that God’s people have once again been grounded in a specific geographical location. He seems to anticipate potential objections to this grounding – which inevitably threatened to render Heidelberg another Rome – and argues for the salubriousness of a fixed location for God’s people during times of his favour:

Allhie aber moecht jemand fragen/ ob dann so viel dran gelegen/ und das so ein hohe wolthat sey/ wann die mauren Jerusalems in einem land recht erbawet seyn? Darauff ist die antwort/ dass in allwege view hieran gelegen/ und es ein hohe thewrewolthat Gottes sey/ wann Jerusalem wol erbawet ist. Dann zu Jerusalem allein/ das ist/ in dem haufflein das Gott recht dienet/ geschicht das/ was in folgendem versickel geschrieben steht: Er heilet die zerbrochnes herzens seindt/ und verbindet ihre schmerzen

[But there might some man perhaps demaund, Whether it be so much to be respected, and bee so great a benefit, to haue the walls of Ierusalem rightly builded in a countrey? Whereunto I answer, That euerie way it is much to bee regarded, and is Gods exceeding great benefit, when Ierusalem is well and rightly builded: For in Ierusalem alone, that is, in the little flocke wherein God is truely serued, is that done which is written in the next verse following, *He healeth those that are broken in heart, and bindeth vp their sores.*]

Meddus’s translation of these lines is somewhat obscure, but Scultetus’s hypothesized objector asks, essentially, if the borders of the Kingdom of God should align with an earthly Kingdom,

---


“in a country.” It is best, Scultetus answers, so that the Church can be “well and rightly builded” — “wol gebawet.” Scultetus implicitly claims that the Palatinate has the truest Church, the best-built Church, and with such, can claim itself to be Jerusalem. Through the pure worship of the Heidelberg Catechism, God can best minister to his people. In this central city, and only here, God will best heal the afflicted. England may have joined with the Palatinate, but far from the dominant imperialism often read into early modern English expansionist hopes, this union is defined by incorporation and de-Anglicization.

The culmination of this imperialist hope can perhaps best be seen only a few years later, when in 1614 Elizabeth gave birth to Henry Frederick, the couple’s first child. The name itself — his uncle’s -- placed him in the tradition of British Heroes and awakened hopes that he would reign over a Protestant empire that combined the might of the English and German people. Henry Peacham, who had been patronized by Prince Henry and celebrated the marriage in a book of mourning for the prince, expresses the imperialist hopes most clearly. In “Prince Henry Revived,” a work dedicated to Elizabeth celebrating her son, Peacham writes:

Now Germanie, and Brittaine, shall be one,
In League, in Lawes, in Love, Religion:
Twixt Dane, and English, English and the Scot,
Olde grudges (see) for ever are forgot;

The Sun-burn’d Niger shall present thee plumes,
Sweet Arabie delicious perfumes:
Sarmatian Ister many a costly skin...134

The child, as Peacham notes, combines almost all the dynastic power of Protestant lands — Scottish, English, Danish, and now German. The neglect for Charles is conspicuous: it seems assumed that this prince, his nephew, will rule over Britain — will make Britain and Germany

---

134 Henry Peacham, *Prince Henrie Revived: Or A Poem upon the Birth, and in honor of the hopefull yong Prince Henrie Frederick* (London: W. Stansby, 1615), sig. B3V-B4R.
one. Once again, the unification, Peacham hints, will follow the patterns presented in early unification projects, for which the Stuart line was famed. Finally, Peacham’s celebration of Henry Frederick’s birth fronts the imperialist expansion that the marriage portends: the entire globe unites under the Protestant emperor, from Africa to the Middle East.

**Wither and Donne**

In responding to the marriage, then, the German Frederick stepped into the role of past English heroes and, more significantly, his land – at least according to some internationalists – superseded England as the metaphorical Israel. The marriage enabled this – a merger not only of the Stuart and Palatine dynastic lines, but the English and Palatinate people into a poorly conceived but desired political union – a foundation for Protestant empire. The imperialist Protestant model of incorporation both promised an increase in English power – as the empire expanded – but also threatened the very de-centering the sermons suggest; if all were equal in and united by the church, the English no longer necessarily played an exceptional role. The idea of the transnational church and this Anglo-German political union, driven in by manifold preachers during the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth, both influenced and provided a foundation for poets celebrating the occasion to imagine a new, transnational unit that encompassed both London and Heidelberg in a larger political union, something separate from and arguably higher than nationalism. Although these themes manifest themselves throughout the epithalamia, two poems in particular reward close reading within this context: George Wither’s “Epithalamion: or Nuptial Poems,” among the first written to celebrate the occasion, and John Donne’s “Epithalamion: or Marriage Song, on the Marriage between the Lady Elizabeth and the Count Palatine being married on St Valentine’s Day.” Wither embraces the union in an apocalyptic context and shifts to an international focus that unites the two peoples;
Donne more cautiously examines the kind of heroism Wither’s approach implies. And yet, these poems interestingly draw out a contradiction in the celebration of these transnational Protestant heroes, for Wither, the iconoclastic Puritan writer, both recognizes and in some ways succumbs to the “archaic charisma of the sovereign;” fervent Protestants both desire a heroic leader of the church, but also iconoclastically reject any head but Christ. Wither threatens to make of Frederick exactly what he claimed he and the English people had made of Henry: another pope. Within this celebrated unifier of the transnational church lurks an idol.

Wither, who always maintained a somewhat-rocky relationship with James’s court based on hurt feelings and the assumption of merit neglected, offers a clear expression of internationalist Protestant hopes as the crown was joined to the most important of the Reformed German princes. As often in his writing, Wither embraces the largely fictional divide between court and country and implicitly raises it as a frame for competing ideological readings of the marriage. In fact, Wither portrays himself as an outsider, one who has vowed “to live exilde,” but has been brought back to the center of power by the momentous event (l.16). Wither hopes explicitly for a new golden age of Protestant unity, mimicking the prophetic element in so much of the festivity and poetry. Wither’s golden age is certainly more militant than those forecast at court: he hopes the union will produce a Protestant heir who will prove “another terror to the Whore of Rome” (192). The marriage offers perhaps the best opportunity to “whelme the pride of Tyber under,” to finally end victoriously the struggle against Roman Catholicism (l.374). It is noteworthy that Wither hopes at first that the couple will produce a Protestant emperor – rather than that Frederick will become a Protestant emperor; the metaphorical merger of England and the Palatinate will thus have received biological expression.

Wither appears equally content with the metaphoric union, however, and he turns
eventually to praising Frederick’s potential glory. Once again, his poem offers a vision of militancy that would likely not have merited James’s approval. Frederick, in fact, is lauded primarily for his heroic and militaristic virtues. Somewhat ironically, given the rather unpleasant future the two would soon face, Wither’s speaker reads in Frederick’s brow

 [...] the storie
Of mightie fame, and a true future glorie.
Me thinkes I doe forsee already, how
Princes and Monarchs at his stirrop bow:
I see him shine in steele; the bloody fields
Already won, and how his proud foe yeelds.
God hath ordained him happyngesse great store. (165-171)

In Frederick himself, as in the marriage, Wither reads a future of conflict, the world still irreparably divided in the apocalyptic struggle between Rome and the true Protestant church. His virtue is an explicitly soldierly virtue. Once again, the hope for Frederick is tied to imperialist expansion, as he will eventually rule over “Princes and Monarchs,” and Wither’s epithalamium embracing a prophetic mode, like much of his poetry. Even Elizabeth’s role is tied to war, as Wither hopes her virtue will cause her to sympathize with and respect the “poore Souldiers,” too often neglected, rather than the “Mimick Apes (that Courts disgraces be)” (238, 244). The manly, soldierly virtue necessary for the conflict with Rome deserves to be once again prized over the current court’s impotent and, for Wither, effeminate non-involvement: “Your wisdom judge (by this experience) can, / Which hath most worth, Hermaphrodite, or Man” (251-2). The same Elizabethan nostalgia and conventional attacks on Stuart effeminacy, present already, would


137 Another irony — as Lewalski has shown, Puritans eventually came to lament the fickleness of the king and wonder at the manly fortitude of the two Elizabeths — deceived by gender expectations.
become heightened exponential during the reign of James’s son.

Both the language and the polemic had fallen out of fashion in court, but Wither specifically recasts the marriage in the apocalyptic mode of Elizabethan Protestant heroism ("Whore of Rome"), an alteration which, according at least to Wither, had been “with Hope expected long” (100). In the marriage, Elizabeth again takes on the role of her namesake: “Our last Eliza grants her Noble spirit” (180). For Wither, the marriage represents a restoration of a kind of Protestant unity against Rome that court fashion threatened to eclipse. He remains characteristically bitter about his separation from James’s court, and returns frequently and petulantly to stress this difference — to stress how far court has departed from his (and in his opinion the people’s) views. He worries the princess and others may dismiss his poem (in the middle of a long stretch of stern didacticism) since he is “not of those Heliconian wits, / Whose pleasing straines the Courts knowne humour fits” (269-70). Consequently, he finds himself “in Court now almost hated” (406). Still, Wither’s edge hardly conceals the fact that he scorns the “knowne humour” of the court, and it is clear he hopes Frederick and Elizabeth will side with the moral majority, now fallen from power. Indeed, even his Spenserian style harkens back to the Elizabethan age and identifies him with an antiquated tradition. As scholars have shown, the Spenserian verse quickly took on a dangerous political edge during the early Stuarts, and like Wither’s verse, often hearkened back to the more heroic virtues of Elizabethans.138

The marriage itself, however, offers Wither a way to imagine Protestant connection that in some ways supersedes and replaces the more nationalistic, court-centered English Protestantism of the second half of the sixteenth century. The Epithalamium, like the masques at

court, appropriates the popular topos of a marriage between rivers — found also, for example, in
the nation-writing works, Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* and Drayton’s *Polyolbion* — and includes
the Rhine to extend beyond the borders of the isle. Wither reads into this marriage more,
perhaps, than the court suggests. The rivers do not solely represent the princes, but all people;
this union makes “Countries” and “Nations” one. Further, their match portends future expansion:
Wither prays that God might “Make this Rhyne and Thame an Ocean” ( ). The marriage of rivers,
so attached to the land and the nation in *Polyolbion*, becomes metonymic for the marriage of
peoples: “We hope that this will the uniting prove / Of Countries and of Nations by your love”
(189-90). It is useful to remember that love — Charity — was for many Protestant theologians
the most important force binding the international church together. More importantly, scholars of
early modern nationalist sentiment have often turned to expressions of this topos — the marriage
of rivers — for evidence of a nascent understanding of territorial and national identity. While
Claire McEachern and Richard Helgerson disagree over the meaning of the rivers in *Polyolbion*,
for example, both see their marriages as central to the kind of nationalism developing in
England. McEachern notes that in some ways, *Poly-Olbion* is a text that celebrates union: “rivers
unite, erode, quench difference.”139 One of the foremost tropes that enabled English writers think
about a British nationalism only a decade before is reapplied repeatedly in this match —
difference is eroded here again, but now between England (Thames) and the Palatinate (Rhine). Given that these writers had just gone through an expansion of national context with the union to
Scotland, it seems plausible that they would be prepared imagine ways to join together in a larger
union with the German territory.

For Wither, then, it seems this match shifts allegiance already to a transnational

association of the church, framed in the apocalyptic binary. The same tropes and themes that appear at court are taken and radicalized by Wither, presented in new ways. There is a militant edge to Elizabeth’s comparison to Elizabeth I; Frederick stands in Wither’s prophecy over the bloody field, rather than ruling over peace. The most important trope for the union of England and the Palatinate is the marriage of rivers. At court, the rivers had referred simply and directly to the princes and elided any wider, nationalist significance. Beaumont, who makes the metaphor most central to his masque, had clearly implied that Elizabeth and Frederick were the rivers:

“You Nymphes,” says Mercury, addressing the crowd of nobles, “who bathing in your loved springs, / Beheld these Rivers in their infancy.”

In the masques identity is tied to dynasty; in Wither, the Stuarts are muted and matter only as figureheads of a larger and more important union. Their marriage has made a deeper and already extant communion more visible.

John Donne also wrote an Epithalamion for the wedding, and like Wither, Donne was, at least at the time, estranged from the court. Two years prior to the wedding Donne had written an anti-Catholic polemic to pave his way back to the inside; two years later, he would take orders. Currently, he was resisting insistent pressure to become a priest. Donne’s Epithalamion is unconventional and oddly decontextualized, compared to the others. Virginia Tufte describes the poem as “one of the most ingenious epithalamia after Spenser and the one which best demonstrates Donne’s major contribution to the mode, the restoration of humor.”

The elegy certainly resonates with playfulness, but how exactly this relates to the grand stakes of the marriage is not immediately clear. Donne shows little interest in the prophetic implications of the union. In fact, as Barbara Lewalski has pointed out, he oddly makes no reference to progeny —

---


“eliding the reformist Protestant hopes so heavily invested in that progeny.”\textsuperscript{142} While other poets, like Wither, modestly abstain themselves from describing the lovers after they retire, Donne characteristically focuses on the moment of consummation.\textsuperscript{143} The entire day, for his speaker, possesses an annoying inertia against the wedding bed. The day seems too long, “longer today than other days;” the feast is eaten too slowly with “gluttonous delays;” the day encumbers them with constant “formalities retarding” their progress toward the bedroom.\textsuperscript{144} As the delays suggest, the poem, I think, sits uncomfortably with much of the celebratory verse commemorating the day and forecasting the couple’s future. Critics focused on the marriage tend to treat Donne’s poem briefly, and include it in the same general laudatory and prophetic pattern of the day. George Gomori, for example, in his insightful survey of the Epithalamia dedicated to the Palatine wedding, claims that Donne, too, seemed to think the wedding could be the dawn of a happier age;\textsuperscript{145} and the final stanza does triumphantly declare that, by the marriage, “Nature restored is” (100). The tone and the focus of the poem, however, the return to the bedroom, in some ways undercut the exuberance of the celebration, minimizing its importance. Instead, it seems, Donne’s “An Epithalamium, or Marriage Song on the Lady Elizabeth and Count Palatine being Married on St Valentine’s Day,” recognizes and questions the zeal of the heroism projected onto the young couple by his contemporaries. Like other writers, Donne engages with the bonds holding together social and religious communities, but his poem is cautious, and in its

\textsuperscript{142} Lewalksi, \textit{Writing Women}, 52.

\textsuperscript{143} One of the trends in Neo-Latin Renaissance epithalamia, however, was “concentration on erotic description of conjugal union” and an important motif in all three of Donne’s epithalamia. Tufte, \textit{The Poetry of Marriage}, 88. Chapman does the same in his Epithalamion, and it was, of course, a common move in the genre generally.


\textsuperscript{145} Gömöri, “A Memorable Wedding,” 216.
caution outlines some of the characteristics of the heroism foisted upon the wedded couple and the problems with the model of Protestant empire that this heroism implied.

Donne rehashes one of his favorite metaphors to describe the couple: they are “two phoenixes” (18). Some slight irony might be involved in this claim, beyond the mere fact that only one phoenix exists at a given time. In this context, the phoenix metaphor is not original to Donne. Elizabeth, as others scholars have demonstrated, was incessantly termed a phoenix as she was flatteringly compared to Elizabeth I. Prince Henry, along with other Protestant heroes, had also been celebrated as a phoenix – including in Joshua Sylvester’s collection, for which Donne had written an elegy. The phoenix became a stock image of Protestant heroism, and the image of singularity ironically surfeited the celebration of these figures; the world was full of many. The celebrations in the Palatinate hailed Frederick as a phoenix both for his connection to these past heroes and, in this context, for his ability to reignite the relationship between England and Germany. In Donne’s epithalamia, however, the image of singularity is transformed into an image of union, as it is in “The Canonization,” restoring some balance to nature as the two phoenixes become one: “For since these two are two no more, / There’s but one phoenix still, as was before” (101-2). Marriage has made them one, so nature no longer contains two singularities; but the insistence of “still,” and the somewhat ambiguous “as was before” awkwardly appended question the image and hint that Donne might be gently mocking the frantic desire to apotheosize these two sixteen year olds.

The marriage once again provides Donne with a way of thinking about social and religious unions; two phoenixes merging sets a pattern for the merger of nations. Frederick and

---

146 See Smart, “From Gartern Knight to Second David,” 181; Ziegler, “Devising a Queen,” 166; This imagery was also revived to celebrate the birth of the couple’s first son, Frederick Heinrich. Calcagno, “A Matter of Precedence,” 249.
Elizabeth’s union is, for Donne’s speaker, clear and desired and yet somewhat multifaceted. He blends the sacred and the secular, as usual, but each mode is fully embedded in the rhetoric of the Palatine celebrations. As we have seen, most of the preachers and many of the poets also mixed holy and profane – politics and the church -- especially because sex and marriage stood as such privileged, biblical metaphors for understanding the relationship between God and his people. Donne certainly also employs this metaphor to explain their marriage, two becoming one; but there are multiple ways this deep union must be forged: “Go, then to where the Bishop stays, / To make you one, his way, which divers ways / Must be effected” (l.51-3). The union demands social consecration – the banquets and feasts – religious consecration – the bishops – and sexual consecration. The last “knot” the couple must tie themselves. Their new relationship is almost over-determined, so enormous that it sounds more like Donne speaks of kingdoms — or perhaps the church — as he explains their union:

To an unseparable union grow
Since separation
Falls not on such things as are infinite,
Nor things which are but one, can disunite,
You’re twice inseparable, great, and one. (l.46-49)

The princes are infinite and thus, like God, indivisible, both because they are princes and because they are now married. There is something both reductive and coldly theological in the demand for unity, the repetition of one – things which are one can never not be one – a circular argument about divinity. The (poorly) rhyming pairs of opposites – separation/one; infinite/disunite – militate against the simple reading of singularity and perhaps push back against the complete incorporation and undifferentiated state the union purportedly achieves. Finally, characteristic of this poem, the entire brief stanza comprises imperatives aimed only at Elizabeth: go/grow. The speaker demands from the princess a unity with fixed meaning – the princes must both
accomplish this union and represent it perfectly for the people.

The conflation of sacred and sexual in Donne’s poem, however, seems to undercut some of the heroism: his repeated use of “courage,” for example, to mean both bravery and, more often, sexual appetite (in the second and penultimate stanza). Frederick was celebrated as a militant young prince, his success at the tournaments portending great future victory. Donne’s “courage” leads Frederick to a very different conquest. The triumphalist vision presented by Wither, quoted earlier, perhaps helps illuminate Donne’s use of sexual metaphors and puns: “I see him shine in steele. The bloudy fields / Already wonne; and how his proud foe yeelds” (Wither, 169-170). This kind of aggressive, militant zeal filled many of the epithalamia written by internationalists, but in Donne the martial and bloody qualities of Frederick are refigured as sexual desire. Indeed, lust and consumption become metonymic for the expansionist desires of his contemporaries. The diction of Wither obviously subjects itself to this kind of mocking re-interpretation, filled with swords and yielding foes. But gluttony, too, joins with lust to typify the day’s desires: “The feast with gluttonous delays / Is eaten, and too long their meat they praise” (l.65-6). The predatory zeal seems to leave little room for a full union of peoples.

Throughout the poem, any hope for lasting equality is continually challenged. Donne at least hints at the matter of precedence, which would become so problematic later in their marriage: “Here lies a she sun, and a he moon here” (85-6). (It was well known James had made Frederick vow to give Elizabeth pride of place based on her higher birth.) Their union, then, seems both sure and conflicted; they are united in so many ways, and yet still distinct and in some ways competing heavenly bodies.

The union between the princes does not interest Donne alone; rather, his poem investigates the relationship between the couple, as Protestant heroes, and their followers. As in
Donne’s canon generally, the in-poem audience occupies a subtle yet important role. Unlike most of Donne’s poems, however, the speaker is part of the audience, an observer of spectacle rather than the subject. Donne advertises this shift in perspective, riffing on one of his most popular conceits: the blinking eyes of the lovers have— or will have — power over the sun. And yet, the speaker is not the lover in this poem, but rather one of the audience subject to the idiosyncratic whims of the lover, living in a world in which the eyes of Frederick and Elizabeth control daybreak: “[…] we / As satyrs watch the sun’s uprise, will stay / Waiting, when your eyes opened, let out day, / Only desired, because your face we see” (ll.103-6). The somewhat creepy, peeping-Tom presence that overlooks lovers in many of Donne’s poems (e.g., “The Ecstasy”) resides here, too; except it consists of the speaker and us readers. The conceit, bold enough when Donne applies it to himself, oversells itself in the suggestion that we all experience even the sun filtered only through Elizabeth’s eyes. The lines not only conflate the speaker and readers (“we”) in an inert and nearly passive state of anticipation, mere “watchers” of the sleeping newlyweds, the syntax continually asserts the watched over the watchers, driving home their overriding importance (“your eyes,” and the inverted “your face”). Even for an Epithalamium, the praise sounds excessive; and certainly the location — gazing on the edge of the private wedding bed — further complicates the picture. The audience becomes somewhat problematic, in fact, even in this quote — satyrs, drunken in celebratory excesses, with an unhealthy focus on the couple. They — or rather, we — hover over the private scene and wager over when and how they will first awake (108); and speak to one another in whispers (107).

Perhaps the audience alone and in itself does not receive the brunt of the poem’s

147 And, as Lewalski has noted, resided during the actual marriage, as James voyeuristically went to check on the newlyweds: “James’s voyeuristic visit to the couple in bed the next morning replayed these gestures of authority in low-comedy domestic terms: according to Chamberlain, the King “did strictly examine him whether he were a true son-in-law, and was sufficiently assured.”” Lewalski, Writing Women, 51-2.
criticism, but rather the action — or inaction — of that audience. Certainly, the poet who had written Satire III, demanding that each must individually struggle up the hill of truth, may have held reservations about the kind of Protestant hope piled on Frederick and, to a lesser extent, Elizabeth. Spectacle — the unremitting and obsequious gaze of the audience — frustrates interpretation in Donne’s Epithalamium. Elizabeth is both decked with stars and herself a star, a constellation, and as such must be read frantically by the observers for meaning:

Up, up, fair Bride, and call,
Thy stars from out their several boxes, take
Thy rubies, pearls, and diamonds forth, and make
Thyself a constellation, of them all,
And by their blazing, signify,
That a great Princess falls, but doth not die;
Be thou a new star, that to us portends
Ends of much wonder; and be thou those ends. ()

It’s a complex and convoluted sentence, but I think the most important point to make is that, among the dense metaphor, the poem demands that Elizabeth be not only the signifier and the thing signified, but even the thing that the signified metaphorically signifies. That is, Elizabeth must be a star, which has heavenly meaning; she herself must portend that heavenly meaning; and then she must effect or accomplish the meaning. The metaphor of the stars is particularly loaded in this context. Blazing stars, as Donne claims in the next line, portend the death of princes; so, there is a sexual pun on Elizabeth’s death, her consummation with Frederick. But also, as we have seen, Prince Henry’s death played a major role in many of the Epithalamia, and the mention of a blazing star and a falling princess could not but remind readers of the recently dead prince. Constellation imagery had filled the mourning for Henry, neatly capturing, as I suggested in my last chapter, both the way in which Henry became established as a cultural symbol and also the competition over his meaning – the contested astrology. Here, the fall of one
star is replaced by another baring the same weight and meaning. The following injunction (“be thou a new star”) plays on the common desire to have Elizabeth — or Frederick — succeed Henry as the leader of militant Protestantism. Still, stars are notoriously difficult to read — even the blazing star in the poem is misinterpreted, since it does not herald Elizabeth’s death, but rather her marriage. Elizabeth, herself becoming a “new star,” may be equally inscrutable, offering no clear signification. The firm close to the sentence, the staccato half line after the semi-colon, in which each word could be stressed, demands that she not only promise, but deliver. Her status as spectacle, as the hope and focal point of all Protestantism, is demanding and uncertain, even frustrating: “Is all your care but to be looked upon, / And be to others spectacle, and talk” (63-4). The day has calcified the new couple into the figureheads of Protestantism, locked them in the roles of their predecessors: Frederick, Henry’s; and Elizabeth, Elizabeth I’s. In Donne’s poem, this seems an unwise burden.

The heroism for Donne seems perhaps to rely too heavily on others, even promising and noble others, to uphold the kingdom of God in the world: “From thine eye / All lesser birds will take their jollity” (31-2). When the opening stanza warns against excessive love, or lechery — somewhat of a strange move in an Epithalamium — it comes eventually to seem addressed to the adulating crowds — the Prince and Princesses lovers — and the Protestants zealous for union with the Palatinate rather than the couple themselves (who, after all, should find their way to the marriage bed and enjoy it); “the sparrow that neglects his life for love” burns himself out in hero-worship, waiting passively in the crowds. If Donne was indeed questioning the wisdom of such heroism, his poem proved far more prophetic than his more exuberant co-celebrants. Within a decade, the high hope of Protestantism was left defeated, exiled, and stripped of titles, and England’s Elizabeth was forbidden by James to return to her native country.
"A Straunge Father"

Frederick and Elizabeth themselves were among the Protestants who misinterpreted the meaning of festivities on the day of their marriage. When Frederick took the crown of Bohemia, encouraged by Elizabeth, they expected the great association of the church to succor them against the Hapsburg powers. No help came. German princes and even the Netherlands sent word of their support, but remained cautious, afraid to upset the emperor. James claimed that he did not advise — in fact, did not even know about — his son-in-law’s decision. Stubbornly, he refused to send aid and continued pursuing a Spanish match for Charles. At court, it was rumored that Moritz of Orange had spoken critically of James: “he is a straunge father that will neither fight for his children or pray for them.” Many in England undoubtedly sympathized. James not only failed to succor his daughter and her husband, but during their disastrous war in Bohemia, he strictly censored any discussion of Bohemian affairs, including prohibiting public rejoicing over the birth of Elizabeth’s fifth child. As the war — which many contemporaries understood as the prophesied apocalyptic struggle between the forces of God and Satan — became more and more disastrous for Frederick and the Protestants, it became harder to reconcile nationalism with Protestant militancy.

Efforts were still made, hortatory calls to remember the past English heroism. John Taylor, one of the poets who celebrated the wedding, wrote a poem to commemorate the small expedition sent to aid the Palatinate, though forbidden to engage with Spanish forces, An Englishmans love to Bohemia. Taylor calls on the English to remember their former militant

148 Contemporary polemic accuses her of driving him to it, controlling him behind the scenes.
150 Lewalski, Writing Women, 57.
virtues -- they used to be so warlike that they would war against themselves when they ran out of foreign enemies. The entire poem resounds with reminders of English glory, primarily Elizabethan, but stretching further into the past:

Remember you are sonnes unto such sires
Whose sacred memories the world admires
Like Talbot to the French, or Drake to Spaine:
Thinke on brave valiant Essex, and Mountjoy,
And Sidney, that did England’s foes destroy.\[^{151}\]

Currently, that virtue has gone cold, wasted as the English rot away in the luxury of peace. For Taylor, however, though he tries to bring nationalist sentiment to the task, the glory of the church, rather than of the country, is his prime concern in this battle. He claims in his introduction that this is a cause “which I believe God and his servants do affect,” and the entire poem is filled with the religious significance of the battle: “Since God then in his love did preordaine / That you should be his Champions, to maintaine / His quarrel.”\[^{152}\] Even the past examples of England’s virtue re-invoke the apocalyptic atmosphere: “And Belgia but for the English and the Scots, / Perpetuall slavery had bee in their lots.”\[^{153}\] God wants the English to again take lead in this struggle for the church, but it is a struggle that unites nations: “Where honour, truth, love, royall reputation, / Make Realmes and Nations ioyne in combination.”\[^{154}\] The (false) list of allied countries that Taylor gives, again meant to flare up English sentiment, includes all Protestant powers other than England: the Netherlands, the German States, Denmark, Sweden, Hungary. And once again, a model for the union of nations again seems present in the British Union: the English used to fight the Scots, but now they have become the same, like Judah and

\[^{151}\] John Taylor, *An Englishmans Love to Bohemia* (Dort, 1620), 4.

\[^{152}\] Ibid., 3.

\[^{153}\] Ibid., 8.

\[^{154}\] Ibid., 1.
Israel: “But since that we are they, and they are we / More neere then brethren, now conjoined be.” Only a head is needed and the kind of expansion promised by the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth might once again prove possible.

The moment when Frederick left to assume the crown of Bohemia thus recalled and rekindled the great hope for a Protestant emperor, even if, perhaps, the enthusiasm was short-lived and myopic and never reached the frenetic pitch of the wedding ceremonies. Still, the entourage of Protestant heroism was refreshed and employed to describe the (it was hoped) victorious Protestant emperor. Martin Opitz, one of the most influential contemporary German poets, who played an import role in standardizing German vernacular poetry with his Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey, wrote an enthusiastic Latin encomium in celebration of Frederick’s crowning. In the shared language of European learning, Oratio ad serenissimum ac potentissimum Principem Fridericum, Regem Bohemiae forwards stark and optimistic claims that reveal some of the assumptions inherent in the imperialistic wedding celebration. For when Frederick took the crown, many Protestants throughout Europe assumed that he would at last subdue Rome and usher in a reign of Protestant peace. Perhaps more surprisingly, these exaggerated claims of Frederick’s majesty were translated un-bowdlerized in an anonymous English version of the oration and made available to an even wider English public. In 1620, a time when Frederick and Elizabeth had already been forced to retreat and popular sentiment had yearned for English involvement, the oration’s celebration of Frederick comes almost unavoidably at the expense of James. “O brave King, this is not enough,” claims the speech, “O King, worthy of the Empire of the whole World, worthy of the favour; worthy also of the

\[^{155}\text{Ibid., 5.}\]
admiration of thy very Enemies!” The empire of the whole world, all subdued and united Frederick, who takes the crown, according to Opitz, to ensure peace. Frederick bears the hopes of Protestant imperial ambition because he, unlike James, has fought for the pan-Protestantism rather than his particular people; he has devoted himself to the church: he is “so divine a Masion for Vertue, and did also consecrate it to the whole Christian world.” So Frederick’s supporters in England had hoped, as they waited for a Christian hero who would supersede national allegiance and unite the people of God; the union of Britain and the Palatinate had seemed a first step in this realignment of political and religious communities. But if, as we have seen, internationalist Protestant hopes shifted to Heidelberg, Frederick rather than James represents their imperialist ambition. James, indeed, is almost elided in the celebration. Even his daughter is related not directly to him, but to his predecessor, Queen Elizabeth, and the golden age of Elizabethan heroism: “your Wife the Heire of the Name and Vertues of that ever renowned Queene great Elizabeth.” While James does receive congratulations, he is celebrated for his projects of unification and his learning – for constructing an imperial foundation rather than ruling an empire: he “hath joyned profound Learning to incredible Wisdom of governing […] and] under a happie Starre hath added England unto Scotland” (7R/). As in interpretations of the marriage ceremonies from Germany and from internationalist Protestants in England, James was sidelined in favor of the younger and more belligerent prince.

Frederick, however, soon lost his status as the figurehead of Protestantism, defeated, impotent, and exiled to the Hague. According to prevailing scholarly opinion, he simply never

156 Martin Opitz, An Oration to the Most Illustrious and Mightie Prince Frederick King of Bohemia (London, 1620), sig. B2V.

157 Ibid., sig. B2V.

158 Ibid., sig. B1R.
had the talent to live up to Protestant expectations. Yates diagnosed this early in her book, following much of the propaganda of the seventeenth century: “The truth probably is that Frederick’s chief crime was that he failed. If he had succeeded in establishing himself in Bohemia, all the waverers, including his father-in-law, would probably have wavered over to him.”\textsuperscript{159} All the celebration and hope invested in the couple came to nothing, and for many years Protestantism itself, at least in the empire, seemed in danger of being extirpated. Donne’s caution, perhaps, proved more keenly foresighted than Wither’s prophetic mode — too much was invested in the couple. “Frederick, Elector Palatinate, had turned out to be a mirage.”\textsuperscript{160} Elizabeth became the living distressed and exiled woman of Revelation, metonymy of the church; her life, which, as Lewalksi has demonstrated, was structured along romance patterns, nearly brought to life the final cantos of Spenser’s fifth book. Now, however, the lady morning in exile was not simply the church/Netherlands, but the church/Netherlands/Palatine/and England’s abandoned daughter. In rejecting Elizabeth — not only refusing refuge in England, but even prohibiting a visit — it appeared to many of the English people that James had very obviously and unnaturally rejected both his daughter and, on a larger scale, the church.

The competing understandings of the marriage, as I hope I have shown, manifested a rift between James’s dynastic imperialism and the expansionist hopes of international Protestants; more significantly, the myriad interpretive possibilities for the event demonstrate that empire and nation still had no fixed meaning. For James, the marriage was dynastic, and the Stuart dynasty defined and was coterminous with the British nation; for Wither and other internationalists, the marriage was not seen in dynastic or even national terms. It was, most importantly, a celebration

\textsuperscript{159} Yates, \textit{The Rosicrucian Enlightenment}, 22.

\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., 24.
of the true church, illuminating and reinforcing the bonds between Protestants on the continent and in England. This marriage, this union, was held together by love, that great binding force that, as theologians repeatedly stressed, was owed to all coreligionists. Mystically, like marriage generally, love bound two political bodies into a single and unified one: the body of Christ.

Even in England, then, many hoped that Frederick might prove capable of ruling over the whole world. German and English faded in importance as markers of identity as, it was hoped, the apocalyptic future might reveal God’s people and God’s enemies. The division of military might in Europe, coupled with Frederick’s relative incompetence, quickly dashed these hopes, but Frederick remained for some time a carrier of the Protestant heroic tradition. His German identity provoked some unease in England, as we have seen, but for many was less important than his service to the Protestant church. In the oration, as in the past poems celebrating the wedding, the iconography and metaphors of this are invoked: once again, Frederick is an Augustus, a David, a Solomon, but one driven by the love of religion rather than fame. After Frederick’s retreat, the conflict quickly became a disaster for Protestant hopes; but these tropes stood waiting in England and on the continent for the entrance into the war of the greatest Protestant hero of the early seventeenth century, the Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus.
4. Gustav Adolph and the Pan-Protestant Literary Field

Introduction

Shortly after the death of Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden and Protestant hero of the Thirty Years War, an anonymous poet in England noted the multilingual character of the accounts of Gustavus’s heroic campaign:

And when it seem’d to lie, or write too much
In English; ’twas good Historie in Dutch.
If it some townes, his Conquest had out-runne,
As Prophecie; twas true ere all was done.¹

The short passage both connects and divides the Protestant communities in England and on the Continent. It implies that the same history was told in both languages in a collaborative and supplementary way – and, it might be added, two languages that included in themselves multiple variations and ethnic groups, since English was increasingly spoken by all the peoples of the British Isles, and “Dutch” referred loosely to all the Germanic languages of the continent, from the Netherlands throughout the German territories. Yet also, if facetiously, it registers English anxiety about the temporal lag inherent in waiting on news from afar and the failures of English heroism in the linguistic difference it detects. Those things that seem too miraculous to be true in English – the swiftness of Gustavus’s conquest; the hope of a Protestant empire; the long-awaited fall of Rome – become true in German, perhaps because the Swedish king is capable of more than the English. As those sceptical of continental news lamented, publications often hurried to proclaim Gustavus’s latest conquest, eschewing tedious fact-checking, outpacing even

the victorious general; but for the poet, the dull prose of the corantoes thus becomes prophecy. Once again, a light irony characterizes the verse, and the poem’s tone qualifies any firm commitment to the purported foresight. This short passage, however, shrewdly captures some of the chief tensions and characteristics of the Protestant celebration of Gustavus: it was multilingual, transnational, steeped in religious language and biblical, millenarian prophecy, and yet invested in some way in the meaning of Englishness – and, for that matter, “Dutchness.”

The English poetry celebrating and mourning Gustavus Adolphus has seen a scattering of criticism – primarily in its relation to Thomas Carew’s famous refusal to commemorate his death. The scholars who have drawn attention to the poetry on the Swedish king have generally retained a political and Anglo-centric focus. Simon McKeown, for example, notes the political edge of English elegies in the Caroline period and argues that “quite clearly, writing about Gustavus Adolphus had become a political gesture of disapprobation and defiance in 1630s’ England.” Martin Blain argues that Gustavus “becomes a focal point in a Caroline debate on the role of military activism in the construction and representation of national identity.” While both McKeown and Blaine make compelling arguments – and indeed Blaine’s claim closely parallels my own -- the nationalist focus once again obscures in part the complex negotiation of community enacted in the elegies. In this chapter, I will examine two poems which both reflect, in different ways, on the departure of Protestant heroism from Britain: Thomas Carew’s abnegation of the task of Eulogizing Gustavus Adolphus, and Ralph Knevett’s epic expansion of The Faerie Queene, which establishes Gustavus as the true heir of Elizabethan Protestant heroism. Carew’s poem, especially, has been thoroughly mined for political significance over the

---


past three decades, as critics challenged early conceptions of the “airy” and “epicurean” lyric and began reading it as a complex political statement. While the poetry on Gustavus has been examined in both a national and courtly context, however, my argument is that Carew attempts in his poem to enforce borders on the English literary sphere – to define as foreign the kind of heroic writing that mourned the Swedish king. In this, Carew parallels the national consolidation – cutting ties from the continent – of the Laudian clergy, insisting on England’s separation from the continent and drawing the borders in bold lines. Even Carew, however, is unable to define Englishness in a vacuum and must also draw on continental resources. Through many elegies, pamphlets, and sermons, I will contextualize these poems in contemporary debates on the heroic Swedish king and argue that Gustavus not only forced internationalist Protestants to re-evaluate the meaning of their nationality – as Marlin Blaine has suggested – but, even more, he forced many English writers to re-evaluate how their national identity related to their identity as Protestants, to view the two as equally compelling but distinct modes of self-understanding, and to re-imagine how these identifications shaped their literature.

The debate between Carew and the elegists of Gustavus Adolphus, in other words, comprises a debate over the national literary canon, and fighting over what constitutes English literature was in many ways another field for fighting over the nation. Writers on both sides insist on this fact and tie their poetry to English identity. In a way, Gustavus’s subject confirms Carew’s self-appointed role as arbiter of English literature, and those writing on the Swedish king inevitably exclude themselves from writing the nation. Instead, their writing belongs to a

---

4 For early readings of the poem as a renunciation of the political, see especially C.V. Wegwood, Poetry and Politics under the Stuarts (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1960), 44; Louis Martz, The Wit of Love (London: Chatto& Windus, 1970), 73.

transnational Protestant literary field, a shared venture that Carew and others at court define as increasingly foreign. Though Knevet controverts Carew by rehashing a major and heroic English poem — in fact, a poem that set itself up as the national epic — he rewrites the Fairy Court as transnational Protestantism, lacking both geographical borders and, after the death of Elizabeth, a true earthly head. His attempt to challenge Carew only proves his rival claims: England has lost the epic, which fits instead the militant and transnational Protestant community, to which Knevet and his poem most fully belong.

These two works, then, illuminate for us very different conceptions of literary community and collective identity and suggest an alternative, transnational literary field in the early modern period. The rapidity of conquest and the apocalyptic character of the events in Germany, key concepts in the short English passage above, appear constantly in the elegies mourning the Swedish king, but so, too, do dozens of images and patterns of praise. Indeed, our focus on the explanatory power of the unique has perhaps occluded the overarching repetition common to early modern literature. The value placed on imitation and dialogue produced countless iterations of the same themes, images, and rhetorical devices. Elegies, as themselves an increasingly codified genre, certainly reflect the frequent repetition, while demonstrating also the transnational potency of literary form. Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of the literary field might serve here as a useful heuristic, and this repetition and response actually renders a more concrete version of the literary field visible. It highlights the connections between authors, the ways in which all literary production was social – collaborative and competitive. The same general “cultural imaginary” – that reservoir of shared language, texts and symbols, derived especially from the Bible and the literature of Greece and Rome – serves as a foundation for most of the
The literature celebrating the Swedish king, however, demonstrates pointed ways in which the early modern literary field – to adopt the somewhat anachronistic metaphor – differed from later manifestations. For Bourdieu, literary production is best understood within a social and competitive context. He provides an elaborate theoretical frame, which sees the literary field as game with a specific logic and its own stakes, values, forms of symbolic capital, hierarchies, techniques and institutions. Bourdieu calls for a focus on the agents of the field (authors, translators, publishers), while also recognizing that these agents are shaped by their social and institutional “point of view.” Inside, writers and poets struggle for pre-eminence, and our aesthetics – which become ossified in literary canons – are the products of past conflict. Because of his focus on both institutions and agents, Bourdieu imagines significant dynamism in the field. Newcomers,

to occupy a distinct, distinctive position, [...] must assert their difference, get it known and recognized, get themselves known and recognized, by endeavouring to impose new modes of thought and expression, out of key with the prevailing modes of thought and with the doxa, and therefore bound to disconcert the orthodox by their ‘obscurity’ and ‘pointlessness’ [...] every new position, in asserting itself as such, determines a displacement of the whole structure.7

Bourdieu’s metaphor provides a useful model for thinking about literary production, but, as the theory itself demands, it must be historically situated. Indeed, many scholars would argue that the necessary conditions did not yet apply in the early modern period. The borders between the literary and non-literary were certainly much more ambiguous, and the identities of authors were not only significantly different, but impacted writing differently. Bourdieu’s writing,

---


moreover, focuses on French literature in the nineteenth century and implicitly places authors always within a national canon. In this high age of nationalism, these borders make sense, but in post-modern, pre-modern, and perhaps early modern times, when the attraction of the nation is different and less determinate, writers often imagine their literary work within alternative communities – the church, for instance, or cosmopolitan humanist circles, or even various regional or ethnic groups. Bourdieu’s sense of a competitive negotiation of capital might thus still be useful for imagining how writers positioned themselves within the literary sphere, but we might add that in the early modern period the very borders of that field were under negotiation. To assume the national canon already grants victory to those poets – like Thomas Carew – who saw the country as the more important source of identity and re-created the literary field accordingly.8

In the praise and mourning for Gustavus Adolphus, it becomes clear that the same tropes, myths, and base texts central to the king’s portrayal were shared across both political and linguistic borders, and that zealous Protestant poets from across Europe saw themselves as part of the same community. These poets imagined a wider, religious space for literary production – and the multilingualism perhaps distinguishes this early modern community even from post-national literary fields. There are, of course, multiple reasons that the same repetitions can be found in literature on Gustavus throughout Protestantism. The Protestant heroic tradition, which had been shaped by the nobility who had defended the Protestant church almost since its inception – Frederick the Wise, Willem van Oranje, Sir Philip Sidney – prescribed a certain set

---

8 Relatedly, in his influential discussion the English nation, Andrew Hadfield has linked early English nationalism to the emergence of a public sphere. The cross pollination between poets and clergymen evidenced in the celebration of Gustavus suggests that the borders of that public sphere were not entirely national. Or rather, that various proto-public spheres existed, imagined differently: national, circles of cosmopolitan elite, religious communities, etc. Andrew Hadfield, Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 5-8.
of metaphors that Gustavus’s followers quickly appropriated. Moreover, the English received their information on the German war primarily from sources translated out of Dutch or German, as many English Protestants followed events on the continent closely. But perhaps at a most basic level, these images, comparisons, and myths recur again and again across linguistic traditions because German, English, and Dutch elegists viewed themselves as part of the international community of mourners, the community fostered and redefined by death. By examining this literature, therefore, I hope to demonstrate the lingering pull of religious identity on English writers, and show also how Carew dismantles this Pan-Protestant literary sphere with his insistent focus on national distinction.

**Carew and the borders of English literature**

The recent interest in both royalist poetics and the court of Charles I, largely pioneered by Kevin Sharpe but flourishing within the last two decades, has significantly altered the reputation of Thomas Carew and re-contextualized his most famous political poem. Almost universally, these scholars have stressed that Carew writes his “In Answer of an Elegiacall Letter” within a political debate, highlighting the many elegies on Gustavus Adolphus to which he responds. This polemical context changes how the supposedly serene and “Cavalier” poem can be read: “it remains perforce entrenched in discourses of confrontation. Charles is unavoidably compared to Gustavus; and perhaps those who read the poem in manuscript circulation may have identified

---


irony in the terms of that comparison.”\textsuperscript{11} Even Carew’s abdication of politics is political. As often happens in criticism, however, scholars of the Caroline court have tended to adopt its rhetoric and polemical stance. Sharpe has argued as vociferously for Charles’s centrist position as either William Laud or Charles himself. His reading of Carew places the poet, too, as a measured and balanced voice in the face of extremes – tyranny or license. Sharpe notes the “tensions in Carew’s verse and life – between explicit language and artful poise, between hedonism and self-control” -- and claims that he balances them “as the heir of Jonsonian morality.”\textsuperscript{12} Other revisionists and post-revisionists interested in Caroline court culture have followed suit. This particular poem, James Loxley claims, does idealize Platonic Love and Charles’s government, “but it neither urges nor enacts the forgetting of Gustavus Adolphus”; it rather stresses the importance of both ideological stances.\textsuperscript{13} According to Andrew McRae, Carew manages an “indeterminacy” (evidenced by the stark disagreement among early critics) that is “entirely characteristic of a politicized early Stuart poetry of praise and blame.”\textsuperscript{14} This has been recent critical consensus: Carew balances extremes with a quasi-Marvellian ambiguity and irony, implying criticism of both Charles and the internationalists. For “In Answer of an Elegiack Letter,” however, this focus seems rather misleading, obscuring the meaning of the debate Carew enters. The argument focuses not on English political involvement in foreign wars or even Charles’s effeminacy compared to foreign heroes, but rather on the character of Englishness

\textsuperscript{11} Andrew McRae, \textit{Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State} (New York: Cambridge UP, 2004), 186.


\textsuperscript{14} McRae, \textit{Literature}, 186.
itself. In other words, Carew is not taking a centrist position, but rather defining the center. Notably, he responds to fellow court poets and future royalists: even William Watts, the author/translator of the *Swedish Intelligencer*, would serve Charles in the war. Proto-royalists, as Sharpe himself has shown, could hearken back to Elizabethan glory as nostalgically as any of the Protestants outside of the court.¹⁵

Loxley’s nationalist reading insinuates what becomes the most important facet of the debate: “The most striking detail of the moral and political map of Europe created by Townshend and King is its very lack of a place, worthy or shameful, for Britain and Charles.”¹⁶ In this context, Loxley claims, we must read Carew’s answer. Yet Charles and Britain disappear in part because the elegists of Gustavus base their mourning in a different community; the nation matters little in these elegies, but the poets mourn as part of the transnational church. Carew certainly is sensitive to this distinction, this privileging of the international community. His poem argues, in response, that not only had the goals of the court and international Protestantism severed, but also the literary imagination of these ideologically-opposed communities. National literature and Protestant literature became distinct traditions, and the Englishmen memorializing Gustavus participated more in a transnational — or for Carew, indiscriminately German — community; the images, base-texts, associations, even subjects and genres in their writing belonged to a foreign tradition as Carew and other Sons of Jonson began enclosing a literary canon that would reflect and define the national character.

Carew insists on this bifurcation throughout “In Answer.” Aesthetics stand in for national differences and national proclivities: “the German drum” opposes the “sweet airs of our tuned

---


violins” (95,99); heroic poetry opposes the pastoral masque. Carew declaims the absurdity of English poetry commemorating Gustavus, because English poetry – or at this point, his poetry -- lacks the heroic quality:

[...] How may
My lyric feet, that of the smooth soft way
Of love, and beauty, only know the tread,
In dancing paces celebrate the dead
Victorious king, or his majestic hearse
Profane with th’humble touch of their low verse?
Vergil, nor Lucan, no, nor Tasso more
Than both, nor Donne, worth all that went before,
With the united labor of their wit,
Could a just poem to this subject fit. (5-14)

The line breaks throughout Carew’s poem continually undercut both the courtly aesthetic and the heroism of Gustavus. Carew wryly implies that the “dancing paces” of English poetry can no longer celebrate any dead; the unexpected “Profane” initiating the tenth line, made more surprising by inversion of subject and object, emphasizes the claim. A present-focused poetics exists in these lines, overturning genre hierarchies. Each generation of poets produces someone to surpass tradition, Tasso better than the Romans, Donne better than “all that went before.” In the list, the poets of national epic become less skilled and less important than the lyricist; indeed, the exemplar for all national epics — Virgil — stands lowest in Carew’s esteem. Donne’s place as the English poet (it seems notable that he is preferred to Spenser and Jonson) inscribes the kind of verse, the amatory verse of lyric and masques, that the poem will later define as characteristically English. Even in forwarding his incompetence for the task, then, Carew has renounced the usefulness of a heroic elegy and established a poetic and national hierarchy that

---

will hold throughout the poem. English poets who, like Donne, renounce the classical preference for epic and focus instead on the pleasures of peace become the most worthy.

The history of criticism on Carew’s poem has engaged the complexity of the verse, complicating Carew’s self-identification and his attachment to the Charles: perhaps the effeminizing peace at times seems to critique the Caroline court, though the chaos of the German field hardly seems better. Certainly, these are complex politics, and they have been brilliantly illuminated by a number of critics in the past two decades; but they are also literary politics: figuring the conflict as a literary conflict, Carew asserts his right (as the most accomplished of the Sons of Ben) to define national literature and exclude the Protestant dissent.

**Carew’s erasure of international Protestantism**

The life and death of a foreign Protestant hero provoked English writers to investigate their own nationality, to explore how their English-ness might align with or challenge their attachment to the international church. The variant strength of these identities, once again, proved divisive. According to McRae, Carew “is all too aware of underlying division. At a time when some were concerned that the death of Gustavus was overshadowing celebrations to mark Charles’s recovery from smallpox, and when *corantoes* celebrating the Swede were officially banned, Carew tries judiciously to assert the values of England’s own ‘good king.”’

18 Critics have failed to stress, however, that Carew asserts these values by arguing for a national canon—by, that is, arguing that his kind of English poetry is inextricably tied with English character. His claim—that the English are not capable of epic verse—is a fairly radical rewriting of both English literature and the English nation.

It has become a critical commonplace that any distinction between literature and politics

---

– or a literary language and a political language – would be anachronistic in the period. Literary critics and historians of various ideological and methodological stances (Sharpe, David Norbrook, Quintin Skinner, and J. G. Pocock, for example) have firmly re-established the importance of political context, with a bent toward examining the depth and complexity of language. These convictions have helped uncover the politics of Carew’s poem, but perhaps because more interest has been given to courtly politics, critics have sometimes overlooked the literary politics embedded in the poem. In “In Answer to an Elegiacall Letter,” political debates are hashed out in the terms of literary criticism. As Sharpe insists, “[t]he very choice of mode and genre often carried political meaning,” and Carew extends this by claiming that particular genres, and their inherent meanings, are suited to the character of a people.¹⁹

Carew’s solution to the problem of zealous Protestants preferring the Swedish king to their own is to divide the church along national lines. What is most notable about Carew’s poem, to paraphrase Loxley, is the erasure of Protestantism. Carew reframes the apocalyptic struggle between Protestantism and Catholicism as a national problem – it is the German drum, not the Protestant drum, that impotently calls for English assistance. While the English writers who assumed the task of eulogizing Gustavus Adolphus saw themselves as part of the same community as the Swedish King — the international church — Carew insisted that they were not: “Then let the Germans fear if Caesar shall, / Or the united princes, rise and fall” (43-4). For many English writers, the Thirty Years War was an apocalyptic struggle that demanded allegiance and revealed the divine binary by which history was structured: the Church of God vs. the Church of Satan. For Carew, the Thirty Years War was a particularly violent German problem. Carew dismisses even the information pouring in from the continent as suspect and

foreign, open to exaggeration:

They’ll think his acts things rather feigned than done,
Like our romances of the Knight o’th’ Sun.
Leave we him, then, to the grave chronicler,
Who, though to annals he cannot refer
His too brief story, yet his journals may
Stand by the Caesars’ years, and every day
Cut into minutes, each shall more contain
Of great designment than an emperor’s reign (23-30)

The lines express not only disinterest (like Jonson’s)\(^{20}\), but mild skepticism about the claims made in the notoriously unreliable *coranteo*, as well as a sardonic reference to their penchant for expansion. Every minute of Adolphus’s life will spill out in more words than other historians use to write an emperor’s entire reign. (Those who have read through the tedious and seemingly unending volumes of *The Swedish Intelligencer*, the hefty prose works by William Watts devoted to telling the king’s story, may particularly sympathize with this line.) Though ostensibly Carew praises Adolphus’s actions as great beyond belief, the incredulity reverberates upon the claims themselves. Carew, after all, writes from England, and has gathered most of his information from print sources. The material comes at a remove, translated from foreign sources that themselves were often not eye-witnesses to the events. In fact, the insistence on the geographical distance subtly undermines his opponents’ confidence in the shared, pan-Protestant public sphere – their sense, which we shall soon see, that all of these poems across national borders were collaborative. The distance and the necessity of translation cut England off from participation.

English poets, fitting the English character, should according to Carew focus on the pastoral masque and the unique Englishness it implies. (As the poem debates nationalism, it

---

\(^{20}\) As Reid Barbour notes, however, the poets belie their superficial disinterest in continental affairs and reveal the pull of competing obligations owed to both Charles and international Protestantism. Reid Barbour, *Literature and Religious Culture in Seventeenth Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 62. Indeed, Carew’s attempt to undercut traditional Protestant heroism can be seen as another argument in the plurality of heroisms that Barbour has traced through his first two chapters: Carew seeks to reframe the national meaning of Protestant heroism.
seems worth noting how many Caroline masques take the nation – or the international Britain – as their subject.) Carew hopes to shift this Anglo-centric focus onto the discussion of the Thirty Years War. English poetry has a specific character not well suited to – though not incapable of -- the continental epic:

not that thy Muse wants wing
To soar a loftier pitch, for she hath made
A noble flight, and placed th’heroic shade
Above the reach of our faint flagging rhyme;
But these are subjects proper to our clime:
Tourneys, masques, theaters, better become
Our halcyon days. (89-95)

The turn from a personal (’My lyric feet’(6)) to a national account of poetry (”our faint flagging rhyme”; “our clime”) is elided without reference, as if Carew has established himself as an unimpeachable mouthpiece of national poetry. Even while praising Townshend’s elegy, he claims that its example has made elegy-writing impossible for others and, more importantly, circumscribes it outside of the national sphere: it is not a subject “proper to our clime.” Gustavus is a foreign king who belongs in foreign poetry – German poetry, as he indeed was. “Clime” reinforces the borders by tying the character of “proper” English poetry to the land, and it also relates poetry explicitly to the character of the people, considering the fact that early moderns believed climate played an important role in personality. Instead, the English Muse suits “Tourneys, masques, theaters,” genres and venues more fitting to the salutary environment of Caroline peace. The final lines complete the abscission of England from the continent and negate any lingering obligation owed to the international church:

[...] The noise /
Concerns us not, nor should divert our joys
Nor ought the thunder of their Carabins
Drowne the sweet Ayres of our tun’d Violins;
Believe me friend, if their prevailing powers
Gaine them a calm securitie like ours,
They’le hand their armes up on the Olive bought,
And dance, and revell then, as we doe now. (97-104)

These lines re-enforce the division between Germans and English — a difference that too many elegists, Carew apparently feels, had ignored under the larger category of Protestant — as it insistently moves between “their/they” (99,101,103) and “our/us/we” (98,100,102,104). Once again, this national difference is figured partially in terms of aesthetics — the “sweet Ayres of our tun’d Violins” opposed to “the thunder of their Carabins” — and their guns, of course, sound much like their drums. Carew’s poem works to circumscribe English poetics, to expurgate “foreign” subjects from native English poetry. In a way, Gustavus’s elegists and epicists belonged more to a pan-Protestant literary field than an English literary field — the very borders of what counted as English literature were at stake. While the two – English and Protestant -- fluidly mixed in the period, as we shall see with Ralph Knevet’s incorporation of Gustavus Adolphus into Spenser’s Faery Land, Carew’s poem meticulously separates them and insists on their distinction. One of the encomiastic poems included in John Russell’s epic on Gustavus seems to have recognized Carew’s attempt to determine English letters: “Thus will censorious Criticks talk, and those / That th’Empire claim of Poetrie and Prose.”21 Carew has claimed the English “Empire of Poetrie and Prose,” and he has attempted to define its character by the exclusion of Protestant material.

Englishness, however, is not easily to isolate, even for Carew. His insistence on severing the pan-Protestant connections must ignore the links between courtly art and the continent, and negotiate being “English” but not provincial. In other poems, Carew recognizes the Italian and French sources of his own poetry and the extent to which his French, Catholic queen has shaped the artistic direction of the court. His “To the Queene,” for example, opens with a

straightforward statement of the Platonic love the queen had helped to bring into vogue:

Thou great Commandresse, that doest move  
Thy Scepter o’re the Crowne of Loe,  
And through his Empire with the Awe  
Of Thy chaste beames, does give the Law.  

Similarly, Carew’s “In Answer” evokes this international complexity, drawn from alternative, non-Protestant continental sources, while trying (unsuccessfully?) to reframe the aesthetic as English. “The beauties of the Shepherds Paradise” inevitably recall the foreignness of courtly masquing and the queen’s central role, as the masque described, Townshend’s Tempe Restored, has everyone surrender in the end to ‘divine Beauty,’ played by Henrietta Maria (54, 61-88).

But in his discussion of Gustavus, Carew works to make these traditions specifically English, to efface the continental connections they imply. Laura Lunger Knoppers has tracked a similar process in portraiture attempts to domesticize the queen and strip her of her dangerous foreignness; yet “the domestic representation of the monarch was in itself unstable: the very success of Caroline portraiture fed anxieties about the queen’s Catholicism and her undue influence over the king.”

Carew’s poem similarly attempts to write the royal couple and the nation as peaceful, isolated, blissful. And yet, as we shall see, the very materials used to define this Englishness recall Catholic and Italian – and even, perhaps unfairly, Spanish – sources to opponents of the court.

Critics have often assumed that Carew writes against more radical Protestants — that the


23 Scholars have increasingly recognized the international networks influencing Henrietta Maria’s aesthetics at the English court. See, for example, Karen Britland, Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria (Cambridge: Cambridge U Press, 2006).

internationalists would in the next decade become those who waged war on Charles. Michael Parker, for example, claims that “Townshend, perhaps inadvertently, has aligned himself with the ultra-Protestant party and jeopardized his position at court.”

Certainly, Protestants further left rallied around the cause of Bohemia, but a surprising amount of the praise of Gustavus derives from future royalists. Townshend is actually entirely representative. William Watts, the composer of the voluminous *Swedish Intelligencer*, fought for the king during the war; Townshend continued to serve the king after war broke out; even Nicholas Oldisworth, who renounces his Englishness to follow Gustavus, apparently resumed his faith in Charles and remained a moderate royalist until his death in 1645. As revisionists have insisted, no simple line can be drawn between positions in the 1630s and 1640s. The attraction of the international Protestant cause and the temptation to identify with a transnational church appealed to far more than the radical fringe. Ralph Knevet also served under Charles in the war, though he writes a version of England and the Pan-Protestant Church in his completion of Spenser’s epic very different from that imagined by Carew.

**Englishness in Context**

Carew’s attempt to redefine English literature, as many scholars have noted, must be placed within the context of the elegies written for Gustavus. There is certainly an erasure of England in these works, and it stems, once again, from an attachment to the international Protestant Church. More than a critique of the Caroline court, the elegies enact a complex discourse on identity politics: might one’s attachment to the church override one’s nationality? Might religion determine both action and character more than one’s nation and region? The fact

---

that so many future royalists would be immersed in these discussions — traditionally reserved to
the radical fringes of Protestantism, those who left their country for Amsterdam — demonstrates
the growing rift between Stuart policy and English Protestants’ traditional self-understanding.
Slowly, the great religious heroes of the age had been led away from England: after the
Elizabethans, Henry, the Scottish prince took the mantle; followed by Frederick V; and now, the
Swedish King, Gustavus. If True Religion moves westward (as George Herbert and others in the
period claim26), Protestant heroism, from an English perspective, had moved North and East.

Robert Gomersall, a divine who occasionally turned to religious verse, flagged his
interest in the religious community even in his address to the reader: “I am sure a Prince in Israel
is fallen, and therefore it can be no shame for David himselfe to follow the Beer. Which I trust
thou dost in a true sorrow for him, and an harty prayer to the Almighty that he would raise up
another to perfect, who thus farre hath advanc’t this royall instument in his cause.”27 Israel, here,
is clearly the church, as Adolphus’s military career had served the people of God – those true
Protestants suffering in Germany. In many of Gustavus’s elegies, as Sharpe has noted, poets hint
obliquely that Charles should assume to position vacated by the Swedish King, and perhaps
Gomersall suggests the same in his prayer that God would raise up someone to “perfect”
Adolphus’s work. In the elegy itself, however, Gomersall focuses on the meaning for the pan-

Protestant community with a marked disinterest for nationality:

Are all our hopes but this? did we expect
that thou our falling Fortunes shoulst erect,
And must thou fall thy selfe? a little dust
Remaine of him, who, we did surely trust,
Should into dust have brought Romes prouder walls,

27 Robert Gomersall, Poems. (London, 1633), sig. O1R.
And hastned the great whores just Funeralls? (1-6)²⁸

His opening immediately places him inside Gustavus’s community (“our hopes”; “our falling Fortunes,” his pronouns pointedly counter Carew’s), and the early appearance of Rome quickly divides the world into the apocalyptic binary. While Gomersall does invoke national heroes — Caesar, Hannible, Henri IV, Bruce of Scotland, Edward — he quickly dismisses them in comparison because of their selfish focus on individual power or fame. Adolphus, on the other hand, fought for others, and especially for God and his church — a theme throughout the international praise of the Swedish King.

Whilst all thy power is spent in Gods owne Cause,
To plant, or to establish his pure Lawes
To make Professours fearelesse, that it might
No longer be a crime to be i'th' Right,
Nor a sufficient cause to make one Dye
That he would seeke a true Æternity. (111-6)

Sharpe and J.S.A. Adamson have drawn attention to the contemporary skepticism regarding Adolphus’s intentions, but in the elegies that lauded him inside the context of the Protestant Church, his imperialistic attributes are celebrated.²⁹ Part of this is perspective: focusing on the church, Protestant writers cared little if he actually conquered and subdued the German lands; indeed, a Protestant emperor was part of apocalyptic history, the one who would conquer the whore of Rome. As with all Protestant heroes, this often gives Adolphus’s accomplishments a messianic tint. The emperor would be, after all, a type of Christ, and his role would be to save the Christian people, not to return German Dukes to power.

Nicholas Oldisworth, a clergyman and poet writing from Oxford, comments directly on the identity conflict provoked by Sweden’s victories: “England, I cast thee off: thou shalt not bee

²⁸ Gomersall, Poems, O1V.
‘My country any longer” (1-2).\textsuperscript{30} It is a bold opening, especially considering that, as Oldisworth inscribes in the margin, he wrote the verses “about the yeare 1630,” while Gustavus Adolphus was still alive.\textsuperscript{31} As John Gouws notes in his edition of Oldisworth’s MS, the call to the younger generation of poets fell on deaf ears in 1630, but it was taken up two years later in the elegies.\textsuperscript{32} For Oldisworth, the English silence, not to mention English non-involvement, is shameful:

“Dares hee spend Blood, and dar’st not thou spend Inke? / […] / Base! Base! Thrice base! Lett mee flie any where, / Rather than tarry to endure Shame here” (9-13).\textsuperscript{33} The extent to which Protestant chivalry was feared dead in the Caroline period has been covered by many critics\textsuperscript{34}; more specifically, however, Oldisworth wonders whether English Protestant chivalry is dead, while he still finds heroic Protestants abroad on whom to cast his allegiance.

The erasure of England often has less overt political significance; these poets are simply pulled to identify themselves through the religious rather than national community. Henry King never mentions England, devoting his entire elegy to what Adolphus’s death means for the Protestant Church. However, like Carew’s poem, each is rendered polemical by its context, and King’s focus on the church at the expense of the nation becomes, in a way, just as divisive as Carew’s more purposeful disentangling. As in Carew’s poem, many of the elegists tied English reaction to a generic failing in English verse: English poets, many argued, had become too dull. Lord Dudley North asks in exasperation what it will take to return the English poets to “heroick

\textsuperscript{30} Nicholas Oldisworth, “To the Wits of Cambridge and Oxford,” \textit{Nicholas Oldisworth’s Manuscript (Bodleian MS. Don.c.24)} (Tempe, Ariz.: ACMRS, 2009), 82-3.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 82.

\textsuperscript{32} John Gouws, “Introduction,” in \textit{Nicholas Oldisworth’s Manuscript (Bodleian MS. Don.c.24)} (Tempe, Ariz.: ACMRS, 2009), xxxi.

\textsuperscript{33} Oldisworth, “To the Wits,” l.9-13

\textsuperscript{34} See especially Adamson, “Chivalry and Political Culture,” 166-8.
straines” if even Adolphus has not been celebrated (6); he worries too much focus has been
placed on “trivial subjects” (13). Russell, who writes one of the epics on Gustavus’s battles,
highlights the fact that he writes in an increasingly neglected mode, “heroick verse.” In
comparison, he dismisses the popular court verse practiced by Carew – likely in response to
Carew’s poem, as Russell’s was published after Carew’s had already circulated (1634):

Let those soft Poets, who have dipt their brains
In am’rous humours, thaw to looser strains.
Let Cupid be their theme, and let them pay
Service to Venus in a wanton lay. 36

English verse needs to be rescued from this trend. Russell designates these amorous poets
“Amorettoes,” which, as Blain has argued, strips them of their nationhood by labelling them
Italianate and effeminate – by recognizing the continental sources of the courtly aesthetic. 37 For
Russell, Italy likely had the further connotation of Catholicism.

Re-Mapping Fairyland

Perhaps the most dramatic effect of the erasure of England and the identification instead
with pan-Protestantism can be seen in the work of Ralph Knevet. The final chapter of this
dissertation thus ends where the first chapter on heroes began: with The Faerie Queene. This
chapter, however, turns to an updated, unpublished version completed in 1635, Ralph Knevet’s A
Supplement of the Faerie Queene. An epic of the nation — by one of those Elizabethan
Protestants so keen to create a kingdom of their own language -- had given way to a generation
of disillusioned writers who wrote as part of an besieged transnational community. Ironically,

35 Lord Dudley North, “An Incentive to our Poets upon the Death of the victorious King of Swedeland,” in A Forest of Varieties (London, 1645), 72.
Spenser’s heirs wrote most of the oppositional poetry during the early Stuart period; a tradition that had attempted to establish itself as national — to define the kingdom of the English language — found itself increasingly marginalized by the prevailing courtly aesthetic. While even Spenser’s national epic, as we have seen, incorporates the transnationalism of the Dutch Revolt, more and more the values of chivalry and Protestant heroism that were embedded in his work became distinctly separated from Englishness. Knevet’s poem is perhaps the clearest example of the weight of foreign Protestant heroes on English nationality: *The Faerie Queene* itself, in Knevet’s version, is reworked as an epic of the pan-Protestant church, a drastic rewriting, though something the Elizabethan poem had already contained as a possibility.

Knevet, in many ways, serves as a counterbalance to the image of Stuart Spenserians as oppositional poets. Unlike some of Gustavus’s elegists, Knevet has never been suspected of “militant Protestantism” or termed a Puritan. He was rather a clergyman of the Church of England who satirized puritans in his early work (the masque *Rhodon and Iris*) and sympathized with Charles during the civil war. His other major poetic work, *A Gallery to the Temple*, supplemented the work of another influential poet, George Herbert, and shows a commitment to the kind of high church ceremonialism which Herbert had come to represent. In his most ambitious project, however, the loyal and patriotic Knevet clearly reads Spenser’s fairyland as an allegory of the church rather than the English nation, devoting his central book to the Swedish king. As Knevet’s recent editors, Christopher Burlinson and Andrew Zurcher, have noted, Knevet flags his emulation of Spenser in several overt ways: he uses the same stanzas; the same antiquated language marks the text; and each book is organized as one of Spenser’s, with


approximately the same length and sometimes including an “allegorical core.” Knevet, moreover, writes Spenser’s characters into his narrative, and often retells Spenser’s stories in condensed form. Zurcher remarks, however, that despite these congruencies, there are moments in which Knevet distinguishes himself: “there are other signs in the manuscript that Knevet thought carefully about the degree or kind of supplementariness to which he aspired, and sought to retreat from intensive integration with his author.” He was more inventive with language, more willing to incorporate foreign words; his similes are more often comic, even ironic, and sometimes undercut his material. Most significantly, Knevet makes historical allegory the primary purpose of his poem and flattens the polyvalence of Spenser’s allegory. Indeed, this historical meaning becomes so prominent in Knevet’s work that perhaps it even hints that he assumed Spenser had also written directly on contemporary history (an assumption shared by many of his contemporaries in their marginalia).

Knevet employs the historical allegory with greater accuracy and detail than Spenser. Events in Callimachus’s quest neatly align with Gustavus’s involvement in the Thirty Years War, redecorating Gustavus’s heroism rather than idealizing it or abstracting it. Yet, precisely because his work is so grounded in history – because it “fix[es] rather than complicate[s] meaning” – Knevet’s allegory obviously muddies the national stakes involved in an epic, and here Burlinson and Zurcher miss a sharp contrast between Knevet and our common reading of


42 Christopher Burlinson and Andrew Zurcher, introduction to A Supplement of the Faery Queene, eds. Christopher Burlinson and Andrew Zurcher (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), 10-27.


44 Burlinson and Zurcher, introduction to A Supplement, 21.
Spenser: we should note, at least, that the work is no longer a national project. In his celebration of James (in Book VII), Gustavus Adolphus (in Book VIII), and Charles I (in Book IX), Knevet has rendered Spenser’s English epic into a transnational work celebrating a particularly militant pan-Protestantism. In fact, James and Charles fare rather poorly in comparison to the Swedish king, who serves as an ideal model of the chivalrous knight and accepts the central quest that Albano (James) had neglected. The English heroes, by their failure to embrace the Protestant cause, have in some ways become estranged from fairyland. Moreover, Knevet’s work explicitly writes itself as part of this transnational tradition, identifies with foreign Protestants also celebrating Gustavus, and draws on the resources, symbols, and base texts of international Protestantism to complete the poem. England retains a role, but it becomes merely complementary as Knevet recounts the heroic military action of the Thirty Years War.

* A Supplement of the Faery Queene thus both confirms and complicates Carew’s division of the English literary field by writing an English epic with the foreign hero. The recognition of this dualism — that the attempt to reinvigorate and remember English militancy relies on foreign generals — drives Knevet to openly controvert Carew’s idyllic image of peace and prosperity; he, like many other elegists, laments the fallen state of English heroism. Callimachus is the knight of fortitude, and Knevet expatiates at length on the definition and necessity of fortitude. Early in the eighth book, the hero comes across an English youth, Tendron, and Callimachus’s advice seems to be directed at Carew’s poem, or at least the sentiment at court that Carew’s poem expressed. In this discussion, Knevet adopts Carew’s use of aesthetics to represent martial valor, but he reverses the hierarchy: masques and pastoral are dishonourable, while the highest literary genre (as Spenser had earlier argued) is the epic that tells of war:

“How happens it that in thy youthful age,
“When now thy limbs with vigor are supplied,
“That thou rid’st not in warlike equipage,
“But looks’t like one fitt for a scenic stage? (8.1.18)\(^{45}\)

There is something unnatural in the idyllic English peace for Knevet; young knights are supposed to desire conflict. Knevet’s critique is targeted directly at Carew and the masquing aesthetic – the “scenic stage” -- he had established as the foremost genre of English literature. Perhaps the nationality of the slothful youth makes it even more unnatural, for the English had long prided themselves on their national belligerency. More importantly, according to Knevet, the non-involvement is more than unproductive: it is ignoble.

“What boots it to pursue the fearful Hart,
“Or rocks-surmounting Roe? Leave these delights
“To Delia, and her Nymphs; it is thy part
“Thy body to engage in bloudy fights,
“And to consort thy self with hardy Knights:
“It argues ignobility to spend,
“In melting vanities thy days, and nights,
“When thou by honors labour mayst ascend
“To bliss, which of all vert’s action is the end. (8.1.19)

The “melting vanities” is again aimed directly at court, referencing perhaps the atoms that “melt away” in Carew’s description of Townshend’s masque, though the poetry of the Caroline court generally contained a lot of melting. Callimachus’s critique is expressed in the traditional political language employed against the court: “Th’art too effeminate” (8.1.22).\(^{46}\) Instead of luxurious peace, Callimachus claims that true glory – and true contentment – come only from a life of harsh self-abnegation and military training: “But (like a Spartane youth) he must address / Himself, to win the palme at any price” (8.1.2). Contest – whether military or poetic – requires sacrifice.

\(^{45}\) Ralph Knevet, A Supplement of the Faery Queene, eds. Christopher Burlinson and Andrew Zurcher (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), (8.1.18). Lines will henceforth be cited in the text.

For Knevet, these are the true values of England and English poetry. Indeed, Tendron seems naturally inclined to assume the heroic role -- “Yet well I wish to arms, and should be glad, / In list of knighted to be numbered” (8.1.20). He simply had not been properly taught. In the failure of education, Knevet subtly critiques Caroline poets, who held the responsibility for inculcating heroic virtue. This failure is all the more apparent considering that Elizabeth’s court – which again in reminiscing becomes the fairy court – had been the paragon of heroic virtue.

Ne certes, were these Maximes upheld,
With more observance of religion,
In any Clime, that ere the sunne beheld,
Then under Gloriane the Parragon
Of honor, and heroic action.
Those that by bloudy Tyrants were oppresst,
Found freedom if they sought it at her throne.
Shee plagu’d the wicked, and the weak reddest:
No Prince ere had more hardy Knights, at his behest. (8.1.7)

Though Callimachus, as a knight of Glorianna, relates to all the heroes of Spenser’s poem, Knevet stresses his descent from the Elizabethan heroes of the Dutch Revolt. His closest exemplar is Artegaill, who makes several appearances in Book VIII, and was, of course, the hero of Spenser’s most political book. Similarly, Callimachus’s quest overlaps significantly with the Redcrosse Knight, whose allegory is generally understood to shadow the triumph of the English Protestant church, though more recently transnational readings have been proposed.47 Callimachus’s quest pits him, too, against a great dragon, “Aquillline,” and the description of both the foe and the battle recall the Redcrosse Knight’s battle culminating the first book of the Faery Queene. The contest between Callimachus and Aquilline, who represents Spain (Knevet’s political allegories are more linear than Spenser’s), frees “Panarete,” or all virtue, and inaugurates Callimachus’s quest, which closely parallels Adolphus’s campaigns during the

Thirty Years War.

However, Callimachus seems to both parallel and in some ways perfect the two earlier Protestant heroes. In taking the quest, he surpasses Artegall, who had been deceived by Aquilline’s subtlety:

Therefore Sr Arthegall persuaded was,
To think that Aquilino did him right,
For in the Faery Court all deceit base,
Was utterly disliked, and in deep disgrace. (8.4.7)

Knevet has clearly read Arthegall as a specifically English hero – though he offers no indication that he read him as a specific Elizabethan and instead portrays him as a generalized version of the militancy of the English Court. In this tale, Arthegall is constantly overlooking, misunderstanding, and responding inappropriately or too late to the foreign war (not entirely an unfaithful representation of his character in Spenser’s work). The case of the Palatinate similarly flummoxes Arthegall:

But Arthegall perplexed much in mind,
Rode on his way with that deceitful Dame,
Who with fond doubts his hands did daily bind,
Of justice true diminishing the flame,
That her neglected his malignant foe to tame. (8.3.43)

So, Callimachus must take on the tasks that Arthegall, in his limited understanding, leaves undone. Callimachus also views himself as completing the Redcrosse Knight’s task, and he meditates on the Redcrosse Knight’s victory to motivate himself toward his own glorious acts.

But still that meed before his eyes he layd,
Which to the Redcrosse Knight was while payd,
For freeing Edens captive Princes late,
From that foul Dragons rage that them abrade,
Whose noble prowess her ‘gan emulate,
Resolving his achievement brave to imitate. (8.3.15)

The parallel to the Redcrosse Knight implies at least that Callimachus frees another true church;
the kind of typology offered by the poem hints that Callimachus was freeing once again the same church – one of the common, typological repetitions that structure history. Indeed, as we shall see, Panarete’s community can only be understood as the international Church.

Throughout the poem, Callimachus continually hears stories “Of Arthegall, Sr Guyuon, and faire Britomart,” placing him in a line of Protestant heroes and establishing him as another hero of the church (8.3.7). Small details were read as prophetic omens confirming Gustavus’s place in the heroic Protestant tradition. Many writers noted, for example, that Gustavus died on November 6, exactly twenty years to the day after the death of Prince Henry. The date of his death served as further proof of what English, and indeed all Protestant writers, already knew: Gustavus was the latest in a series of militant Protestant heroes, the heir to a tradition stretching back at least to the Dutch Revolt. Indeed, analogical thinking searched out these hidden connections, finding prophetic clues even in his name: GUSTAVUS became an anagram for AUGUSTUS, and SVED (Sweden) was DEUS inverted.

A wealth of material demonstrates contemporary understanding of Gustavus’s place in the lineage of heroes extending from William of Orange. Just as in each wave of elegies, a new hero was expected to arise and assume the place and mission the previous hero had vacated, so the same imagery and iconography could be transplanted onto the next hero. Like Prince Henry, the Elizabethans, and Frederick, Gustavus was a Phoenix, according to Henry King: “like the Phoenix in her Spicy nest, Embalm’d with Thine owne Merit, upward fly.” The Phoenix offered both rebirth and continuity, progress and tradition. After Gustavus died, another, elegists

---

48 An Alarme to all Christian Princes claims Gustavus died “the very same day of the moneth the 6 of November old stile that Prince Henry died.” An Alarme to All Christian Princes and States of the Religion (Amsterdam?, 1632), 7-8.

once again hoped, would fill his place: “Wie auss des Phoenix Asch ein ander aussersticht; / So kömpt euch übern Kopff gewiss ein ander Schwed” [As out of the phoenix ash rises another, so certainly comes another Swede over you all as head.]\(^{50}\)

Part of the repetition may derive simply from how formulaic elegies can be both now and certainly in the early modern period. There is nothing particularly heroic – or characteristically Protestant – for example, about a dying king, but in each series of elegies poets return to the apparently novel realization that princes, too, are mortal. Another anonymous poet expresses his surprise as the death, “since we looke, / On Kings, as if they were not clay and dust.”\(^{51}\) As in the death of earlier heroes, elegists conventionally wonder that some divine sign did not accompany Gustavus’s death:

> Was there no clap of thunder heard to tell  
> All Christendome their losse; and ring his Knell?  
> Impartiall Fates! I see that Princes then,  
> Though they live gods, yet they must dye like men.\(^{52}\)

The exact sentiment, almost the exact claims had been made twenty years earlier for Prince Henry. Notably, however, the community bonded by the loss here is “All Christendome,” and even the conventional lament for the death of princes stems from the Old Testament, that reservoir of Pan-Protestant imagery (“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 (Ps. 82:6–7)). In a court-centric context the continued reference to the mortality and fallibility of kings may seem like implicit criticism of Charles. Some of the anonymous lyric in the Swedish intelligencer could

---


\(^{52}\) Ibid., l. 8-11.
border on political confrontation, especially from the perspective of Charles and his sanctified image of kingship. King exhorts contemporary princes, for example, “Learne You Kings! / You are like Him, but penetrable things.” While critics have read a critique of the Caroline court into lines like these – and assumed Carew responded to this critique – the statement is entirely conventional and had been said equally by those mourning Henry. Context matters, but judging by how many of the elegists actually sided with Charles when war erupted in England, they may have intended less political critique than has been found in their lines. The focus, instead, is on an international community that mourns in almost ceremonial repetition. England is superseded by the wider and more important Church of God, and the way people mourn, extending far past these heroes, has hardened into convention.

Despite the inevitable repetition as a product of generic imitation, the archival record suggests that early moderns viewed these heroes in tandem; there existed almost a type of “Protestant hero” filled by a series of militant princes. A famous woodcut serves as a frontispiece to the *Swedish Intelligencer* (1632), an equestrian of Gustavus overlooking a battlefield of the Thirty Years War. Not only does Gustavus’s posture on the horse, his gaze out of the woodcut toward the reader, consciously reflect the heroic equestrian paintings of Prince Henry and the heroes of the Dutch Revolt, but the verse at the bottom ties Gustavus to his immediate predecessor and ignites the hope for a Protestant empire. Psalm 45: 4-5, printed below, reads “Gird thee with thy sword upon thy thigh, etc. / Good lucke have thou with thine honour: / ride on, because of the word of trueth.” As we have seen in the previous chapter, the psalm, associated with the marriage of Solomon and the Pharaoh’s daughter, for which the marriage of Frederick and

53 King’s elegy is one of the only credited elegies in *The Swedish Intelligencer*. King, “An Elegie,” sig. Q3R-Q4V, l. 54-5.
Elizabeth served as the antitype, promised militant and imperial expansion for the true church of God. Under Solomon/Frederick – or now Gustavus – the psalm promises conquest for the true faith and expansion of the metaphorical Israel. Gustavus’s victories had resurrected both the potential and the desire for a transnational Protestant empire, and Gustavus himself promised to be the godly emperor who would finally and decisively defeat Rome: a task with which all these heroes had been charged, but none had accomplished.

Knevet, too, places Callimachus in this lineage of heroes and borrows much from the already established stores of Protestant heroic iconography. Hercules, for example, was another frequent exemplar, a term of praise for Protestant heroes, and Knevet introduces the link between
Callimachus and the Hercules myth. These stories, however, also provide Knevet an opportunity to discuss his own theory of poetry’s effect on the reader and to stress why heroic poetry is so important. After Callimachus slays the dragon, Panarete leads him on a tour of her palace. One of the palace’s wings consists of a gallery of heroic pictures, and Knevet uses the paintings of Hercules to discuss how exemplarity works. At a basic level, Knevet’s theory of the importance of good heroes in poetry was commonplace in the early modern period, paralleling Sidney’s. In Sidney’s well-known argument, poetry surpasses both philosophy and history in nobility because it is able to inculcate moral lessons (unlike the strict historian, who must report even the success of the wicked) and do it pleasurably (unlike the heady and tedious philosopher). Sidney’s discussion shares the ubiquitous Platonic assumption that art will transform the viewer/reader, that readers will inevitably become more like either the villains or the heroes in their reading:

And that the Poet hath that Idea, is manifest, by delivering them forth in such excellencie as he had imagined them: which delivering forth, also is not wholly imaginative, as we are wont to say by them that build Castles in the aire: but so farre substancially it worketh, not onely to make a Cyrus, which had bene but a particular excellency as nature might have done, but to bestow a Cyrus upon the world to make many Cyrusses, if they will learne aright, why and how that maker made him.  

There is some agency in the reception of art — the reader must “learn aright, why and how that maker made” the hero; but the instrumental sense implied by the verb — to make — and the exact repetition — Cyrus makes many Cyrusses — stress the potency of poetry on the reader. Inside Panarete’s palace, the images “Of Hercules the labors perilous” (8.5.13) begin to transform Callimachus into another Hercules. They were

Examples great, to price on each brave heart,
To the achievement of renown, and glory,
Either by valor, or ingenious art:
[...] Here light was given unto each heroic mind,

Whereby the way wee to true happiness may find. (8.5.12)

The stories have their desired effect, inflaming Callimachus with a desire for glory:

Those doughty deeds which Hercules had done,
His haughty thoughts, with emulation plum’d:
Hee wish’d that he had bin Alcmenas sonne,
Though he in OEtas flames had bin consum’d,
Or by a gapping Earthquake quick inhumed,
So that his name surviving might have own’d,
Those trophies of renown. (8.5.14)

Callimachus responds properly to representations of heroism – something Englishmen under the
Stuart regimes had notably failed to do. They had not only the “doughty deeds” of their
Elizabethan forbears, but even their representation in Spenser’s epic. Even Callimachus’s
response to heroic art models proper English behavior. Knevet also offers a further explanation
of his practice of romance, as well as a key for how he reads the romance of his predecessors. All
the enemies faced by Hercules, Knevet explains, were actually bad men, but art generalized them
to make the lessons more universal:

Sterne Tyrants, Theeves, and bloudy Murtherers,
Were all the monsters that her fought with all,
Whose savage cruelties, and riots fierce,
Made Poets in their lines perpetual,
Them Lions, Dragons, Bores, or Bulls to call,
Such were those Giants, that liv’d then likewise
Men that were not then other men more tall,
In stature, but in neatly cruelties,
These Monsters measured were by their great Villanyes. (8.5.16)

Knevet’s theory of romance is perhaps more straightforward than Spenser’s; characters in poetry
represent the “Tyrants, Theeves, and bloudy Murtherers” in a direct allegorical relationship. This
explains the detailed accuracy of his historical narrative, especially compared with Spenser’s
idealized account of English intervention. Each crucial battle in the Thirty Years War finds direct
representation in the plot of Book VIII, and Knevet is faithful enough to the historical account to
have Callimachus die at the battle of Lützen. While his poetry accurately retells Gustavus’s military action, the generalizing tends to reinforce the apocalyptic binary between Catholics and Protestants: Catholics are giants and dragons, murderers and rapists. Knevet believes in the importance of poets in this process – like so many of the elegists who exhorted the English to write elegies – for they choose between sides and essentially interpret history, making sense of the turbulence of the Thirty Years War by dividing parties into evil and good:

And Poets did immortalize his name,
In many elegies, and poems grave,
Wherewith thy did his memory embrace,
And for to make his glory exquisite,
They him the Symbole made of Knighthood brave,
And of his labors twelve did songs endive,
Which ought to bee achieved by every errant Knight. (8.5.17)

Poets, in other words, determine both the borders and the character of the community. One thing apparent from this understanding of art is that for Knevet the debate over the poetic canon was very directly a debate over the national character. Carew seems to agree, considering his description of the pastoral masque as suited to the “clime.” Both, in discussing the kind of poetry the English should or do write, are equally discussing the kind of English men and women they hope to produce. For Knevet, the answer is obvious, and he writes a Gustavus hoping to make many Gustavuses. This makes Carew’s celebration of the “Halcyon days” especially pernicious, because it threatens to undermine the heroism Knevet hopes to inculcate in his reader. Even Callimachus, after his victory, is softened by celebration and false love:

He quite neglected deeds adventurous,
Addicted to delights effeminate,
Which did his martial vigor much abate. (8.5.44)

The Platonic love celebrated at court, according to Knevet, is responsible for England’s lack of heroism:
Love is the bane of noble actions,
The poison of an honorable mind,
By which great persons oft have bin undone,
For it doth so the understanding blind,
That to true bliss it can’t the right way find,
Hurtfull in youth, but monstrous ’tis in age:
A bird of fairest hue, and seeming kind,
That unawares the heart of man doth gage
With deadly dole, while her no evill doth presage. (8.4.45)

Court has promulgated a perfidious and enervating ideology, and Knevet sets love in direct antipathy to heroism. Of course, he does attempt to rescue Charles’s image, and he remained attached to the king. The debate over the English canon — and therefore English nation — mimicked the competition over Charles’s image, which Sharpe has admirably traced. Knevet views — or at least desires to view — his prince in the mold of the Protestant hero. The dedication to the book on Fortitude praises Charles martial valor as comparable to the Swedish king’s:

Even so (renowned Charles) thy fortitude
Protects thy self, and People from all fear;
While all the world beside with blood’s embrued:
Kingdomes defac’d, and Townes dismantled bear
Makres of Bellonas cruelty severe. (8.1.3)

Knevet praises the English peace, like Carew, but counterintuitively views it as a product of Charles’s intimidating martial prowess. England’s peace, even in this militant epic, is a desirable thing, and like Carew’s ambiguity, Knevet’s praise of Charles registers some conflict between his duty to his nation and his duty to the international church. However, Knevet’s commitment to militarism throughout the poem threatens to render some of his praise of Charles ironic. He adds, for example, a third layer to George Herbert’s double moat around the British church:

Britaine is by a threefold Wall surrounded,

(Great Prince) while thou dost raigne […]
The third Wall, which in strength exceedeth all,
Is thy imperial vertue, which doth move
Both God, and Man of thy great actions to approve (8.1.5)

Much like assurances that the insuperable Prince Henry’s conquest would lead to universal peace, Charles’s skill in war has assured that no enemy might be tempted to attack his kingdoms. In this context, however, the praise of Charles seems almost ironic and becomes rather difficult to read in a laudatory tone. The entire book is devoted, after all, to Gustavus, a king whose intervention shamed the English monarch’s passivity, and Charles receives only a nine stanza dedication. Though the next book is devoted to Charles, it celebrates Liberality and, as Burlinson and Zurcher have noted, seems less laudatory than the work devoted to Gustavus; the juxtaposition only reinforces Charles’s failures: “the contrast between Gustavus Adolphus and Charles I could not be starker.”

Every time Charles or a Caroline English hero appears in the eighth book, they fail in their quest. In the context of war, it becomes all but impossible to uncover Charles’s “great actions.” I am inclined, however, to take Knevet’s dedication of the work to Charles, as well as his praise of the English monarch, seriously, considering his decision not to publish and his later sympathy for the royalist cause; it seems he generally intended not

---

56 Burlinson and Zurcher, introduction to A Supplement, 24.

57 The long-standing debate over the effectiveness and invasiveness of early Stuart censorship relates, perhaps, to Knevet’s decision not to publish the work, and moreover to rid the work of signs of his authorship. Whether from loyalty or fear of punishment, Knevet recognized that his work ill suited the political climate. Though it risks oversimplification, the scholars on censorship in the period can generally be divided into two camps: those who believe censorship had little to no impact on the book market, and those who believe it made a significant impact and became increasingly stringent under Charles I.

D.F. McKenzie, for example, has claimed in his economic analysis of the London presses that censorship had “virtually no impact on the economy of the booktrade.” D. F. McKenzie, “Printing and Publishing, 1557-1700: Constraints on the London Book Trades,” in The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, eds. John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge U Press, 2002), 566-7. Sharpe has repeatedly insisted that Caroline censorship was neither effective nor even all that interested. Deborah Shuger has argued, similarly, that most censorship in the period related not to ideas, but instead to libel, and was important for developing a concept of “civility” on which a public sphere could be founded. Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor-Stuart England (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).
to offend his king. The question arises, I think, why his work fails so entirely in its praise of Charles, and the answer hints at Carew’s delimiting of works on Gustavus outside of the English canon. Throughout the poem, and throughout the writing on Gustavus, the foundational community of reference is the transnational church, and in this context, Charles becomes difficult to praise.

**Knevét’s Community**

However much Knevét tries to re-integrate English Protestant heroism and the epic romance, his book on Gustavus Adolphus essentially proves Carew’s claim: Knevét’s poem participates in a transnational Protestant imaginary that reinterprets English meaning in the *Faerie Queene* as pan-Protestant meaning. The most obvious facet of this is the fairy court, which very clearly no longer resides in London but instead represents Protestantism generally. As I have tried to demonstrate in my second chapter, this meaning was always implicit in Spenser’s own work, the ambiguity of the allegory simultaneously referring to both the nation and the church. That the political language itself was so invested with ecclesiological language – the nation and church as bodies, as temples, etc. -- made this tie natural, especially when the English could genuinely see themselves in the vanguard of Protestant chivalry. But the Stuart
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On the other hand, Anthony Milton, who agrees with some of their findings, argues that “there was an effective tightening of regulations of the printing of religious literature in the 1630s.” “Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England,” *The Historical Journal* 41.3 (1998): 635-6. The claims that censorship was rarely effective or enforced in the period seem to square poorly with many of the known facts. S. Mutchow Towers, in a survey of the period’s religious writing, also notes a shift: “by 1637, in the area of religious printing, press control through ecclesiastical licensers was effective for newly printed works.” *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England* (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003), 277. This control ushered in a major ideological change, according to Towers, a move from a Calvinist Orthodoxy in printed religious works to a Laudian focus on adiaphora and the beauty of worship. Randy Robertson, in the most recent and one of the most anti-Caroline of the works on censorship, argues for a much more pervasive influence, and notes “the psychological impact of censorship, the “chilling effect” that licensing and exemplary punishment undoubtedly had,” remarking on the kind of self-censorship that seems particularly germane to Knevét’s case. *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), 10.
period made that identification more difficult, as evidenced by Knevet’s praise of the military virtues of Charles, which reads unavoidably like paradoxical encomium. In Knevet’s epic, pan-Protestantism has been re-inscribed as the central community of relevance, but beyond this, all of the references, symbols, types and allusions used to describe the Swedish king, even those stemming from Spenser, are shared with Protestant writers on the continent. In other words, Knevet not only re-centers the community on the church, his epic draws from a Pan-Protestant imaginary and therefore becomes part of a Protestant, non-English, literary sphere — exactly as Carew had claimed.

Several times in Knevet’s poem, fairyland has clearly been dislocated from England. It seems possible, even, that Knevet may have interpreted Spenser’s fairyland as the church rather than the nation, misunderstanding some of the nationalist connotations of the epic. Indeed, considering Dekker’s *The Whore of Babylon*, many contemporaries may have shared this internationalist reading. When Leucippe, representing James’s daughter Elizabeth, the queen of Bohemia, in the allegory, sends her dwarf to beg for succour, it is clear that the Faery court has extended to all of Protestantism: “[M]any Heroes, of illustr’ous fame, / Desir’d to succour that distressed Dame” (8.1.8). While Elizabeth received much support in England, not only English warriors were “in the action foil’d, / Defeated, and repell’d with mickle shame” (8.1.8). Many of her most illustrious supporters came from abroad — especially the Prince of Orange and Gustavus Adolphus. In fact, this internationalist focus is reinforced later when Knevet notes that

… though Callimachus, were fairely bred,
Of princely stemme, yet were in faery Court,
Many that did in birth farre him exceed. (8.9.6)

Though Gustavus may not have descended from as noble a line as the Stuarts, since the crown of Sweden was younger than the crown of England, there were not “many” in England who “did in
birth farre him exceed.” Only in surveying the larger Protestant — or even anti-Hapsburg — movement can one find several knights outranking a king. This focus becomes more apparent later, after Callimachus’s defeat of Androgeus, when

… those that wish’d well to the Faery state,
Reioyce’d to heare these newes exceedeingly,
But others did repine, and greve thereat. (8.7.29)

The true fairies are those who celebrated Gustavus’s victories. As we have seen throughout this chapter, that demographic in no way neatly aligned with the English. Similarly, in the next stanza Androgeus is designated as the “supreme foe” of Faery land, and Tilly, certainly, was never regarded as England’s greatest foe.

The book’s focus on the Thirty Years War and Protestantism has, like many of the elegies, almost effaced England — certainly re-centered fairyland on the continent. Because of how deeply Spenser’s fairy and Englishness seem associated for us, this can be difficult to see; indeed, the poem’s first modern editor, Andrew Lavender, claims in his introduction that “England is yet the center of Faeryland,” and Burlinson and Zurcher continue to place the nation at the center of Knevett’s militant Protestantism – “urging his nation to pursue its elect role in the evolution of European history.”58 Yet as the allegory plays out, the context continually undermines any English meaning, and even Lavender glosses fairyland as “the Protestant world” when discussing Gustavus’s campaign.59 Perhaps the final stanza clinches most fully the internationalist bent of Fairyland, as all “That for the health of Faery Land did care” mourn Gustavus’s death excessively (8.12.36). Once again, as Carew demonstrates, this clearly was not true throughout England.


Like so many of the elegies, Knevet’s poem turns to metaphors of the church to discuss the community to which both the poet and Callimachus belong. Panerete’s palace, the seat of virtue and a parallel to Fairyland, shares everything in common, just like the early church, and was “composed” by “that great Architect, who high doth site / Above the starry fabrice of the skies” (8.5.2). Of course, the church as a temple built by God has reticulated throughout this heroic discourse and certainly suggests the church on earth. In fact, Knevet stresses the internationalist connotations of this building — the pieces were “selected out of divers provinces” (8.5.4). Just as with the knights of Fairyland, the court’s close parallel is insistently international.

In this context, however, the church has entirely superseded the nation, regardless of the extent to which the language incorporates both notions: it stretches the reader beyond belief to see Gustavus Adolphus as an English or British prince, even if he was a Knight of the Garter. A clear example of the contemporary confusion between the church and the nation, even in more radical calls for Protestant obligation, can be seen in the anonymous pamphlet *An Alarme to all Christian Princes and States of the Religion*. Unlike the many elegies gently insinuating that Charles should assume the role vacated by the Swedish King, *An Alarme* demands it, courting politically dangerous positions: “Let them [Princes] declare themselves, (as our Saviour wisheth) hot, or cold, for Religion, or against Religion: for the common libertie of their conscience, and their country, or against it.”\(^6^0\) The pamphlet states that Charles’s recent illness came as a warning from God and presented an opportunity to renounce his “popish and Spanish” influences at court and join the heroic Protestant struggle; it leaves no doubt about where obligations lie, subordinating the nation to the international church entirely, to the extent that the “English”

\(^6^0\) *An Alarme*, sig. A2V.
nation becomes meaningless. However, once again the language of ecclesiology overlaps with nationalist rhetoric. Like the nation, the church is a body: “for we are all members of that his mysticall bodie, and every one hath an interest in the weale or woe thereof” … “We are all Hypocrates twins, we must either, laugh together, or weepe together: wept we have a long time.”61 As the pagans felt obligated to their country, so Christians were obligated to the church: “And it was one of their great commandements, pugna pro Patria: and is lykewise to every true Christian: pugna pro Ecclesia.”62 And once again, that vexing typology of Israel is constantly employed in a discussion of Gustavus’s death.

The writer claims boldly that if only a Parliament would be called, “both Church and state had still flourished, as in the dayes of Queene Elisabeth of famous memorie: since utterly decayed, the glory gone from Israel, and nothing prospered that we have undertaken.”63 This position, at which decades of revisionist historiography have chipped away, has fallen from accounts of the period; scholarship has shown incontrovertibly the material benefits of the Caroline peace. And yet, perhaps this critical consensus overlooks the religious perspective. English Protestants — especially those leaning more to the left, but even those who would eventually serve Charles — saw their church and the true religion in decay, and the crisis often provoked an international frame of reference. “Israel” is here once again ambiguous, simultaneously the English church which avoided intervention, and a true international church encompassing also the German church under canon and sword.

Elegies written for Gustavus take the same approach; though they have often been read in scholarship as political critique, and perhaps functioned as political critique because of the

61 Ibid., sig. A2V.
62 Ibid., 8.
63 Ibis., A3R
content, the elegies seem much more interested in the international community. England has been effaced in their verse, but only because it has been subsumed into the larger “Christendom.” While some writers do lament the waning English militancy, just as many take credit for Protestant victories, joining themselves with the heroes on the continent. An anonymous poet published in *the Swedish Intelligencer* notes that Fortune needed to eliminate Gustavus because she saw “The fortune of the warre would over-tilt / To us.”64 The next elegy sides itself similarly with all of Protestant Christendom: “Were there no reason else, this might suffice / To prove thee dead, that we want victories.”65 Carew’s repetition of *us* and *them* is perhaps in response to this English tendency to identify with Gustavus. The penultimate elegy opens extending Gustavus’s influence to a global scale:

I will not curse thy victory, or say,  
Though we were Conquerors, we lost the day.  
That thou wert all of us; that in thy fall,  
(Thou being its soule) twas the worlds funerall.66

Once again, “we were Conquerors,” the English poet claiming his Protestant allegiance. And as we have seen throughout this study of Protestant heroes, Gustavus again holds together the Church; as the world’s soul, he was “all of us.” Gustavus, in this frame, was always seen as “Christendom’s great Champion;” he belonged to all Protestant peoples, and his expanding empire was associated with the apocalyptic Christian emperor who would usher in 1000 years of peace. His empire would be a Protestant – not Swedish – empire. Many of the elegists in England welcomed the prospect. These poets saw themselves as part of the pan-Protestant

---


community, that international association they still called Christendom, and their poetry was produced in this context.

More remarkably, an examination of continental literature demonstrates why these English poets imagined their own participation in the continental war and suggests that a vibrant pan-Protestant literary field continued to exist. The writers in various national traditions are drawn together, in part, through their shared ideology and the common popular imagination still uniting most of Protestant Europe. The typology common to Protestant thought, which we have seen throughout this heroic tradition, certainly facilitated a sense of a transnationally shared space. Like his predecessors, Gustavus was hailed as a repetition of several Old Testament heroes, first in the German broadsides, *encomia* and elegies, and later in English verse and sermons. The rich array of biblical heroes provided the matrix though which Gustavus’s conquest was understood. As a militant leader in the fight against the Catholic Church, writers hailed him as another Joshua. In “Gustav Adolfs Tot bei Lützen,” for example, Johann Rist, a prolific poet, hymnist, and eventually pastor, residing during the early 1630s in Heide, describes the tyranny of the “Babylonian whore” before the arrival of “our Joshua”:

> Bis unser Josua in Eil' sich that begeben  
> Den Feinden ins Gesicht, und wolt Ehr', Leib und Leben  
> Aufsetzen, ja sogar die königliche Kron'  
> Vor teutsche Libertet und die Religion.  

[Until our Joshua in haste took action against the enemies in his face, and desired to try his honor, body, and life, even his kingly crown, for German liberty and the religion.]

Joshua had lead the Israelites after the death of Moses and was responsible for the defeat of the Canaanites and Israel’s entry into the promised land. As the anti-Catholic rhetoric leading up to the passage suggests, the type referenced the common association of Catholics and Canaanites –

---

idolaters – and thus adopted a particularly belligerent stance toward continued conflict. (The Canaanites, after all, had to be wiped out entirely.) For Rist, the type also confirms Gustavus’s increasingly mythic role – the defender of German liberty – while also splitting the communities Gustavus served. He fought both for German liberty and ‘the’ (not ‘German’) religion. This bifurcation – German liberty and true religion – appears repeatedly throughout the elegies.

Because of the rapidity of Gustavus’s conquest, Gideon became an equally popular comparison. Towns fell before him seemingly at the blast of a trumpet. In fact, Gustavus had drawn this connection to Gideon himself as early as the 1620s in his wars against Poland, and his accumulating successes after he entered the German territories only reinforced his perception of his divinely appointed role. And, if his success during life linked him to Gideon, his death, which transpired during a Protestant victory (though less of a victory than contemporaries imply), reminded poets of another biblical hero: “Im Anfang deiner Thaten / Ein dayffrer Gideon / Am End ist dirs. Gerahhten / Stirbt gleich / Wie ein Samson” [In the beginning of his deeds, a brave Gideon, at the end is the same, died like a Sampson]. Together, the Old Testament heroes provided a tradition for interpreting Gustavus, the same foundation that had made sense of the other heroes before him. (In fact, as we will see shortly, these other heroes accumulate inside the tradition, as Gustavus becomes not simply a repetition of Joshua or Sampson, but another Willem van Oranje.) Writers combined the types indiscriminately, in part because they all repeated the same role – leaders and defenders of God’s church. Thus, it was no conflict to pile up figures: “Was Simson/ Gideon/ und Josua gewesen/ Wie man von ihnen mag in Gottes-Buchern lesen/ Das ist gewesen auch der Mitterndchtig Heldt/ Den Gott zu seiner Kirch und unser Schuz bestellt.” [What Samson Gideon, and Joshua were, as one may read in God’s book,

so also was the midnight hero, whom God sent to his church and our protection.]\(^{69}\) As Achim Aurnhammer has noted, “Der biblische Vergleich freilich intensiviert die christliche Valenz von Gustav Adolfs Triumph.” [The biblical comparison certainly intensified the Christian valence of Gustav Adolphus’s victory.]\(^{70}\) Certainly, the comparisons imply a religious understanding of the events. More importantly, however, they place Gustavus’s conquest within a providential history that effaces nationality and instead divides the world into two parties: the elect and reprobate, God’s church and Satan’s. Like the biblical heroes that preceded him, Gustavus defends the church, and his role parallels those written in the scriptures. Indeed, from a wide view of history, as another repetition of the same pattern, Gustavus himself has been written by God into the role.

These types both clarified and defined Gustavus’s meaning for contemporaries, and they appear in almost every elegy published. As the last passage implies, this had certain ramifications for how Gustavus was understood. Against those sceptics who imagined the Swedish king in pursuit of an earthly, Swedish empire, the recourse to biblical exemplars insisted that religious conviction motivated his military intervention. In the anonymous “Ein Christliche Klag-Lied,” for example, the author insists on the spiritual motivation for Gustavus’s campaign: “Sonder der vielmehr gewagt/ Nicht nur Land/ Leut/ Gelt und Gute;/ Sondern auch ganz unverzagt/ Fuer die Reine Lehr sein Blute.” [But much more, he risked not only his land, people,
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money and goods, but also his blood, entirely undaunted, for pure teaching.]\textsuperscript{71} Far from desiring material gain, Gustavus risked his wealth, lands, and life for the sake of true belief. He fought, the elegies insist again and again, for God’s church. In fact, the types were almost always associated with the wider church and true belief. In another anonymous poet’s praise of Gustavus as Gideon, for example, he maintains that Gustavus came as a divine gift for the Protestants.

Wir aber sein betrübt sehr/
Und stehn in grossen Schmerzen/
Wers trewlich meint/ mit reiner Lehr/
Muss trawren jetz von Herzen/
Dass uns der grosse Gideon/
Von unserm Haupte ist davon/
Zur Unzeit nu genommen/
Wagen und Reuter Israel/
Dess sich getröst viel tausend Seel/
Der Grechten und der frommen.

[But we are very afflicted, and stand in great pain, who mean truly and with right belief; we must sorrow now in our hearts that the great Gideon is untimely taken from our head, chariots and knights of Israel, who comforted many thousand souls of the righteous and the pious.]\textsuperscript{72}

Only those with “reiner Lehr” mourn for the king – recognizing, it seems, communities within Germany that did not lament his death; he was taken from the “Grechten und der frommen,” from Israel.

Typology therefore rendered the king more shareable both in that these comparisons crossed national and linguistic lines and belonged to the shared stock of European culture, and also in that the religious community for which he fought became open and inclusive. Scholars

\textsuperscript{71} Ein Christliches Klag-Lied (1633), l. 528-32, \url{http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN815310684&LOGID=LOG_0002}

\textsuperscript{72} Rex Sueciae, Rex Gloriae (1633), l. 81-90, \url{http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN773856676}
have already discussed the typology, in part because it was so pervasive.\textsuperscript{73} As Simon McKeown accurately notes of the popular literature,

In the wake of Breitenfeld, we find innumerable instances of broadsheets, pamphlets and canards styling the King of Sweden as a latter-day Gideon, Joshua, David, Jehosophat, Josiah, Daniel, Judas Maccabeus, Moses, or Jacob. What is uniform throughout this material is the fervour with which such publications advocate the providential status of the Swedish king and the chiliastic significance of his enterprise.\textsuperscript{74}

Yet generally these discussions have taken place within a national context, which has misrepresented how fluidly the war became transnational for contemporary Protestants. As these types insist, states did not hold the right to legitimate violence – the right to wage just war – but rather God and the religious community held that authority. The Old Testament exemplars promoted a borderless, apocalyptic reading of contemporary events. Many writers, like Rist, expanded the types explicitly: if Gustavus was Joshua, or Gideon, or Samson, then those people for whom he fought were Israel. Even if many German poets imagined the suffering German Protestant churches in their lament for Israel, the well-established metaphoric connection between Israel and the entire church ensured that it included all those Protestants following the news in England.

In the connection to Israel, Moses was most often invoked as Gustavus’s antetype; like Moses, he would lead the people from Egyptian (or Catholic) tyranny. In “Ein Christliche Klaglied,” the poet offers an extended comparison of the two princes, pointing out their manifold similarities. Their importance in freeing God’s people becomes most important:

Wie unter sechs hundert tausend
Moses war allein der Mann/
Der sein Volck durch das Meer brausend

\textsuperscript{73} See Werner Milch, \textit{Gustav Adolf in der Deutschen und Schwedischen Literature} (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1977).

Führen solt in Chanaan:
Also ward der König hoch
Gewürdig’t von GOTT alleine/
Der von dess Anti-Christ’s Joch
Erloss sein betrangte G’meine.

[As among six hundred thousand Moses alone should be the one to lead his people through the thunderous sea and into Canaan, so was the king, highly honoured by God, alone the one to free his [...] society from the Anti-Christ’s yoke.]75

The type of Moses once again, then, tended to reinforce the binary dividing Catholics and Protestants, and associated the early Catholic successes in the war with another period of Egyptian slavery. In some ways, it even appropriated the other emerging interpretation of Gustavus’s heroism – as the defender of “German liberty” – for the wider church, for it insisted that he resisted a specifically Catholic, anti-Christian tyranny and restored the liberty proper to the people of God.

The Bible was thus rich with heroic princes who had defended God’s besieged church, and some aspect of Gustavus’s life or death could inevitably be found to be presaged in one of God’s ancient heroes. As so often in the pan-Protestant heroic tradition, the types link Gustavus to both his predecessors and successors, and place him within the same repeating role in history. They appeared in broadsides and manuscripts, poetic collections and news pamphlets. Indeed, this typology never became simply a provenance of poetry, for the pulpits broadcasted the same message: Gustavus had come, like an ancient biblical hero, to defend the church. The German Lutheran pastor Nicephor Kessel lists Gustavus’s antetypes in a single sentence, bringing together the vast typological field through which the Swedish King could be understood:

[...] unnd uns unsern Gideon, unsern Josuam, und zugeschickten Heiland/ den Durchleuchtigsten und Grossmaechtigsten Fuersten und Herzen/ Herzen Gustavum Adolphum der Schweden/ Gotten und Wend Koenig/ R. von uns durch den Todt widerumb abgefordert/ dass er mit Juda Maccabeo, mit Josia und

75 “Ein Christliche Klag-Lied,” l. 89-96.
In England, those who mourned for the Swedish king appropriated the same biblical types, both because, to most Protestants, they were obviously true, and also because the news of Gustavus passed through the German texts first, rendering the common motifs of the celebration and mourning well-known. A network of translators and news agents existed to convey crucial information about the events in Germany to an eager reading public, and they drew on the culturally shared material – both types and, as we will see, classical figures – to tell their story. The English poets who in turn wrote their own commendatory verse while reading this material thus appropriated metaphors and comparisons original to the material stemming from the continent. Indeed, Achim Aurnhammer has demonstrated the pervasive intertextuality between the broadsides and elegies written in German territories; and the translated material in England, we might add, provides a similar foundation for English poets. The elegies never exactly became direct translations – none of the major German poets had their work translated in full – but rather manifested the kind of borrowing and overlap characteristic of a culture deeply indebted to imitation and ‘commonplacing.’ The first elegy in The Swedish Intelligencer, for example, celebrates Gustavus’s Samson-like death as “A death Triumphant, at whose spreading fall / The Empire groan’d, as if t’expired withal.” This may have derived from the many German poets who also referred to the Swedish king as Sampson; or it may simply be that both English and German poets drew on the same cultural texts to make what seemed a straightforwardly evident comparison.
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76 Nicephor Kessel, *Gustaviana Recordatio Admiranda* (Nürnberg, 1633), sig. B2V.


78 “An elegy on the king of Sweden,” in *The Swedish Intelligencer*, l. 9-10, sig. Q1R.
For most English writers, typology was the primary frame for reading the actions of the Swedish king within the German territories. Robert Gomersall, a clergymen and poet, opens his elegy for Gustavus with a prefatory address to the reader setting up the meaning of the event: “I am sure a Prince in Israel is fallen.” The claim itself references a passage in the Old Testament, 2 Samuel 3:38, and subtly interprets Gustavus’s death as a religious and universal loss, including Gomersall and other English Protestants in the mourning. Gomersall sees Gustavus especially as another Gideon, as he notes, “Their walls were like to those of Iericho, / Would fal to give thee entrance.” Similarly, we hear again that Gustavus was another Moses. According to the same poet who first introduced us to the linguistic variance in this literature, for example, Gustavus’s death before the completion of his empire recalled Moses’s death on Pisgah:

Wherefore this Prince like Moses, after Hee
Had led the people from captivitie;
And scourg’d the nations, like some humane God,
Till rivers bled, done wonders with his rod:
Dy’d on the top of honour. Pisgah is
For a brave height, a mount much short of this.
But lest we worship Him: we know not where,
This day to finde his hidden Sepulcher.

The poem introduces both the threat of idolatry, the purported reason God had fated the death of Gustavus (as well as the death of Prince Henry), portrays the victories of Gustavus as miraculous and divinely inspired, and also, most importantly, re-inscribes the Church as Israel. Just as Moses led the Israelites to freedom, so Gustavus freed the Protestant Church. The type of Moses was perhaps the most bold of all those applied to Gustavus, and it referenced that celebrated penchant

79 Robert Gomersall, “An Elegy upon the untimely, yet Heroicall death of Gustavus Adolphus the Victorious King of Sweden, &c.” in Poems (London, 1633), sig. 1R.

80 Ibid., l.120.

81 “Upon the king of Sweden” in The Swedish Intelligencer, 1. 63-70, QQQ3V.
for freeing the enslaved. Another poet, even more invested in Old Testament typology, claims that, like Moses, Gustavus had laid the foundation for a nation properly devoted to God:

   The sea-sequestring Chiefe, whose sceptred Rod  
   Establish’d freedome to the Church of God,  
   Had yet his period, and from Nebohs toppe  
   Was faine, by Prospective, to tast that hope,  
   He might not live to graspe I’th promis’d Land,  
   Whose seizure heaven kept for a Ioshuahs hand:  
   So thou (Mosaique Prince,) this fair foundation  
   By thee being laid to unslave the Germane nation.82

Once again the type interprets those oppressed German Protestants generally as “the Church of God,” and again Gustavus frees them. The freedom promised by Gustavus’s conquest was paradoxically brought nearer by his death. And yet, given the deeply religious overtones, it seems unclear whether the nation-founding work of Gustavus applies to Germany or Israel – that is, Germany or the church. Considering the excitement during Gustavus’s early campaigns in England, many English men and women apparently imagined the victories of the Swedish king applied equally to them. Throughout the poetry, the types again and again insist on reading the history through a religious frame. Indeed, Gustavus became so close to a biblical hero that, according to Oldisworth, children assumed his story could be found in the scriptures:

   And busy Children, hearing how by dint  
   Of sword, the tyrant Emperour is beaten,  
   Question their fathers, if the King of Sweeden  
   Bee in the Bible or the Psalter nam’d.83

   Relatedly, by drawing the action of the Swedish king into biblical history through this ubiquitous typology, the elegies, broadsides and sermons often took on a prophetic character. The works became charged with religious and apocalyptic significance, as writers felt the

82 “On the king of Sweden: an elegy,” in The Swedish Intelligencer, l. 39-46, QQ2R.

approach of the end times during the violence of the war. Prophecy is in fact central in much of
the celebration of Gustavus, just as some English poets are distancing themselves from the
prophetic mode.\textsuperscript{84} Many writers traced Gustavus’s entry into the war to a prophecy of Paracelsus,
which had drawn on Jeremiah to claim that a golden lion would come from the north to defeat
the black eagle. The “Northern lion” was one of the most frequent epithets used in praise of the
Swedish king, and the Hapsburgs were represented by an eagle, so the significance seemed, to
contemporaries, fairly obvious. In the hands of Protestant poets, this quickly became tied to the
prophecy in Revelation, and writers eagerly heralded the fall of Rome. In Knevet’s poem,
Callimachus is called forth to rescue Vittoria by a prophecy:

\begin{quote}
Upon your targe those royall signes you beare,
Which (as it hath prognosticated bene)
That Knight of honorable worth must weare,
Who shall preserve my Lady from distresse, and feare (8.6.34).
\end{quote}

William Watts highlighted The Swedish Intelligencer’s prophetic mode by including the
prophecy that supposedly heralded Gustavus’s entry into the war in an opening epistle. He notes,

\begin{quote}
For that it seemes impossible\textsuperscript{85} for us English to avoyde that observation of Philip de
Commines, That in all great actions, wee are still harkning after Prophecies...the famous
Paulus Grebnerus his Booke, now in Trinitie College in Cambridge... He speakes of a
King of a true Religion that should doe all this: and of much happinesse that should
succeede it.\textsuperscript{86}
\end{quote}

Henry King notes the “Cassiopeian Sparke, / (Which in the North did Thy first Rising marke).”\textsuperscript{87}

And equally, prophecy is central to the poetry written inside the German territories. This
prophecy tends to polarize the world into the Church of God and the Church of Satan, and


\textsuperscript{85} Oddly, “impossible” is written with the German β, again flagging participation in a German subject.

\textsuperscript{86} William Watts, \textit{The Swedish Intelligencer}, sig. A2V.

\textsuperscript{87} King, “An Elegy,” l. 127-8.
therefore reinforces the prioritization of the international community. This is the reason, perhaps, that Carew views Protestant writing on Gustavus as particularly un-English: the prophetic mode subverts national distinction.

The polarization again leads to the anti-Catholicism, typical of this pan-Protestant poetry but, to the chagrin of many English Protestants, not present in the courtly aesthetic. In Threnen, the world is clearly divided between God’s people and the “Feind” who persecutes them through the emperor; in *Zwei Klag und Trawler Lieder*, the poet unites “Bapts/ Teuffel/ Jesuiter/ / Ganz Anti-Christen Hauff,” all of whom persecute the evangelical Christians without mercy. The second song in *Zwei Leider* celebrates Gustavus’s victory against “Der Babylonischen Hur,” the staple epithet of Protestant propaganda in the empire for over a century. The English elegists embrace anti-Catholicism with equal verve: “Should into dust have brought Romes prouder walls, / And hastned the great whores just Funeralls.” The metaphors of the escape from Egypt and from the Babylonian captivity, as we have seen, are particularly prominent. Knevet scatters vitriolic attacks on Catholicism throughout *A Supplement*. But all Knevet’s anti-Catholicism can be placed within this tradition, the writing on the Thirty Years War from Germany which – understandably, given the context -- inclined to polemical extremes. Like the typology, the anti-Catholicism allows English Protestants to participate in the suffering of their German coreligionists, to universalize the conflict.
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88 *Threnen. Uber Den Traurigen Jedoch Sighafften Todtsfall. Weyland Hess... Herrn Gustavi Adolph Victoriosi, Der Schweden, Gothen und Wenden König* (Strassburg, 1632), e.g. l. 24, 36, [http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11063135_00002.html?zoom=0.6500000000000001](http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11063135_00002.html).

89 *Zwei Klag- und Trawler-Lieder*, l. 50-51, [http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11063136_00004.html](http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11063136_00004.html).

90 Ibid, l. 67.

91 Gomersall, “An Elegy,” l. 5-6.
These English poets and clergymen who adopted Gustavus did so consciously as
Protestants rather than Englishmen. (As we have seen, Oldisworth felt that following Gustavus’s
progress even required renouncing his English identity.) A comparative frame that examines the
English and German response to the Swedish king simply misrepresents the way these writers
imagine their literary production. Moreover, these same types extended into other countries and
areas. Perhaps the most complicated encomium for Adolphus that engaged Old Testament
history was written by a preacher in Zeeland, Bartholomaeus Hulsius. *Den Onderganck des
Roomschen Arents door den Noordschen Leeuw* (The Destruction of the Roman Eagle by the
Northern Lion) draws on the typology common to pro-Swedish propaganda throughout Europe
in its emblems celebrating the king, composed likely before 1635 (though published
posthumously in 1642, perhaps to capitalize on the ten-year anniversary of Gustavus’s death).
McKeown has written extensively on the work, and he argues that the “emblematic nature of the
text… allows for the construction of allusive symbol-complexes that condense the mythopoetic
identities bestowed upon the king by propagandists, prophets and panegyristst.”92 The medium of
the emblem, in its complex interaction between text and picture, facilitates a thoughtful
reflection on Gustavus’s role. As Hulsius’s emblems progress, they portray Gustavus as Joshua,
Moses, Aaron, Gideon and Sampson, and link him even to Christ. The Swedish king’s campaign
is aligned with the progress of Israel in the desert, and thus the same binary, apocalyptic thinking
often structures the work.

Yet the Dutch emblem book characteristically resists national readings. McKeown notes
Hulsius’s claim that “myne Herdtgrondighe gehenegentheyt tot myn L[ieven] Vaderlandt” ([his]
heartfelt inclination towards my beloved Fatherland) incited him to write the book, but

---

“Vaderlandt” in this context is a vexed concept. As McKeown has also shown, Hulsius was born to Dutch parents in Frankfurt-am-Main. He later moved to Zeeland, however, and became deeply implicated in the religious politics of the Dutch Republic. Only two pages earlier, Hulsius had dedicated the work to “alle vroome Christenen, insonderheyt alle trouvve Duytsche myne Landsliden” [all pious Christians, especially all the faithful of Germany, my fellow countrymen]. Thus the religious frame and appropriation of the Germans as “fellow countrymen” encourage the readers to assume the Fatherland refers to (some of?) the German territories suffering from the war, while the book also plays directly to a Dutch audience – written in Dutch, propagating Counter-Remonstrant views, and referring to Dutch history. The letter prepares the (Dutch) reader to interpret the works in an inclusive way, to understand Gustavus Adolphus as fighting and dying for them. Indeed, the final parallel, Christ, drives this home, as Gustavus, like Christ, dies to save the church, not just the German nations.

Other Dutch writers appropriated the same typology and employed it in similarly transnational ways. One of the most eager of Gustavus’s advocates in the Netherlands, for example, was the poet Jacobus Revius. Revius both translated German material on Adolphus into Dutch verse and composed his own poems, and like many zealous Dutch Calvinists, saw the war in purely religious terms from its inception. When Gustavus first arrived on German shores, Revius encouraged the “veoren volck,” (meaning Protestants generally) to “leert hopen, leert
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93 Bartholomaeus Hulsius, Den Onderganck des Roomschen Arents door den Noordschen Leeuw (Amsterdam, 1642) sig. 3V.

94 McKeown, “A Reformed and Godly Leader,” 68.

95 Hulsius, Den Onderganck, sig. 2V.

Zealous Dutch Calvinists viewed the war most often through the type of Israel. Even the poets who never explicitly hailed Gustavus as a Gideon, Joshua, or Samson viewed the conflict as one between God’s church and the antichristian Roman church, and therefore saw Gustavus as a hero of the church.

For the Dutch, however, contextualizing the war within church history inevitably recalled their own conflict with the Hapsburgs in the previous century. The Dutch Revolt became another fold in God’s providential history, and the heroes of the revolt presented themselves as comparisons – almost types – for the current Protestant heroes of the Thirty Years War. Among the other biblical heroes who set the mould for Gustavus, for example, Hulsius compares him also to Willem van Oranje.

The anonymous author of “Een nieuwen gheordonneerden Sweed-dranck” likens Gustavus’s main opponent, General Tilly, to the Duke of Alva, the primary antagonist of the Dutch during their war against Spain. The line between biblical history and contemporary history disappears because of the faith Reformed writers placed in the continuity of the church, the way in which God’s people were subjected in every generation to the same conflict with the anti-Christ. The linking of Gustavus and Willem thus establishes Gustavus within the tradition of Pan-Protestant heroism, connects the Dutch to the contemporary German conflict, and also, perhaps more importantly, insists on a method of reading history that always privileges the religious community. Regardless of the national arena, the same war ensues continually, and all the oppressed and besieged members of God’s church must stand united.

Typology thus became the most important shared cultural context for the celebration of
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Gustavus, and it both provided a means of unification between the English and German (and other foreign Protestant) peoples, while also shaping Gustavus’s construction and personation. These biblical readings, however, were not alone, and many other exemplars were found that also were common to all the cultures of Europe. The classical heroism of Greek and Roman mythology offered a rich, shared symbolic field, and writers also found past exemplars in Greek and Roman works – though somewhat less frequently than in the Bible. Gustavus was Perseus, according to the epigrammist Adam Tülsner: “Gleich wie der Perseus war Andromedens Beschüzer; / So war der Schweden-Held Teutschalnd noch viel näzer.”

Hercules also appears through German and English literature on the Swedish King, and was, as we have already seen, an exemplary figure for Callimachus. Though the Hercules myth had accrued diverse meaning from long use, its application to Protestant heroes is particularly salient. Every hero in this study had been termed a Hercules, and, as Jane Aptekar has shown, the Protestant tradition cultivated in particular the representation of Hercules as a champion of justice. So it was for the heroes of the Dutch revolt; or for Frederick V, the “German Hercules;” and certainly for Gustavus. In Tülsner’s poem, for example, the connection to past heroes is again made explicit:

Gleich wie Augiae Stall mit grosser Müh’ aussreumbte/
Der streitbar Hercule; Also sich auch nicht scumbo
Der Schweden Hercule: voll Unflath Teutschalnd war/
Er kam und reumet es in kurzer Zeit fost gar.

[Just as the mighty Hercules cleaned Augiea’s stalls with great effort, so also did the Swedish Hercules not tarry: Germany was full of filth; he came and cleaned it entirely in a short time.]

---
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101 See also, Anagramma, A3r. Hundertfacher, which references “Der Schweden Hercules” (60).


103 Tülsner, Hundertfacher, 241-4.
In “Hundertfacher,” the Hercules trope has a rather limited application – Gustavus was merely completing the lowest task, cleaning up the filth of the German war. Other writers developed the comparison with more complexity. Paul Fleming, for example, compares Gustavus often to Hercules:

Dan du, wie Hercules, nach dem dein Lauff vollendet,  
Solt werden dieser welt, die dein nicht wehrt, entwendet,  
So hoch wirt sein das werck zu machen Teutschland frey (XL 262-4)

[Then you, like Hercules, after your course is accomplished, shall go from this world, which yours do not resist, steal, so high will his the work to make Germany free.]

As Aurnhammer has shown, Fleming drew on the broadside, Schwedischer Hercules, which had been printed in 1630. Often, perhaps because Hercules had become so important in Protestant propaganda (dating all the way back to Luther’s depiction as Hercules in the original broadsides publicizing the Reformation), these classical analogies were appropriated by Reformed, Protestant belief. The Schwedischer Hercules broadside’s image accommodates the classical myth to providential history, as the hand of God holds strings connecting Gustavus, a militia, and, in the background, a struggle between a church and a dragon. Though Aptekar has also demonstrated the ambiguity in the Hercules myth, within this tradition of Protestant heroes Hercules came to be reinterpreted specifically as a Protestant monarch who resists the tyrannical practices of Roman Church – who fights, as these poems claim Gustavus does, for Christian Liberty.

This, of course, is another internationally shared characteristic: the poetry and prose all praises the champion of German freedom. In the German elegies, as we have seen, there can be some tension between the religious and secular purposes that motivated Gustavus’s conquest, but
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often they are simply conflated. He fought for both Germany and the church: “für Gott und Gottes Ehre/ Und vor das Vaterland/ und vor die reine Lehre/ Legt seinen Harnisch an/ und bueft das Leben ein.” [For God and God’s honor, and for the fatherland, and for pure belief, he laid his armor aside and sacrificed his life.]\(^{105}\) In an anonymous broadside, Threnen Uber Den Traurigen jedoch Sighafften Todtsfall, Gustavus claims “wir vor Gottes Ehr/ unser Freyheit/ und Leben / Fechten” [We fight for God’s honor, our freedom and our lives.]\(^{106}\) While combining liberty and religion, however, Gustavus thus generalizes “German liberty” by including himself in the community of the oppressed – he fights for “unser” freedom. For many more zealously Protestant writers, religious liberty entailed the complete overthrow of the Catholic forces, though this binary, as we will see shortly, became a contested point for writers that desired a less militant solution to inter-confessional conflict.

The English elegies generally focus on Gustavus’s religious significance, but they also appropriate the national epithet and praise his role as liberator. The Swedish Intelligencer names Gustavus the “glorious Assertor of the Germane Libertie;”\(^{107}\) Gomersall has him claim “I free’d the oppress.”\(^{108}\) Liberty separates this emperor from all past emperors, according to an anonymous elegy in The Intelligencer:

Then up stood He, Chiefe Iustice of the world.  
O’re Free States Caesar did himselfe extoll;  
And on their ruines, reer’d his Capitoll.  
When he usurpt that Peece which had not on  
His Image or his Superscription.  
What though the Eagle be the highest flowne?  
Yet was not th’ayre diffus’d for him alone:

\(^{105}\) Tülsner, “Hundertfacher,” l.141-3.  
\(^{106}\) Anon., Threnen, l. 150-6, sig. A3R.  
\(^{107}\) William Watt, The Swedish Intelligencer, sig. B1V.  
But every bird, how small so e'er it be,
Hath as good right to its owne nest, as he.\textsuperscript{109}

Gustavus assures that all equally possess the right to life and religion. In the second of the \textit{Zwey} Klag- und Trawer Lieder, “Ein Anders,” Gustavus “aufgesetz sein Leib und Blut / Vor unser Freyheit/ unser gut.” [tried his body and blood for our freedom and our good.]\textsuperscript{110} In Knevet’s work, Callimachus restores the “freedome” and “libertyes” that Almnasor had pilfered (8.7.33). Almost always in both the German and English context, the idea of German liberty, though ostensibly tied to ethnicity, relates to Protestant freedom more generally. Since Rome is the tyrannical oppressor, the right of freedom extends to all Protestants; Gustavus guarantees that freedom with his sword, and thus he completes the work of Luther: “Hat Luther mit der Schrifft den WiderChrist bezwungen / So ist es mit dem Schwerdt dem Schweden auch gelungen.” [Luther conquered the anti-Christ with his writing; so it is that the Swede triumphs with the sword.]\textsuperscript{111}

The history of Greece and Rome, as the quotation from the \textit{Intelligencer} implies, was likewise mined for the \textit{encomia}. Alexander and Caesar foreshadowed the Swedish king, though Gustavus exceeded them, primarily because of his religious significance. Writers across Europe note that “Gustavus” is an anagram for “Augustus,” revealing his clandestine connection to the Roman emperor. The Latin poem “Anagramma Serenissimo Ac Potentissimo Principi Ac Domino Dno, Gustavo Adolpho,” develops the anagram as the theme of the poem, finding other

\textsuperscript{109} “Upon the king of Sweden,” sig. QQQ3V, l.10-8.

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Zwei Klag- und Trawler-Lieder}, l. 1-3, \url{http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11063136_00004.html}

\textsuperscript{111} Tülsner, \textit{Hundertfacher}, l. 285-6.
words hidden inside Gustavus’s title. “Hundertfacher” calls Gustavus another Alexander, one whom “weder Teuffel/ Tott noch Helle schaden kan.” Georg Weckherlin, a German poet writing from London, similarly perceives the Greek conqueror when he views Gustavus’s victorious march through the German territories: “Vil vestungen und stat, ja ein land nach dem andern / begehren ihr gesatz von disem Alexandern.” When Gustavus was seen as a Caesar, again, he was a holy Caesar, and a Protestant emperor: “Daher, weil sein gesicht kont alle welt entrüben, / sah man ihn alle welt hochachten, ehren, lieben, / als welchem an verdienst kein held, kein Caesar gleich.” Each of these poets argue that Gustavus’s religious calling and virtue separate him from his Greek and Roman predecessor, which, as Wolfgang Harms has shown, was frequent in the German occasional and popular literature responding to the king. The sentiment equally informed the poetry and prose written in England. According to an anonymous elegy in The Swedish Intelligencer, “Liv’d Putarch now, and would of Caesar tell, / He could make none, but Thee, his Parallell.” Gomersall draws the comparisons into more recent European history, listing Julius Caesar, Hannibal, Bruce of Scotland, Henry of France, and Edward of England, while continuing to insist that Gustavus differs from past conquerors:

112 “Anagramma Serenissimo Ac Potentissimo Principi Ac Domino Dno, Gustavo Adolpho,” (Schoenigk, 1632).

113 Tülsner, Hundertfacher, l. 56.


115 Ibid., l.355-7


All these were Conqu'rous, but upon what right
May we inquire, did some of them first fight?
Some were but Royall robbers, and the best
Made man so cheape for their owne Interest,
Revenge, or Profit drove them unto Fame,
And thus they injur'd, whilst they gain'd their name:
Whilst all Thy power is spent in doing good,
And thou gain'st nothing but the losse of blood,
Whilst all thy power is spent the wrong'd to right,
And thus thy acts are Iudgement, and not Fight

The repetition of “right” as a rhymed word and the insistence that Gustavus’s acts represent God’s judgment against Rome, once again locate the Swedish king in this church-centered historiography. Gustavus fights, he claims, “in Gods owne Cause.” Rist even combines classical and biblical heroes in his elegy for Gustavus, implying that they all should be understood in a similar manner:

Seht, hie ligt Hannibal, Hektor und Alexander,
Gottfridus, Carolus, und David mit einander,
Hie Kaiser Julius, hie Josua der Held,
Hie Scipio von Rom, hie ligt das Haubt der Welt!
Hie ligt die Frömmigkeit, die Gottesfurcht daneben,
Hie ligt Gerechtigkeit, mit wahrer Lieb’ umgeben!
Lauf, Fama, lauf geschwind, fleug schnell durch alle Land
Und mach des Helden Tod, ach weh! der Welt bekant.

Thus for zealous Calvinist poets, the classical exemplars did not shift the discussion into a national frame, but simply incorporated Roman and Greek history into the story of Gods church, and allowed Gustavus’s Christian heroism to complete classical heroism.

In both England and the empire, these classical figures often prompted calls for a poet to rise to the occasion of chronicling Adolphus. As Tüslner argues,

Aeneas Heldenwerck hat Maro schön beschrieben/
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So ist auch Hectors Lob nicht ungemeldet blieben;
Wo finden aber wir jetz unter einen Mann/
Der unsers Hectors Lob auss Schweden preisen kan?\textsuperscript{121}

This is, perhaps, the most important ramification of the religious reading of contemporary events, for these Reformed writers seek to appropriate the nation-founding genre of the epic and use it to further the church. The holy community deserves an epic based on the heroism of Adolphus, recounting Sweden’s intervention on behalf of the suffering Protestants in Germany. English writers similarly called for an epic focused on Gustavus (though while protesting their own unworthiness.) And, in fact, two English epics were written – Knevet’s, which has been considered at length in this chapter, and John Russell’s \textit{Two Famous Pitched Battles of Lypsich and Lützen}. While epics, especially, tend to reinforce assumptions about the importance of national literatures in the period – Spenser, for example, writes an English epic to compete with Greece, Italy, and France – these works suggest that many writers instead drew their literary identities from the wider Protestant community. Knevet and Russell adopt the “foreign” hero because he belonged equally to them; they write not for the nation, but the church.

Fleming’s elegy for Gustavus, “Auf Ihrer Königl. Maiest. In schweden Christseeligster Gedächtnüß Todes Fall,” engages this topos in a unique way, and comments, subtly, on the multilingual and religious character of these proposed projects. Gustavus’s death leads Fleming to lament that moderns have accomplished none of the great works of the ancients, but he insists that the heroism of Gustavus should inspire one. In answer, he builds his elegy upon Gustavus’s virtues, using the common metaphor of the poem as a building. As a foreshadowing of this great work, however, Fleming offers the example of the tower of Babel: “Man würd ein gröβer Werck biß in die Wolcken führen/ ür welchem Babels Bau sich wie nicht durffte rühren/ Als solt es

\textsuperscript{121}Tülsner, \textit{Hundertfacher}, l. 261-4.
Perhaps the disastrous pride symbolized by Babel undercuts Gustavus’s praise, but it also references a moment before linguistic confusion. Considering elegies were simultaneously being written in most of the languages of Europe, the chance to accomplish something through collaborative and multilingual celebration offers, Fleming implies, a chance almost to restore the universal understanding and heroic possibility lost at Babel. This multilingual character, indeed, makes this tradition particularly great, and promises success beyond the narrowly national literatures.

Once again, then, the shift between national traditions – German to English – misrepresents in part the tradition, for these writers all imagined themselves in the same community. Indeed, the Dutch poetry illustrates the transnational stakes of the tradition particularly well, because it offers more explicit contest over the image of Gustavus. The famous Catholic (Baptist at the time) poet Joost van den Vondel wrote often of the Swedish King, and perhaps surprisingly, he was equally laudatory. Yet he expressly avoided biblical material and focused instead on Gustavus’s classical exemplars: Caesar and Alexander. Vondel stressed the strand in the literature that portrayed Gustavus as a champion of German liberty. For Vondel, this was a war for religious freedom, not a religious war, and though he employs similar classical metaphors, he insists on their political rather than religious meaning. Early in his first laudatory poem dedicated to the Swedish king, Vondel marks the “Roomse rijck” rather than the Roman church as the aggressor, targeting the Habsburgs specifically. Gustavus’s victory undermines this political tyranny, as he “‘s Keysers maght verstroyt, in bloedigh veld.”

---

122 Paul Fleming, *D. Flemings Teutsche Poemata* (Lübeck, 1642), l. 9-11. [Held in the Harold Jantz Collection of Duke University’s Rubenstein Library]

123 Joost van den Vondel, “Lijck-offer van Maeghdeburg,” in *De Werken van Vondel. Derde Deel* (Amsterdam: Gebroeders Binger, 1857), l. 42, 46, [http://www.dbnl.org/arch/vond001jlen03_01/pag/vond001jlen03_01.pdf](http://www.dbnl.org/arch/vond001jlen03_01/pag/vond001jlen03_01.pdf)
emperors might in bloody field[124] Indeed, Vondel removes the possibility of religious war in his critique of the Habsburgs, which disassociates heavenly and earthly power: ‘t Geloof is Gods, geen aerdschen Keysers knecht.”[125] He may speak directly of the Habsburgs, but the sentiment applies equally to the conquering Swedish king. For Vondel, religious freedom clearly extends beyond simply the Reformed Christians. While many Dutch Calvinists hoped Gustavus would found a Protestant empire and finally defeat Rome, Vondel’s desires were more secular, if no less massive. Gustavus, he anticipated, would end the war and, like Augustus, usher in another age of peace. Thus, he closes the poem with the longing comparison: “En ‘t vyer des krijghs, met wapens, uytgeblust, / Wisch Adolf uyt, en schrifj: Gustaef August.”[And the fire of war extinguished with weapons, cross out Adolph and write: Gustav August.][126]

When Revius employed the classical comparisons, on the other hand, he generally subjected them to Reformed historiography, as did English and German Calvinists. In “Tranen-vloet,” for example, Revius lists the common historical predecessors:

Sett by Gustavi graf den grooten Alexander,
Den grooten en al-om vermaerden Antonijn,
Den grooten Carel, en den grooten Constantijn
Vier Coningen, in eer niet wijckende malcander. (127-130)[127]

Yet despite a heavily classical overlay, and comparisons between Gustavus and Caesar, Hector, and Achilles, Revius returns to a religious reading of the events. The Swedish king, Revius

---

[124] Ibid., 72.
[125] Ibid., l. 140.
[126] Ibid., l. 183-4.
insists, was “Begerich door Gods cracht te lossen onse banden.” Even if his victories united him with classical emperors, Gustavus’s empire was Reformed. This religious reading allied Revius with his coreligionists abroad, and Vondel’s image of Gustavus was clearly meant to counter not only the poetry of the Calvinists within the United Provinces, but the image created and shared by zealous Protestants in all of these traditions.

Almost certainly, then, all of this overlapped stemmed from both intertextual relationships – connections between printers, poets, and preachers – and, more simply, shared source material and religious hopes. Georg Weckherlin, for example, wrote his German poems while living already in London and frequenting the same literary circles as many of the English elegists,129 but even for those who had no direct connection to the German poets, they all drew from the same source material and identified with the same church. All of this writing navigated a period before national identity had taken its modern form, when, as we have seen, many poets identified primarily with the religious community, and wrote to promote the church. And yet, pro-Swedish propaganda capitalized on these connections, and clearly cultivated this multilingual, transnational community. Perhaps the best example of this is a broadside printed in Amsterdam shortly after Gustavus’s death, *Triumphi Gustaviani Typo Cupreo Delineati Explicatio* [figure 1]. This five-language broadside draws on the emblem tradition to celebrate and mourn Gustavus in the major languages of pan-Protestantism: Latin, French, German, Dutch, and English. Two allegorical images fill the upper third of the broadside. On the left, Gustavus rides a chariot pulled by eagles and tramples over the familiar image of the Babylonian whore. The other images portrays Gustavus in his death, blessed by God, as the armies of Sweden stand

128 Ibid., l. 116.

in the distance. The rest of the broadside contains the same verse translated in all five languages:

For trueth & justice both Gustavus blood was shede,  
Which both in life & death made him deserve his crowne.  
By Eagles black & white his Charet is fort ledde,  
Which is the pride of Poles & Austriens cast downe.  
The seaven-headed Beast, & filtye Whore of Rome,  
Are brought below the wheeles of his triumphing might.  
His foes fledde at his death, & to his heavenly home  
The Angles bring his soule in presence of Gods sight.

There are small but noteworthy variations in the other vernacular languages. Where the English has “trueth,” for example, the others render the concept in much more explicitly religious terms (“Religion,” “Gottesdienst,” “Godes-dienst”). Because the poem narrates the pictures, much as a traditional subscriptio refers back to the pictura of an emblem, all the translations are tied together and fairly accurate, which in effect unites all the languages around the two pictures of the heroic general. The broadside still implies the dualistic character of Gustavus role – both spiritual and worldly, religion and law – but the entire context, surrounded by the five-language poems and celebrating his victory over Rome, demands that his military campaign be read from the wider perspective of ecclesiological history. Those who celebrated – and propagandized for – Gustavus most directly always imagined this multilingual, transnational audience.

Thus Knevet and the English elegists mourning Gustavus are participating in a real and shared international literary project; their work reflects this, and they seem to have recognized the international character of their community. This was the aim of the propagandists and the assumptions of the poets. To fully comprehend how the early moderns who mourned the Swedish king in verse imagined their audience and literary community, it is necessary to move beyond narrow, national traditions and embrace the larger frame of the Protestant church. At the same time, to suggest that English poets were aware of these German readings and imagined a wider sphere for their literature – and indeed shared much content throughout Europe – does not
imply that local variation did not exist. Fleming’s poem, “Auf des lobwürdigsten Königs der Schweden Gustaf Adolfs des Großen seinen Todesfall,” provides a noteworthy example. As Gunter Grim has argued, some irony and distance characterize Fleming’s sonnet.\textsuperscript{130} Through a subtle intertextual relationship with Martin Opitz’s satirical \textit{Lob des Krieges Gottes Martis}, Fleming critiques the militarism of the Swedish king. In many ways, this sentiment aligns him more with the courtly circles advocating English non-involvement than the zealous English Calvinists insisting on aiding their coreligionists. But, if read in England, it seems dubitable how much this irony would be passed on, picked up in English translation. Local variation can thus reflect very real barriers against this transnational collaboration. But we also should recognize that that difference was never mediated by anachronistic groupings of poets based on nationality or even language. Difference, instead, points to the political contention between religious and national identities. The same battle is being carried out on multiple fronts, and the divisions break down not along national lines, but religious commitment, moderns and premoderns.

Gustavus’s propaganda of course courts international opinion, but reading these works transnationally, it becomes clear that this was not simply propaganda. Many German, English, and Dutch writers fully agreed with him that the most important community – for identity and literature – was the church.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Critics tend to focus on English elegies written for Gustavus only to provide context for reading Carew’s answer; it is important to give equal weight to these poems to understand the sentiment Carew rejects, but perhaps more important because the tradition represented by these

poems was widespread and demonstrated the shape and diversity of the literary field in the early Stuart period, before an exclusively nationalist canon had emerged. While writers who participated in the subject matter, the myths and histories, and the images and symbols of their coreligionists on the continent had likely never before considered their writing un-English, the radical disparity in how various English writers viewed the Swedish king prompted in poets both an evaluation of their own identities and an attempt to ascertain the community to which they belonged. Only when placed in this international context, I think, does the political and aesthetic significance of Carew’s poem become clear: it is a literary version of the national consolidation occurring simultaneously in the Church of England, as Laudian divines increasingly cut themselves off from the Reformed Churches of the continent.

In some ways, my entire dissertation has been an attempt to take the claims forwarded by Thomas Carew in his “In Answer to an Elegiacall Letter from Aurelius Townshend” seriously — that the English are not a heroic race; that heroism belongs more properly to the Protestant rather than national community — and to understand how the nation that once saw itself at the vanguard of Protestant forces could have been so fully divested of their militarism in a single generation. Many poets ideologically opposed to Carew agreed with his assessment: the English had been dulled by peace. Most, however, saw this as a negative consequence of the two early Stuart kings, and they faced a crisis of identity under which their attachment to an international Protestants Church encouraged them to renounce their nationalism. As we have seen, they turned instead to participating in an international literary tradition, though not necessarily as political opposition to Charles, as many served him during the war.

When Spenser expressed his desire for a “Kingdom of our own language,” the political implications of which have been so brilliantly illuminated by Richard Helgerson, he tied that
national canon with the political body; the canon itself was a kingdom and defined the kingdom. Politics and literature, as has been convincingly argued by an avalanche of scholarship over the past quarter century, were inextricably linked in the period. So, as has always been recognized, were politics and the formation of the literary canon. While the emergence of a national canon has generally been pushed dated in the Age of Johnson, an implicit legitimized version of national experience can be found already in Carew’s poem. As the scholars focused on various “national literatures” have argued, national canons both represent and construct what it means to be a particular nationality; in Knevet’s debate with Carew, both writers struggle to assert their vision of Englishness and its relation to the continent, especially their coreligionists suffering in the Thirty Years War. Carew’s vision is fixed in land – this clime – while Knevet’s unavoidably, in his reading of Spenser, departs from the national community of England and gives precedence to the international Protestant church. In this way, he has been pushed outside of the national canon; he participates instead in a larger but doomed canon, enthusiastically inaugurated in England and Scotland by disciples of Du Bartas, but fated to pass away as national identity took precedence in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

In Knevet’s work, even Prince Arthur locates his identity more in church than country. When he enters the tournament, he is adorned with both national and religious symbols, but priority is given to those of the faith:

A rich Caparison adorn’d his steed,
Embroidered all with roses, white and red,
Which work a wavy border did confine,
That those faire flowers round environed:
On his helm did a golden Lion shine,
But on his brest was figured a crosse devine (8.8.30).

The “crosse devine” is reserved for his chest – his heart is with the church. Though the elegies dedicated to Gustavus prove that many Englishmen agreed, it was an ebbing society.
The most poetic biographer of Gustavus Adolphus locates in his death the end of international Protestantism: “The end of his life heralded the closing of an epoch: the epoch which had begun with the Reformation; and though England was still to produce, in Cromwell, Gustav Adolf’s epigone, on the continent the influence of religion upon politics was waning fast.”131 Never again would writers from abroad identify themselves so fully with heroic suffering churches; never could the religious community hold such powerful claims on the right to sanction violence; nation rather than church would hold sway in European politics. Critics and historians are perhaps over-inclined to grand and revolutionary changes, to seeing the world immediately and irrevocably altered by an event; more recent data has suggested instead a long process of overwhelming continuity. Still, in the elegiacal writing for Gustavus Adolphus, one can see a kind of truly international poetics that, in the ages of nationalism, would not easily re-emerge. English letters join in this mourning with a polylinguistic group, a group that is defined not by geographical borders or even political alliance, but by their participation in the body of Christ.
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